

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

SOCIAL EDUCATION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL:
AN ILLUMINATIVE EVALUATION

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Philosophy in Education at
Massey University

Delyse Valerie Springett
1986

ABSTRACT

This study examines whether a social education programme such as Button's Developmental Group Work can provide a transformative curriculum in schools. The data are drawn from an evaluation conducted in three Wellington secondary schools in 1983.

The reasons why social education curricula have not been fully implemented are basically political, and, compared with 'high-status' subjects, the area has lacked a centralized curriculum rationale, as well as teacher-training. The political relationship between school ideology and curriculum content is explained from a Marxist or neo-Marxist framework. The concept of 'hegemony' is examined to demonstrate the complex ways in which schools maintain social control through the 'official', the 'hidden' and the 'null' curricula. Technical control over curriculum form is seen to be part of the reproductive function.

Developmental Group Work is shown to follow the 'teacher-as-researcher' process model of curriculum development. A thorough description and critique of the programme is provided, and the ideological, political and social implications for curriculum transformation examined.

Illuminative evaluation methodology provided a more flexible, comprehensive and sensitive approach to a programme where important criteria of effectiveness may emerge in process.

The data from the evaluation focus upon: 1) the development of student autonomy; 2) the professional development of teachers and their role as change agents; and 3) the programme's influence upon school organisation. Any counter-potential, to reinforce the reproductive role of schools, is also examined.

Significant and embryonic changes were discovered in the focal areas, but were constrained by the minimal amount of teacher education and training available. Positive changes were in the influence upon curriculum form, pedagogical style and classroom control; student and teacher relationships; participants' self-esteem and increased group-support; in classroom techniques and the ability to work 'in process'; in teachers' increased awareness of students, and of the school organisation, and consequent changes in values and attitudes; and in the influence all of these began to have upon the schools.

Evidence of the programme's counter-potential lay in the tendency for students to conform rather than becoming more questioning and assertive.

The conditions necessary for the programme's effective implementation were concluded to be: 1) full school commitment; 2) improved teacher education and training; 3) student education to understand school organisation and their part in the programme's transformative potential; and 4) the use of qualitative evaluation methodology for programmes in the affective area.

The implications of the study underline the need to examine the ethos of the new Health Syllabus, with which the programme has been closely associated, and which is more embedded in social reproduction than cultural renewal. Political and ideological constraints on social education curricula have led to both the pessimistic 'reproductive' image of schooling, and the use of programmes such as Developmental Group Work to restore social control and conformism. Political ways of acting upon schools must overcome the ensuing cynicism and sense of futility, and employ conflict in the curriculum and the phenomenological experiences of teachers and students

to accomplish change. An image of schooling which sees individuals as relatively autonomous, and schools as having the capacity to transform themselves and work for cultural renewal, is vital.

PREFACE

The thesis presented here emerged as a result of an interest in social education programmes in schools, particularly in the area of human relationships, developed over many years in schools as an English teacher and as a Guidance Counsellor.

While studying for the Diploma in Guidance and Counselling at Massey University in 1978, I met Dr Leslie Button and attended one of his workshops. It was Button's programme of 'Developmental Group Work' which became the basis for the Wellington pilot programme which I evaluated in 1983, the results of which provide the central focus of this thesis.

Button's work also provided the basis for the 'group work' and 'human relations' programmes which I have initiated, taught and trained other teachers for since 1979, and represents, therefore, a pedagogy and framework with which I am thoroughly familiar.

In 1982, while holding the position of Senior Fellow in Education at Massey University, I conducted a survey of 'health-related' programmes in almost two hundred New Zealand secondary schools in order to discover what schools, lacking a central policy on social education, were providing. The survey covered social education programmes in the broadest sense, and also sought information on the amount and type of in-service training in the area that teachers had received; the provisions for parent education; co-ordination of the programmes offered, and resources used.

One discovery was that Button's texts proved to be the most commonly quoted resources possessed by the schools. This, in itself, was not surprising : most of the schools had Guidance Counsellors, and many of these would have

come across Button's work in their training, on Button's visits to New Zealand, or through their professional contacts. When his programme appeared in New Zealand, it provided the first systematic, developmental curriculum in inter-personal relationships teaching which incorporated teacher-training as an essential part of its methods. Its wide-ranging objectives also make it a suitable vehicle for other curriculum areas, such as health and careers education, so that schools readily perceived that it filled an important gap in social education provisions.

Whilst conducting the survey, I also liaised with the Education Officer responsible for preparing the draft of the new Health Education Syllabus. The immense care with which the new syllabus, and my own survey, had to be introduced highlighted the political climate which generated a need for sensitivity and a low profile where implementations in human relationships curricula were concerned. The aftermath of the Johnson Report had delineated the area as one where it was safest to do little, if anything. I was encouraged to word the survey as neutrally as possible, so that the original title referring to 'Human Relationships Programmes' was changed to the more innocuous 'Health-related Programmes'.

The history and place of social education in the New Zealand curriculum, as well as the wider areas of curriculum design and evaluation, came to be of increasing interest to me. In 1983, when the opportunity arose to evaluate the pilot programme of Developmental Group Work in Wellington, a forum was discovered for examining, not only the programme, but certain aspects of curriculum innovation, as well as a situation where teachers were able, to some extent, to follow Stenhouse's (1975) 'teacher-as-researcher' model of professional development. It was also an ideal opportunity to examine work in schools by using an illuminative model of evaluation. The Depart-

ment of Education further supported the project with the granting of a research contract, and the ensuing report: 'Evaluation of a Pastoral Role Training Programme: Developmental Group Work' was published in April 1985.

I had also developed a growing interest in the 'political' aspects of curriculum and of schools, particularly in the position that the school, through curriculum transformation and teacher awareness and professional development, may become an agency of cultural change, rather than an agency of reproduction.

The thesis, then, sets out to explore and demonstrate the extent to which the evaluation of the programme of Developmental Group Work in Wellington in 1983 discovered a vehicle for curriculum transformation, and for change in schools. It also considers what, in the nature of schools, will encourage, inhibit, or subvert the programme's potential for change, and examines a situation where teachers worked together as curriculum innovators and researchers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Principals, teachers and students from the three schools taking part in the programme for their ready and enthusiastic participation in the evaluation.

I also wish to acknowledge the academic guidance received from Dr John Codd, Reader in the Department of Education, Massey University.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Overview	1
The Historical Context	2
Discussion	5
Conclusion	7
CHAPTER TWO: IDEOLOGY AND CURRICULUM FORM AND EVALUATION	
Introduction	8
Schools and Social Reproduction	8
The 'official', the 'hidden' and the 'null' curricula	12
Curriculum form and the 'possessive' individual	17
Reproduction and 'labelling'	20
A 'process' model of curriculum development	21
Reproduction, technical control and evaluation	24
Conclusion	28
CHAPTER THREE: DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK - DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE	
Description of the programme	30
Theoretical rationale of the programme	35
The potential for curriculum transformation: Ideological, political and social implications	39
Conclusion	48
CHAPTER FOUR: AN EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK - BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURES	
Setting up the project	50
Evaluation: Qualitative Evaluation Methodology	52
Evaluation: Procedures	59
Discussion	63

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER FIVE: THE SCHOOL CONTEXTS AND THE PARTICIPANTS	
Introduction	65
The school contexts	65
Participant selection - teachers and senior tutors	74
Discussion	75
CHAPTER SIX: DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK AND STUDENT AUTONOMY	
Introduction	77
Curriculum form and pedagogical style	82
Effects upon students: limits and possibilities	91
Conclusion	95
CHAPTER SEVEN: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - TEACHERS IN CHANGE AND AS AGENTS OF CHANGE	
Introduction	97
Changes in pedagogical style and classroom relationships	103
Alternative classroom techniques and strategies	107
Content and planning in process	109
'De-skilling' and 're-skilling'	112
Colleaguial support	114
Changes in teachers' perceived self-image	118
Values and attitudes	120
Teachers' role in the evaluation	122
Conclusion	125
CHAPTER EIGHT: THE INFLUENCE OF THE PROGRAMME UPON THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION	
Introduction	126
The hidden curriculum	126
Professional development and school organisation	131
The programme's influence upon values	132
Influence of the programme upon curriculum form	133
Changes in methods of control	136
Discussion	137
Influence of the contexts upon the programme	138

	<u>Page</u>
The influence of the evaluation	141
Conclusion: Conditions for the effective implementation of Developmental Group Work	145
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION - IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY	
Introduction	149
The Health Education Syllabus	149
Obstacles to Social Education curricula	152
Beyond reproduction: political ways of acting upon schools	156
APPENDICES:	
APPENDIX A Coding of Participants' Responses	162
APPENDIX B Project Diary	163
APPENDIX C Teacher Questionnaire	168
BIBLIOGRAPHY	180

CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW:

The central concern of this thesis is to assess whether a social education programme such as Developmental Group Work (Button, 1974) can provide a transformative curriculum in schools: one which, while focussing upon what really happens in schools, also makes it possible to bring about change. The data to be examined will be drawn from an evaluation of the programme conducted in three Wellington secondary schools in 1983.

In this chapter, the pilot programme will be set, briefly, within the historical context of social education in New Zealand, and some implications discussed.

In Chapter Two, an overview of how schools function in such a way as to preclude the development of such programmes will be presented from the framework provided by such writers as Apple (1979; 1982) and Bernstein (1971), who emphasize the school's role in reproducing the social structures of society.

A thorough description and critique of the programme will be presented in Chapter Three, and those features of the programme which make it a potentially transformative curriculum will be described.

Since the act of evaluation is itself a political one, it will be explained in Chapter Four why an 'illuminative' model was deemed most appropriate for evaluating this programme. Features of the model will be described to support the thesis that it presents a style of evaluation which can help to focus upon what really happens in schools, and which, through its 'reflexivity', can assist the programme in the process of transformation.

Chapters Five to Eight will draw closely upon the evaluation of Developmental Group Work conducted in 1983. The contexts in which the programme operated will be examined for their possible effects upon the programme; evidence of the programme's ability to increase the autonomy of students and to enhance the professional development of teachers and their role as change-agents will be studied; and the extent to which the programme affected the school organisation will be discussed. An examination will also be made in these chapters of the programme's counter-potential, that is its potential to underline and reinforce the traditional structures of the school.

Finally, Chapter Nine will examine the implications of this piece of research for curriculum development in New Zealand. The rationale of the new Health Education Syllabus will be considered in relation to the structural features of schools and the transformative aims of social education programmes such as Developmental Group Work.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT:

Schooling in New Zealand has traditionally been more concerned with the socialization of the child rather than social education per se: the one has tended to be confused with the other. As Codd points out (1981), the fact that the social determinants of the curriculum have been so strong, and generally based upon the acceptance of existing social practice, has led to the confusion between education and socialization. The widely debated Johnson Report (1977) for instance, stated that 'primary socialization must be the over-riding concern of home and school', (ibid : 15), and that the teacher 'must ensure that values accepted by the school and community in partnership are strongly emphasized', (ibid : 34). Bates' critique of the Johnson Report (1978) distinguishes between socialization and social education: for social

education, "the cognitive content, skills, attitudes and dispositions (are) of a much higher level ... also the procedures which may be employed are confined to those which are consistent with the ends of social education". (ibid : 29). Codd emphasizes that, while the transmission of prevailing norms has a place in education, socialization that results in lack of awareness or tolerance, or the denial of the capacity for rational and independent judgment, is ill-suited to a society which purports to be democratic. (op.cit : 58).

Significantly, it has generally been at times of social unrest in New Zealand, when signs of the erosion of traditional values have appeared, that the area of "social" education has received most attention. It is not surprising, therefore, that the focus has tended to be upon socialization in the narrow sense. The concern for the development of 'social education' programmes in the 1950's, following the Mazengarb Report on Moral Delinquency in Children and Adolescents (1954), illustrates the point. As Snook has pointed out (1980), a chronicle of the influences upon moral education in New Zealand, to which social education can be closely allied, serves to emphasize the extent to which schools have reflected the social, political and economic climate of the nation. (ibid:210-216).

Moreover, efforts to develop and implement programmes of social education at the school level were not supported by centralized policy. Even the Currie Report (1962:22) tended to discourage the school's assumption of too strong a role in the physical, moral and social education of young people. A Curriculum Development Unit Bulletin on "Social Education" in 1968 was the only lead offered by the Department of Education, although the secondary teachers' professional body, the Post-Primary Teachers' Association, in the Report of the Curriculum Review Committee, (1968 : 74), emphasized the need for schools to do more to foster the social and personal skills young people need to face an uncertain future.

The areas of health and social education became highlighted by both lay and professional opinion as being of central concern during the deliberations of the Educational Development Conference, 1972-4. Two reports, 'Educational Aims and Objectives' (p.19) and 'Improving Learning and Teaching' (p.77, p.148), underlined the need for better social education provisions in schools.

The issue was picked up in the Ross Report, 'Human Development and Relationships in the School Curriculum', (1973:8). The discussions following this report led to the setting up in 1975 of the Committee on Health and Social Education, and the Committee's comprehensive report, "Growing, Sharing and Learning". (1977).

The public debate and dissension following the report demonstrated clearly the political nature of the school curriculum, and of this curriculum area in particular. Implementing the recommendations of the report in schools would have meant overtly examining, and encouraging young people to examine, the values underpinning our society. The upshot was a period of vociferous debate, dominated by vocal minority pressure groups, followed by an uneasy stalemate, and even a tendency towards retrenchment in the area of social education in schools. (Harris 1982).

Snook, (1985), has analysed the political basis to the contest over the curriculum, particularly these curriculum areas concerned with morals, values, and social education. Value-judgments, related to religious, social, political and economic interests tend to underpin disputes about what schools ought to teach. (ibid : 248). Snook points out that it is social and political interests that are reflected in many of the statements made, the conflicts reflecting differing political values and beliefs, however the protagonists may like to couch their statements in terms of 'morality'. (ibid : 249-50).

It was not until 1981 that the Department of Education appointed an Education Officer (Health Education) to draft a new Health Syllabus for primary and secondary schools. Under the jurisdiction of the then incumbent Minister of Education and the still watchful eyes of minority pressure groups, the new draft slowly made its way into schools and towards the setting up of pilot programmes.

Since a change of government in 1984, there have been signs that the kind of curriculum transformation in which the new Health Education Syllabus provides a lead may be encouraged. The Labour Party Manifesto (1984) aimed at bringing about "the acceptance in school programmes that knowledge concerning human development and relationships is part of the growing, sharing and learning process". It is also clear that the new syllabus has led to the determination by pressure groups to muster their strength. Articles in the Listener (26 October 1985) and in the press (N.Z. Times, 2 February 1986) reveal that the groups opposed to the Johnson Report are at least equally as prepared today to oppose the new Health Syllabus.

However, the Department of Education has shown some determination to attend to the gap left by social education in the curriculum. Through the Health Syllabus, and through the Department's wish to influence the climate of schools and facilitate the abolition of corporal punishment, there has been active encouragement to introduce Developmental Group Work in schools. The pilot programme examined in this thesis was one project made possible by the support of the Central Regional Office of the Department and a Departmental research contract.

DISCUSSION:

The reasons why social education has failed to find a firmer footing in the school curriculum are, at their

base, political. The organization of the secondary school curriculum early on into subject boundaries, emphasizing 'high-status' subjects geared to the needs of a technological society, excluded social education. This has meant that the curriculum rationale for social education has differed from that of 'high-status' subjects, and some of the reasons for this will be given in the next chapter. There has been no official body of knowledge or recognized syllabus of social education taught in schools: that proposed by the Johnson Report was quickly thwarted, and we have yet to see what will happen to the new Health Syllabus.

Another important point is that teachers have not been trained in social education, and this omission has powerfully de-emphasized the curriculum area. Moreover, where social education has found a place in schools, it has tended to be integrated into other subject areas, or else it has been taught only to selected groups - sixth form classes or 'less capable' students - so that the work has attained no status, and can readily disappear from the curriculum. Further, there has been no evaluation undertaken of programmes operating.

The programme set up in Wellington in 1983 promised to fill some of these gaps, so that the effects of an organized programme could at last be studied. A curriculum was provided through Button's Developmental Group Work; teacher-training was an in-built feature of the year-long experiment; the Department of Education as well as the three schools involved lent their support in some tangible ways; three different school contexts were available so that comparisons could be made; and the evaluation was built into the programme to include all participants.

CONCLUSION:

The 'history' of social education in New Zealand reveals a curriculum area which, like all aspects of the curriculum, has been strongly affected by the social determinants of schooling. More than some other areas, social education has become the cockpit of dispute based upon strongly-held values stances as well as political positions. While a good deal of lip-service has been paid to the need to attend to this area of students' education, in reality, little lead has been given to teachers to treat the area as a serious and significant part of their teaching function.

The following chapter will examine this relationship between school ideology and curriculum content. At the centre of this relationship is an important dilemma. On the one hand, a programme such as Developmental Group Work has the potential to produce a form of social education which could transform the dominant ideological structures of the school. On the other hand, however, such programmes may cohere with the dominant ideology of the school and ensure that young people are more effectively socialized, thereby reinforcing the social control of the institution. The origin of this dilemma will be explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER TWO : IDEOLOGY AND CURRICULUM FORM AND EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION:

The fact that schools function in ways that, generally, preclude awareness-raising programmes such as social education can be explained by the theoretical analyses of schooling presented by such critics as Bernstein (1971), Young (1973) and Apple (1979; 1982). Their theories help us to see that state education is ideology-bound, and forewarn us of the macro-issues involved when any transformation of the school curriculum is contemplated.

This chapter will examine the role that schools play in social reproduction; the workings of the 'official', the 'hidden' and the 'null' curricula of schools; the ideological influence upon curriculum form, and the ensuing creation of the 'possessive individual'; and the process of 'labelling' of students that takes place in schools.

The chapter will also look closely at the concept of a 'process' model of curriculum development which offers an alternative to the reproductive role of schools; will examine the part that evaluation has played in the reproductive schooling process; and suggests that there are models of evaluation, as there are models of curriculum development, which can provide teachers with some counter to the dominating forces of reproduction which schooling has generally supported.

SCHOOLS AND SOCIAL REPRODUCTION:

Theories about schools and schooling which have emerged over the last decade from educationists such as Young, Bernstein and Apple, explain why curricula of social education have failed to become established in schools. Writing within a Marxist or neo-Marxist framework, these

writers examine the school's role in the reproduction of society, dispelling in the process any illusion that education in our schools is a neutral enterprise.

Much as school people may like to adhere to their 'ameliorative' philosophies of what schools do, and despite the fact that many individuals now employed in schools and other organisations are living examples of the 'social mobility' which schools make possible for some, the case has been made quite plainly that the school's major role is one of social reproduction. (Apple, 1979).

State control over education means that, far from being neutral, democratic institutions, schools are set up to serve the needs of the labour market, that is, of the dominant groups in a capitalist society. Bowles and Gintis (1976) stressed this economic role of schools, but later critics, such as Apple (op.cit), pointed out that the situation is altogether more complex than the earlier analyses suggested. Apple argues that the basic ways in which institutions, people, modes of production, distribution and consumption are organised and controlled reflect the structural arrangements of the dominant groups in society (ibid).

Schools are just as much a part of these structural arrangements as other institutions such as industry and the media. (Apple 1982 (a) : 32). If we examine the day-to-day practices of schools, the relationship between the school's overt and covert teaching, the ways in which schools select and organise knowledge, as well as the modes of evaluation used, we will discover the intimate connection between what is revealed and the principles of societal and cultural control. (Apple, 1979 : 1).

Schools do not only preserve and distribute the economic property, but also the symbolic property of society - its 'cultural capital' (ibid : 3). Their role, Apple argues, is more than reproductive: they also create

the forms of consciousness that enable social control to be maintained. This they do in extremely complex ways which can best be grasped through an understanding of the concept of 'hegemony'. Williams (1977: 110) defines hegemony as "a whole body of practices and expectations ... our shaping perceptions of ourselves and the world. It is a lived system of meanings and values - which as they are experienced as practices appear reciprocally confirming. It is, that is to say, in the strongest sense, a 'culture', but a culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes".

However, Apple points out that to deduce that the functioning of schools was being manipulated by a small group of people - the 'conspiracy theory' - would be too simplistic. (1979: 4). The hegemonic control of schools is more subtle and more complex. According to Gramsci, (1971), hegemony supposes the existence of something so truly total and all-pervasive that it saturates the commonsense consciousness and practices of our lives. Gramsci concluded that the oppressed came to accept or 'consent' to their own exploitation, and his concept of 'ideological hegemony' explains how the dominant groups in society achieve popular consensus which is mediated through all the levels of institutions of society, including the schools. Boggs (1976) defines the concept of hegemony as used by Gramsci, thus: "By hegemony Gramsci meant the permeation throughout civil society - including a whole range of structures and activities like trade unions, schools, the churches, and the family - of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs, morality, etc. that is in one way or another supportive of the established order and the class interests that dominate it. Hegemony ... is diffused by agencies of ideological control and socialization into every area of daily life ... as all ruling elites seek to perpetuate their power, wealth, and status, they necessarily attempt to popularize their

own philosophy, culture, morality, etc. and render them unchallengable, part of the natural order of things." (ibid: 39). Hegemony refers to the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions which are lived in our society. It entails control with the agreement of the dominated, who learn to accept the ideology of the dominant class as the commonsense and only way of doing things. (Ramsay, 1983: 17).

Schools, through their overt and covert curricula, are used as one of the main agencies of transmission which induce the process of ideological saturation. (Apple, ibid: 5). The required results which take place make the values and typifications, the traditions transmitted, emerge as what we take as given - they become 'taken-for-granted' (Apple, 1979: 5). Reproduction needs to be a 'logical necessity' if the unequal social order which we have come to take for granted is to be maintained.

Apple also points out that schools do more than process knowledge: they are agents of cultural as well as ideological hegemony, and another part of their role is to process people. They help to distribute the dominant culture, at the same time creating people who cannot imagine any alternative economic or cultural arrangements. (ibid: 6). One of the subtle ways in which this takes place is through the 'processing' of those who work in schools, who have traditionally persisted in seeing schooling as a 'neutral' enterprise, and who have prided themselves on being 'neutral' in their role, on not taking a political or value-laden stance. Indeed, it has been a tradition in the 'democratic' education of teachers to emphasize the importance of such 'neutrality' and to eschew 'indoctrination'. This aspect of 'neutrality' has been especially emphasized in moral education programmes such as "Values Clarification", (Simon, et al, 1972), and has particular relevance to the programme considered in this thesis.

As well as being imbued with an 'ameliorative' ideology, teachers also grapple with immense problems which do not leave them time to seriously reflect about the relationship which exists between educational practices and the reproduction of inequality. (Apple, 1982a: 6). Over-large classes, meeting the requirements and deadlines of examination prescriptions, as well as occupational stress, leave little time or energy for critical reflection on the hegemony of the school.

When schooling is viewed within a social reproduction framework, it can be seen to embody a process of indoctrination: the knowledge given has already been chosen; it is filtered through ideological and economic commitments; and the social and economic values of the dominant group are embedded in the way schools function (Apple, 1979: 9). The faith in the 'neutrality' of schools has even helped legitimate the structural bases of inequality, because it has been assumed that this 'neutrality' eliminated the need to deal with the issue of whose knowledge should be preserved and transmitted in schools. (Apple, 1982a: 12).

Social education and health education programmes have, as part of their agenda, the aim of focussing upon values - those of the individual, of the immediate context and of the outer society. Their transformative potential lies in their aims for raising awareness, and encouraging examination and questioning of the status quo and the ideology it reflects.

THE 'OFFICIAL', THE 'HIDDEN' AND THE 'NULL' CURRICULA:

The school reproduces and legitimates hegemony through the 'official' curriculum, the 'hidden' curriculum, and the 'null' curriculum, as well as through its systems of pedagogy and evaluation.

Of the official curriculum, Apple suggests we need to ask such questions as:

Whose knowledge is represented here?
 Who selected it?
 Why is it organized and taught in this way?
 Why to this particular group? (1979: 7)

These questions can help to uncover the latent ideological content of curriculum forms. The values discovered, Apple argues, are those of the middle class which underlie our technocracy: but the school will teach them as though they are supposedly 'shared by all'.

The kind of knowledge schools treat as most important is 'technical' knowledge, serving the technological needs of society. However, the alarming failure rate in schools underlines the fact that low levels of achievement by some groups of students can be as well tolerated by the system as high rates of unemployment for the same groups when they leave school.

The most 'important' knowledge transmitted by schools has been termed 'high status' knowledge, (Young, 1973; Bernstein, 1971; Apple, 1979): a relatively scarce but extremely instrumental commodity which will not be available to all students. This means an emphasis upon science and mathematics, as opposed to arts subjects, and is revealed in disparities between subjects in funding and other resources such as time, personnel and accommodation. The fact that schools offer subject-centred curricula rather than integrated curricula is significant: the former system safeguards the school's role in maximising the production of high status knowledge, as well as its role in the selection of agents to fill economic and social positions.

These points go some way towards explaining why curricula for social education assume little prominence in our

schools. Moreover, attempts to develop social education are likely to be strongly resisted because of any consequent alteration to the relationship between high and low status knowledge areas. As long as social education is appended to other 'subject' areas, taught only to some groups, or made part of the 'options' system of the school, it will pose little threat to the position of high-status subjects.

The 'hidden' curriculum of the school is possibly even more powerful in reproducing the ideological hegemony of society, because of its covert nature. It is contained in the basic, day-to-day regularities of the school, in the norms, values and dispositions which are tacitly taught and which are as much geared to a stratified society as is the high-status knowledge of the overt curriculum.

Apple points out that arguments about the 'mindlessness' of schools miss the point that schools were designed to teach their hidden curricula, which are neither as 'hidden' nor as 'mindless' as has been assumed. (1979: 44). Like the overt knowledge of the school, the covert knowledge is also selected, and the most important areas of knowledge are available only to the selected few. In the hidden as well as the official curriculum is embedded the 'cultural capital' of society. Bourdieu [in Eggleston (ed) 1974] points out that schools take this cultural capital, which is really that of the dominant class, and regard it as natural, employing it as though it were accessible to all children. However, the process effectively aids the maintenance of an unequal social order. As Bernstein says, (1971: 64), the total culture of the school is not available to the working-class child, and a good deal of the cultural capital of the middle class, even though it is at the foundations of education, will not come into the possession of most working-class children, any more than high-status technological knowledge will.

Harker (1985) has applied Bourdieu's cultural reproduction theory to the history of schooling in New Zealand, and discusses the way in which schools, and especially the curriculum, have supported the dominant position of a particular life-style as the only one for New Zealand. His historical analysis of the rise of public education, and particularly of the nature of the provisions made for Maori education, shows how clearly Bourdieu's argument is supported by schooling in New Zealand. For example, despite the education system's claim to be 'multi-cultural', it can be seen that, where Maori elements have been added to the curriculum, they have been divorced from their cultural context and 'incorporated' into the knowledge codes of the dominant group, using culturally inappropriate pedagogical and evaluative systems (ibid: 69).

What most working-class children will learn from the hidden curriculum of the school is how to wait, be patient, accept authority, be non-assertive, accept failure - and believe it is their fault. When they fall foul of the overt or covert codes of the school, they will generally accept the label of deviancy applied to them, usually without being critical of the institution. For the role of the hidden curriculum is powerfully related to notions of control. However, Willis (1977) shows that not all working-class children conform. The students termed the "ear'oles" in his study did conform to the pressures of the school, while the "lads" resisted these pressures - although Willis also discovered that this very resistance tended to turn against the "lads" in the end.

Apple points out, (1982a: 2), that everyday meanings and practices in schools, what students learn from the hidden curriculum, provide the 'warp and woof' of reproduction, contradiction and contestation. This will include the day-to-day interactions between people, for much of the covert teaching of the school is brought

about by the style of social relations of the classroom - a point which has important implications for the programme of Developmental Group Work which is the central focus of this investigation.

Thus it can be argued that curriculum content directly reflects the reproductive functions of schooling, which explains why some programmes of social education are politically contentious. In particular, these are programmes which claim to have the capacity to enquire, to uncover, to examine conflict and to penetrate the meanings of the hidden curriculum, all of which would pose a threat to the school's role as an agency of social control. Moreover, as will be shown, these programmes rely upon a pedagogic style which could threaten the foundations of hegemony in the school, one where power relationships and teaching through 'telling' are replaced by shared control between teacher and taught, and teaching through facilitating growth - a shift which would require many teachers to go through an uncomfortable process of 're-skilling', because they have not been trained and educated to use the more open, facilitative style of teaching.

The 'null' curriculum refers to the 'content' which is missing from the school curriculum - those silences which reveal, as powerfully as overt curriculum content does, the interests of ideology at work. (Apple, 1982a: 31). It is the knowledge of the dominant middle-class which is present in the official curriculum carefully discriminated on the basis of class, race and gender, so that the knowledge, the culture, of many students is disregarded as though it did not exist. A very powerful way of dominating and exploiting large sections of society is to nullify their own knowledge, while using the knowledge of the dominant class to control them, without making it fully available to them.

Social education programmes can tap the voids of the null curriculum, by following the accepted educational principle that we should work with what the child can offer, a principle which, as Bernstein points out (1984: 68), we fail in general to practise.

Social education programmes can be more capable of focussing on schools and processes than on the supposed 'deviancy' of the student. They can have the potential to become more political, and to go some way towards creating the kinds of institutions which Apple asks if we can create (1979: 59) - ones which enhance meaning and lessen control. On the other hand, as Bernstein has pointed out (1971), such programmes can be used to provide more subtle means of reinforcing the hegemony of the school, and this possibility will also be considered when examining the programme which is the focus of this thesis.

CURRICULUM FORM AND THE 'POSSESSIVE INDIVIDUAL':

It is not only curriculum content that is influenced by the dominant ideology of the capitalist society. Apple discusses the profound effect upon curriculum form of bringing school policy and curriculum into closer correspondence with industrial needs (1982b: 249). It means that the ideologies of the dominant groups become built into curricular form, affecting not content alone, but the manner in which what is taught is organized. Pre-packaged sets of curricular materials 'de-skill' teachers, removing them from the arena of curriculum deliberation and design: goals, process, outcomes and evaluative criteria are defined by people external to the situation, and the professional skills of teachers atrophy (ibid: 255). Moreover, since part of the logic of technical control lies in its ability to integrate into one discourse what are often seen as competing ideological movements (ibid: 260), it has the power to generate

consent from each of them and remove intellectual conflict from the curriculum.

A further result of the increasing technological control over the curriculum is in the over-emphasis placed upon the individual. As Williams points out, (1977), the dominance of the individual in bourgeois society leads to a distortion of people's understanding of their social relations with and dependence on others. So in schools, emphasis is placed upon competition and individual progress. Apple draws the parallel between this process and the manipulative ethic of individual consumption in our wider society (1979: 10). In schools, it is seen in the kind of individualization programmes where individual students interact only with the teacher, not with each other, paralleling the passive, individual consumption of goods and services, such as watching television, which absorbs much of people's lives.

Increasingly, modes of technical control have been 'built into' curriculum form so that students can proceed individually, at their own speed, and the 'possessive individual' required by a capitalist society can be reproduced. Neither student nor teacher plays a very active part in the process: product and process, and even the responses of student and teacher, are pre-specified by the material itself to a large extent; the teacher's role is reduced to that of manager; and even the interaction between student and teacher is cut down. (Apple, 1982b: 256). It comes close to Freire's (1972) description of the prevailing mode of education in the Third World: "a denial of man's subjectivity through the cultural invasion of his being with pre-packaged curricula".

In all of this, the highest premium is placed upon intelligence, not upon other human qualities, such as moral excellence, collective commitment, the ability to relate to others, or initiative. (Apple, 1979: 151). One of the main effects of the school is to maintain the

hegemony of those of high intelligence, and to largely allow the human resources of other students to be wasted.

Bernstein (1971), in discussing curriculum content and form, uses the concepts of the 'classification' and 'framing' of educational knowledge, which are pertinent here. The notion of boundary strengths underlines both concepts, and of control over teaching-learning interactions. 'Classification' refers to the relationships between curriculum contents - whether they are well-insulated from each other, as in subject-bound curricula - and gives us the basic structure of the curriculum message system. The concept of 'frame' refers to the structure of the pedagogy system, the form of the context in which knowledge is transmitted and received. It refers to the strength of boundary between what may or may not be transmitted, the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received.

The concepts are introduced here since both classification and frame will be strongly affected by the technical control of curriculum form which Apple describes. The boundary strength between 'high-status' and 'low-status' subjects will tend to become better insulated, resulting in strong classification. Relaxation of frame will prove virtually impossible where neither teacher nor taught has any range of options available in the control of what is transmitted and received in the learning transaction: their control over selection, organization, pacing and timing of knowledge will all be dictated by outsiders, and non-school, everyday community knowledge will find no place in the curriculum. These concepts are also important because the programme examined in this thesis has the potential to influence classification and framing in quite the opposite way, that is by blurring classification and relaxing frame.

After examining these theorists, then, a powerful distinction can be drawn between the professed educational ideals of schools which regard themselves as neutral institutions of meritocracy, and the actual effects which schools have. A failure to see the connection between the 'production' of certain kinds of people and knowledge, and the reproduction of an unequal society which establishes the roles for which these agents are produced, (Apple, 1979: 18), only serves to strengthen the school's role in the process. Apple argues that what is taught in schools has to be considered as a form of the distribution of goods and services practised in the wider society, and that the investigation to be conducted is into what is currently considered to be 'legitimate' knowledge in schools.

REPRODUCTION AND 'LABELLING':

While schools do lead to social mobility for some, a resultant of this at present is that lack of mobility is defined as 'failure'. Because schools and their hidden and formal curricula and pedagogical processes are seen as neutral, any failure to follow or attain the 'norm' is labelled as some kind of 'deviancy'. At the same time, a startling relationship still exists between a person's family background and their success in adult life, despite their transit through these 'neutral' and 'meritocratic' institutions. (Jencks, 1972; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Apple, 1982a).

Even procedures in schools which look particularly 'helpful' contribute to the defining and labelling of children. These may include 'diagnostic' and 'treatment' programmes for 'deviants' such as slow learners, remedial or discipline problems. The entire 'guidance' programme of the school may play its part in certifying students for their place in the workforce, or non-workforce, while defusing any debate over the role of schooling because these special

efforts look so 'helpful', (ibid: 50). As Bernstein suggests, (1984: 65), the whole concept of 'compensatory education' distracts attention from the deficiencies of the school itself, focussing instead upon the deficiencies of the child, his family, or the community. These comments have important implications for the programme to be examined later.

The picture of schooling presented does not imply that teachers enact a conscious conspiracy against the lower classes. (Apple, 1979: 64). It does, however, reveal some of the latent functions of schooling of which many educators remain unaware. It also helps to explain why 'low-status' but potentially 'awareness-raising' programmes of social education are almost suffocated out of the school curriculum. Moreover, the powerfully reproductive role of schools makes it clear that those who would hope to transform schools and curricula must not be so naive as to believe that an alternative curriculum and enthusiastic teachers will, in themselves, change the nature of schools. A political awareness and willingness to work at a number of levels to change the deeper structures of schooling will be required if anything more than cosmetic change is to be achieved.

A 'PROCESS' MODEL OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT:

In spite of the somewhat pessimistic analysis of schooling presented so far, it would be untrue to say that teachers have no scope to direct their practice towards change which counters the hegemonic effects of the school. Apple (1982b) emphasizes that, from a phenomenological perspective, teachers are creators of their own lived world and are not passive recipients of an imposed reality. They are capable of reflecting on their roles and making autonomous decisions.

However, such autonomous decision-making is more likely to be exercised by teachers working with a 'process' model of curriculum development and evaluation as advocated by Stenhouse (1975). It was this model, focussing upon the liberation of the teacher's role as innovator and researcher, which appeared to offer the most suitable framework for the examination of a curriculum such as Developmental Group Work: Stenhouse's model makes a 'transformative' curriculum possible. The level of congruence between Stenhouse's theory and the practice analysed through the research is considered closely in Chapters Six to Eight.

It has been more of a tradition in Britain than in the United States or New Zealand to assume that the curriculum is an area of decision to be delegated to individual schools and to teachers. (ibid: 123). In Britain, teachers have been used to a role in curriculum development and creation. What Stenhouse presents is an extension of this tradition, a movement towards a 'research model', casting the developer in the role of 'investigator' (ibid: 125). Totally unlike the confinement imposed by technological curricular forms, the model looks at curriculum as dynamic, as a policy which evolves and improves, the focus being upon the intelligent and penetrating study of problems rather than 'solutions'.

The key factor in the research process is the participation of the teacher: the teacher's role as researcher relates closely to her role as teacher, and to her developing role as curriculum evaluator. It implies research-based teaching. The model attempts to integrate action and evaluation into a unified research model (ibid: 140), which has strong implications for the kind of evaluative model which will be deemed suitable. The likelihood of an objectives model of evaluation complementing action research based upon process, where each contextual setting will produce its own 'truths', seems remote.

While Apple focusses upon the constraints which limit the autonomy of teachers, Stenhouse emphasizes the conditions which will maximize their autonomy. He moves well away from the notion of curriculum as a package of materials or syllabus of ground to be covered; instead, he identifies curriculum as "a particular form of specification about the practice of teaching" (ibid: 142), a way of translating educational ideas into hypotheses testable in practice.

At the heart of the research model is a role defined for teachers which occupies the other end of the continuum from the de-skilled, de-professionalised package 'managers' that Apple deplures. Stenhouse's teacher is an 'extended professional', developing "a capacity for autonomous professional self-development", (ibid: 144), allowing others to observe and discuss her work, studying the work of other teachers, and testing ideas for herself by classroom research procedures. She will be prepared to examine how she is seen by her pupils, and will openly negotiate with them and define her role as teacher-researcher. Stenhouse points out that the impact upon the social structure of the school, between colleagues, and between teachers and taught, is likely to be profound - and much richer than the de-humanizing effect upon individuals and their interactions which Apple describes as a corollary of technical control over curriculum form.

Stenhouse sees the results of his model as being far-reaching: a change of organization and pedagogy founded on the development of the professional knowledge and skills of teachers might be looked for, as well as an increase in teacher morale (ibid: 167). What might also be expected, when schools are staffed by a self-critical, professional community of teachers, is the development of a degree of reflexivity in the institution itself: a capacity to review its own processes critically and reflectively. (ibid: 176).

REPRODUCTION, TECHNICAL CONTROL, AND EVALUATION:

A further dimension needs to be considered at this stage, in view of the nature of the research forming the basis of this study. Hegemony in education is not maintained only through the official, hidden and null curricula of schools, nor through the technical control that has been assumed over curriculum form. Curriculum evaluation is also a form of social action which has political consequences. (Deakin, I, Intro: 1982). The increasing emphasis upon evaluation since World War I, and the tendency for 'evaluation' to be equated with 'measurement' and what Eisner (1979: 12) calls the "illusion of precision", has meant that evaluators have pursued a quest for efficiency, and quantitative output measures, which Apple says mirrors the interests of the dominant groups in society in maintaining social control. (1974: 45). The school's role as an agency of social order has been strengthened by the expectation placed upon it to evaluate people. One example of the use of evaluation as a means of social control would be, as Apple points out (ibid: 46), the strong racist element running through the testing movement, a movement which Eisner also says has provided one of the most powerful controls of educational practice. (Eisner, op.cit.: 2).

Evaluation is not a neutral activity: it encompasses a process of social valuing (Apple, op.cit.). The work of evaluators is inherently political: in choosing their allegiance to an evaluative method, evaluators are demonstrating a political stance, for, as MacDonald argues, (1976: 229), the different styles and methods of evaluation express different attitudes towards the power distribution of education.

The traditional, and most potent way in which evaluations have embodied the ideology of control has been through the use of technical models of evaluation, such as the

'objectives' model, where pre-determined behavioural objectives tend to focus upon 'student' behaviours, rather than the teaching process or the evaluation of the institution. Again, as Apple points out, (op.cit:54), the tendency, when objectives are not met, is to blame student 'deviancy' rather than the institution, and any ensuing attempts at 'reform' tend to be the reform of the student rather than the school. Technical evaluations, based on the ideology of control, may even be used to hide the school's need to change, or the fact that the school organization itself is creating the difficulties it is supposed to solve, and which evaluators are called upon to examine. (ibid: 51).

Apple suggests we need to investigate how the process of evaluation gets some groups the results they want, contributing to an unwarranted sense of well-being when the objectives can prove to have been met. Evaluation has tended to focus on individuals, to be conservative, to serve the predominant ideology, and to ignore any evaluation of institutions in themselves. (ibid: 59). Emphasis upon pre-specified objectives will almost certainly mean that student conduct or criticism that may be threatening to the educational setting will be eliminated from the report. Any elements of argumentation and conflict, which might ultimately have allowed change to evolve, will not be sought or recorded, (ibid: 58), for the objectives approach does not seek phenomenological views. How students experience the school, what the relationships of the school reflect, would be difficult aspects for the objectives model to consider.

The evaluator's perspective will be influenced by her own social position, despite any claims made to neutrality. Some evaluators may even take a political stance without realising they are doing so, because the implications of the position they hold have not been understood. (ibid: 56). MacDonald argues that there is no such

thing as an 'independent' evaluator (1976: 235). He stresses that the evaluator is embroiled in the political process which concerns the distribution of power, and is 'free' only to choose his allegiance, and his political stance will determine his choice of technique.

Consequently, in recent years there has been a strong move away from the evaluation of technical control towards justifying educational action within a wider context of greater social and cultural understanding. (Codd, 1982:1). The trend has been to move along the continuum from the dimension of control to the dimension of understanding, from summative to formative evaluation. Here, more attention can be given to descriptive analysis, and to the value of any discovered conflict and disorder. (Apple, *ibid*: 58). It means that evaluative exercises can be conceived of more broadly to include curriculum processes, and also factors such as the way the innovation is used, and the influence of the setting, which Parsons (1976: 241) points out are as important as the innovation itself. This kind of formative evaluation has the potential to be counter-hegemonic by challenging the implicit structures of schooling and by giving attention to the 'hidden' and 'null' curricula, although it is argued (Deakin, 1982: Intro) that the transformation can occur only within the context of deliberative action.

The implications of the above discussion were important in choosing an evaluative model for the Developmental Group Work programme. The programme's focus upon curriculum as process, its potential for researching some of the sociological concerns raised by Apple through the examination of process indicated that the objectives model, itself a technical model, would be an unsuitable choice.

Various criticisms can be levelled at the objectives model in terms of its appropriateness to a process-oriented

curriculum. One criticism is the possibility of over-emphasis of trivial outcomes, since objectives are pre-specified, whereas important but unspecified outcomes discovered only 'in process' may be missed. The strong emphasis of the objectives model upon assessment - particularly the fact that evaluation comes at the end of the programme, rather than being an integral part of it - presents another problem. The Developmental Group Work programme focuses upon a phenomenological view of experience, where issues emerge in process, and we are interested in outcomes for the individual which cannot be precisely specified in advance. Moreover, the emphasis placed, in defining objectives, upon student behaviours, leads to the threat of increased political control over the curriculum which a programme such as this would tend to avoid. In a human relations programme, it could result in the expectation that the programme should be used to change student behaviour in the direction of conformity, the programme itself becoming an agent of social control. On the contrary, such programmes are intended to encourage the appraisal of their own political assumptions and of their values, as well as those of the institutions and the society in which they operate. The objectives model would possibly fail to assess benefits brought about by the programme because all that happens in process cannot be specified in advance, with the further danger that it might appear to be the programme which had failed, because it did not conform to the pre-specified objectives required by the model. It has also been pointed out that the objectives model fails to consider the political nature of curriculum decision processes, an important factor to be considered with a programme hoping to have some effect upon these very processes. In all, the strong likelihood that the objectives model might not only inhibit understanding of the programme's successes, but actually miss what really happened and what really mattered, pointed to its inappropriateness for this particular evaluation.

An account of the 'illuminative' model of evaluation and its considered suitability for the programme under consideration is presented in Chapter Four.

CONCLUSION:

The theoretical analysis of schooling presented by critics writing from within a neo-Marxist framework makes transformation of the curriculum and the school appear an almost impossible task without radical reform of society first taking place. The role the school has traditionally played in social reproduction, its preservation of the economic and symbolic property of the dominant groups in society, and its transmission of the hegemony of society so that the mass of people come to consent to their own exploitation, makes it a powerful institution and one which will not change easily. The official, the hidden and the null curricula of the school all play their part in the reproductive process, as does the influence of technology upon curriculum form, as well as the methods of evaluation traditionally favoured in schools.

Those teachers who would increase their own autonomous decision-making in schooling and attempt to transform the school and its curricula may find their best means in the process model of teaching and education which Stenhouse presents. The model enables teachers to start working from within the system, without first having to radically change the macro-structures of schooling. As action-researchers, they focus upon their own professional development, their team-work with others, and examine what is happening in the processes of teaching and learning. It means that the structures and values of a socially reproductive institution will themselves become the focus of research and evaluation.

It is not a model which is necessarily at variance with Apple's own analysis of the reproductive role in schools.

As will be examined in Chapter Nine, Apple also sees teachers as having power to influence the system within which they work.

In the evaluation of Developmental Group Work which constitutes the focus of the present study, two important opportunities were presented. One was to examine the extent to which the work offered teachers some scope to experience working within a process and action-research model like Stenhouse's. The other was to discover whether such a method of working, from within the structures of the school, had the potential to transform those very structures.

CHAPTER THREE : DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK : DESCRIPTION
AND CRITIQUE

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMME:

The only programme of social education that has been used on a fairly wide scale in New Zealand schools is the Developmental Group Work programme of Dr Leslie Button, formerly of Swansea University, presently at Exeter University. It is one programme which the Department of Education has set some lead in promoting, especially as it has relevance to the new Health Education Syllabus (p.149). It is also one programme of social education operating in New Zealand schools which has been evaluated. (Harris, 1983). Thus, it presents an example of social education whose potentially transformative nature can be tested against the framework presented in the previous chapter.

With a team of 'action researchers', Button spent a considerable amount of time working with groups of young people in all kinds of settings - schools, youth clubs, prisons, on the streets - exploring their needs, and devising ways of helping to meet these through group-work settings. The general aim was to "help young people to build up their general resources so that they can cope more adequately with life". (1981: 2). Believing that "To be human is synonymous with being in communication and in relationship with other people", (1974: 1), and that "our personal satisfaction, growth and development is achieved mainly through the part that we play in the lives of other people and they in ours", (ibid: 1), Button concluded that the social skills required to develop satisfying relationships, as well as personal growth, were best learned in the safe environment of a structured, supportive group. Many of the young people he worked with had not previously experienced this, not even within the family.

Developmental Group Work is intended to be adaptable to any kind of setting, and the purpose and style of the work will be considerably influenced by the setting itself (ibid: 2). The focus of this discussion is upon its adaptation to schools, where it can offer a planned approach to education in personal relationships, social skills and responsible attitudes. Button has eschewed the 'social skills training' approach, which is problem-based, and frequently provided mainly for students who are considered 'deviant', because they do not adapt to the school situation. Instead, he has devised programmes which have sequence and continuity, which are developmental and educative, and aimed at helping all students through the developmental stages of their growth and awareness, as well as encouraging them to become "active partners in their own education". (Button, 1983: 34). The programme aims at helping young people to "build up the social skills and personal resources that will enable them to cope with life as it comes along". Button does not address the issue of the need for structural changes in society to provide more equal and positive opportunities for people. The emphasis is upon learning to cope with life as it emerges.

The work is located in the social psychology of adolescence, and, although Button claims the work can transform schools, he does not argue this from a sociological position. However, an attempt is made in this investigation to examine the claims for the programme more widely and to set the potential of the programme within the framework presented in Chapter Two. The evaluation of Developmental Group Work presented in this thesis considers its effects not only on individuals, but also on the structures of schools.

In schools, the basic programme of Developmental Group Work is centred upon the pastoral role of the form-teacher with the form group, and Button emphasizes the importance of the preparation, training and support required for

the form-teacher's role. Teacher participation in curriculum deliberation and development, and in evaluation, is emphasized, which provides scope for Stenhouse's model of the 'teacher-as-researcher' (1975) to operate.

Aims of the programme:

The programme has three main sets of aims which might be expected to have some effect on the transformation of the curriculum. These are directed towards:

- the personal growth of students;
- teacher professional development;
- the influence of the programme upon school climate.

Depending upon the context, these aims can be specified in the following ways:

- a) Personal development of students and of their skills for life. Since the programme is flexible, the specific aims will vary from group to group of students, depending upon the context and how the students' current needs are perceived. The aims, generally, are in keeping with the claim of the New Zealand PPTA (1968) that, above all, a school should help children solve all the problems they meet in everyday life and enable them to formulate questions and find satisfactory answers.

Aims would include:

- help with individual growth and adjustment, encouraging self-reliance and self-discovery;
- development of social competence through social skills;

- developing ways of satisfying basic emotional needs;
- the development of care, concern, responsibility;
- better study skills and academic progress through improved social ease and self-image;
- developing the skills to achieve one's own stated goals and to evaluate progress;
- discovering knowledge about health, citizenship and the world in general.

b) Professional development of teachers: Button emphasizes the importance of the opportunities for teacher professional development which the programme provides: "The long-term potential for staff development is a valuable by-product of the programme". (1983: 39). The following aims in this area could be outlined:

- involvement in curriculum deliberation and decision-making;
- involvement in deliberation over content and methods;
- development of new teaching approaches;
- working in a collegial team with other teachers and with senior students;
- involvement in evaluation;
- personal growth;
- development of staff support groups;
- involvement in peer training amongst tutors.

- c) Development of a positive school climate: The programme is claimed to have the power to profoundly influence the ethos and climate of the school, although Button emphasizes that this is only likely to occur if the whole school is moving in the same direction (1983: 38). His experience has suggested there is little point in training teachers unless there is this commitment - without it, he discovered trainees working almost 'secretly' or 'apologetically', in spite of the ease with which they had developed sophistication in the techniques through their training. Nevertheless, Button claims that "it is possible to help a whole school move in a new direction", (ibid: 39), as long as certain conditions, including adequate teacher-training and whole school commitment, can be met.

Three aspects of the work might be considered capable of transforming school climate:

- the effect upon integration and frame of teacher-based curriculum innovation, teacher support groups and changes in teacher-student interaction;
- influence upon the style of relationships within the school;
- improved professional development and competence of teachers and a more active, political approach to curriculum areas, especially programmes in the affective areas.

Discussion:

The basic skills and concepts underlying such a statement of aims include the development of the group as a caring community and the development of support within the group.

It opens up the possibility of relating on a deeper level between peers and between teachers and students. Button places his aims firmly within this 'social psychology' framework, but the present thesis seeks not only to evaluate the programme within such a framework, but also within a wider sociological framework. The programme is examined not only in terms of its own stated aims, but also in terms of its wider transformative potential.

Clearly, there are value assumptions in the stated aims as outlined, and these would need to be considered explicitly in the deliberations preceding the introduction of the programme, and in the course of the programme sessions.

THEORETICAL RATIONALE OF THE PROGRAMME:

The programme is described as 'developmental', indicating that the models of work are structured and sequential, each activity serving as a basis for the next. The content and methods should enrich the student's social experiences in a safe, supportive environment, while also offering the opportunity for challenge and the experience of conflict. (Button, 1974). Social interaction is the major mode of teaching, talking is the chief tool used, and there is an emphasis upon activity, both in the physical exercises and in the sense that content is dynamic, never static or inert.

Content:

Meeting the stated aims is attempted through a number of themes, developed in a cyclical manner, each theme having its importance at every stage of development. These are:

- the pupil's place in the school;

- the pastoral group as a small, caring community;
- relationships, the self and social skills;
- communication skills;
- school work and study skills;
- academic and careers guidance;
- health and hygiene;
- personal interests.

The content is not fixed, and the themes are flexible enough to embrace virtually any issue raised in the group. Justification of the content rests upon the premise that the themes are vital to the lives the students live, and to the enrichment of those lives and the students' developing autonomy. (Button, *ibid.*). The intrinsic value position requires that we see students as actors in a process which will make them more aware and more able to recognise, select and go after the knowledge they require.

Teaching Procedures:

The approaches adopted are "enquiry-based, resting upon a step-by-step programme of personal and group exploration. It is, in fact, an action research programme, with the young people at the centre of their own discoveries". (Button, 1983: 35). The teaching procedures can be seen as falling into two main categories:

- the training of teachers to run the programme;
- teaching procedures in the classroom.

The two are interdependent, the methods overlap, and the character and success of the programme rely heavily on both. Button claims (1981: 1) that "the methodologies upon which these programmes are based are as important as the topics and materials included in them". The programme presents a process model (Stenhouse, 1975) with emphasis upon principles of procedure, the teaching approach being an important part of the content. Teachers need to become comfortable with the new procedures, and preliminary and on-going training sessions for teachers and senior tutors require them to work through the training procedures and practise them, and to experience for themselves anything that they will require of their students, so that teacher-training as well as student-learning is action-based and experiential. The methodology essentially offers a pedagogy for pastoral care.

Button claims that, from his experience, teachers readily grasp the expertise and theoretical framework required, and that "Training teachers for this role is no longer a problem". (1983: 38). Button and his team have prepared models of work, programmes and tried methods of teacher-training to ensure that teachers develop practical expertise as well as a firm grasp of the theoretical principles involved.

A lesson will generally begin with a 'game' or 'warm-up', the purpose of which may be a momentary disorientation from the school or home situation, so that students may be more open to new experience, or it might have a functional purpose, such as learning names or practising co-operation. The technique of 'disturbing the equilibrium', introducing an element of stress, can be used in other ways to give people a chance to behave differently or break free from unhelpful patterned responses.

The group is the base for all activities, but within this framework there are opportunities for individual tasks, for working in dyads, fours and sixes, and in

the total group. The small-group situations provide opportunities for rehearsal and risk-taking before the large group activities are undertaken, which Button suggests makes people less fearful of participating in the larger group. He calls the technique 'Socratic Group Discussion'.

The experiential approach means that events are used as experience. Physical contact is used to develop trust and support, but in an organic way, woven into a programme of experience. 'Action methods' are used, which can include physical exercises, role-play, socio-drama or psychodramatic techniques. Students also become active in talking to people from outside the group, inviting visitors in to be interviewed, or undertaking research activities in the school or community.

The methods have important implications for leadership style. There is a need for leadership which is positive without being overly directive, neither authoritarian nor laissez-faire, the leader being confident enough to make use of the unexpected opportunity, while having a cohesive plan for each lesson and series of lessons. Leadership which is too dominating will tend to stifle student initiative, but indefinite leadership is likely to leave students feeling confused, unsure and reluctant to take risks. The style required will be encouraging, challenging and active, will model personal support, caring, risk-taking, sense of humour and fairness, attributes which it is hoped the students will also demonstrate or develop.

Although Button has produced texts which offer the classroom teacher carefully planned themes and lessons which can be followed (1981, 1982), the programme is intended to be adaptable. It comprises an eclectic range of techniques and approaches which can free the group-work teacher to encompass as classroom material any issue currently relevant to the group; and, moreover, the teaching style is flexible enough to work just as well in the 'ordinary'

subject-based classroom as in the 'group-work' situation, since what Button basically presents is a pedagogy.

THE POTENTIAL FOR CURRICULUM TRANSFORMATION : IDEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The foregoing description of the content and pedagogy of Button's programme is based upon his own account of its rationale. The aim of the present investigation, however, is to explore the nature of the programme in political terms, to evaluate its potential for transformative action in challenging the hegemony of the school as a social institution. The programme possesses a number of features which potentially make this a possibility: its values-stance; its aims and objectives; its apparent potential for scrutinizing the official, the hidden and the null curricula of the school; its capacity to foster teacher and student autonomy; its effect upon relationships and the social system of the school in general, and upon integration and frame in particular; its engagement with alternative methods of control and with group process as opposed to the creation of the 'possessive individual'; and its capacity to cast a critical eye upon the proceedings of the institution rather than condemn the 'deviancy' of students.

Values:

The very perception of a need in schools for programmes such as Developmental Group Work reflects a value stance, and the programme itself provides the chance to openly deal with values issues. Raven, (1984: 26), arguing that schools should be selecting wider objectives which develop rather than waste human resources, urges a shift in the concept of teaching away from supposedly 'neutral' educational objectives to value-laden objectives.

In this programme, justification of the content rests upon the premise that the themes are vital to the lives of the students, and to the enrichment of those lives and the students' own developing autonomy. The value assumptions behind the aims of the programme reflect a belief that human beings are unique and worthwhile; that they have within themselves the powers to develop autonomy, values and decision-making skills; and there is a strong assumption of such felt human needs as the need for social interaction with others in a variety of settings. This value judgment extends to the view that teachers, too, should develop and exercise autonomy; that they can be part of the necessary deliberation on the curriculum, instrumental in its planning, execution and evaluation.

There is a further assumption that a certain kind of interaction between teacher and student will be an improvement on more traditional styles of interaction, and that the new style of interaction will benefit both teacher and student. Snook (1976: 52) makes the point that the most important debate in educational theory is "what sorts of things are worth teaching and learning and what sort of human life is worth living". Underlying this programme is the value judgment that human relationships programmes such as this are worth teaching and learning, and that human life is more worth living if people can develop their individual potential and relate to others. It is a sensitive and political area of educational ground to tread, one which not everyone would agree is the province of teachers or of schools. It is interesting to speculate why Button called his methodology Developmental Group Work, and whether, in doing so, he was acknowledging the driving force and the powerful values stance of the work ethic which persistently, if ever more redundantly, imbues our philosophy. However, the values-stance does not explicitly address the need to challenge the hegemony of society contained in the formal and hidden curriculum, or to look at the deep structural arrangements which make schools what they are.

Aims and Objectives:

The aims and objectives of the programme are wider than those of curricula geared to meet the technical needs of the labour market. The objectives of Developmental Group Work accord more with the wider objectives advocated by Raven (ibid: 25), such as developing initiative, confidence in dealing with others, ability to make one's own observations and to work with others. Apple (1979:151) asks why it is that we do not value moral excellence or collective commitment as highly as we value intelligence. The wider objectives of this programme mean that schools could come to value other personal qualities, which might allow them to distribute rewards more extensively to include the least advantaged.

Bowers (1976: 63) suggests that the classroom be used to help students become more explicitly aware of their own cultural experience, to begin with the actual experience of the students, rather than with the concepts and typifications of others, and this is something the programme is able to do.

The objectives go even further, however. The role defined for teacher professional development goes beyond the need merely to learn a few 'techniques'. While teachers may at first experience some 'de-skilling' as they change from the authoritarian stance of the classroom, it is not the de-skilling which Apple describes as having undermined the profession and education in general (p.18). What the aims for teacher professional development make possible is that teachers take education back into their own hands: that they become the curriculum deliberators, innovators and evaluators, as Stenhouse advocates (1975). It offers a strongly political stance, particularly as it also encourages a mutual, professional support amongst teachers which would do much to break down the isolation and separateness which disempowers teachers as groups. (Apple, 1982b: 257).

The programme, used in this way, could take teachers a long way from the kind of technical control which reduces them to managers of 'teacher-proof' curriculum packages. (Apple, 1982b). Instead, teachers would have an improved chance to learn and practise the skills of curriculum development as outlined by Eisner (1979: 47):

- the ability to work with others;
- the ability to deal with the complexities of practical deliberation;
- the ability to establish distance between one's work and oneself in order to see it more clearly;
- the ability to envisage the ways activities might function in the classroom;
- the ability to judge how much guidance they might need and engage in that task (made much easier when teachers are engaged in peer-training).

A model of democratic administration such as Apple advocates (1982a: 64) is at least put into practice at the classroom level: teachers working as partners, whatever their 'status' or 'subject'; senior tutors working in a collegial relationship with teachers; and teachers and students working in a partnership where they share a more equal relationship.

The Hidden Curriculum:

It has been speculated that one of the important results of the values-laden stance of the programme, of its more widely embracing objectives and its declared aims of influencing the social system and the climate of the school, might be to bring the covert messages of the hidden curriculum of the school out into the open.

The values of the hidden curriculum, its assumptions about how people are expected or allowed to behave, relate, assert themselves, could be open to scrutiny in a programme which focuses upon these very areas of relationships and values. The unstated norms and dispositions of the hidden curriculum, the mystique of the structural codes of the school, would be made more explicit to all students, including the working-class child, whose mastery of these codes is limited, and who may be placed at considerable disadvantage in relation to the total culture of the school. (Bernstein, 1971: 64). The mastery of these codes, which is so potent in society and in schools, partly because it is only available to the understanding of the dominant classes, could become more available, or at least visible. Its ownership by a powerful few could become disputed and shared. Moreover, this would tend to focus attention upon the organization itself and lead to a degree of institutional criticism, rather than blaming the 'deviancy' of individual students whenever difficulties arise. (Apple, 1982a).

Integration and Frame:

The fact that teachers train, plan and even teach together, whatever their subject speciality within the 'collection code' of the school curriculum, provides the beginning for a teachers-based integration code to find a hold in the school. As Bernstein suggests (1971: 104), there will be a shift in the centre of gravity of relationships, making stronger horizontal and non-subject-bound allegiances possible. A feeling of teacher autonomy, teamship and professionalism could result in a more cohesive, more powerful body of people, freed from the tension of what Stenhouse (1975: 45) calls their 'professional persona'. It also, of course, presupposes a high level of ideological consensus if the programme is to become at all extensive (ibid: 107), and, as Button has noted (p.34), the programme will only thrive where full-school commitment to it is met.

The change in teacher-student and peer relationships have implications for the style of leadership of the school, and the control ideology of the school may shift somewhat from the pole of 'custodialism' towards greater 'humanism' (Stenhouse, *ibid*: 46).

The change in pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught is likely to have an effect upon frame, since both will have greater control of what is transmitted and received, and the boundary between non-school everyday knowledge and 'educational' knowledge will be relaxed. The point Bernstein makes, that relaxation of framing may be used for purposes of greater social control, making more of the student available to more intensive socialization (*ibid*: 99), will be looked at later in the results of the evaluation. But, as Stenhouse maintains (1975: 110), the less rigid structure of the integrated code also makes it a potential tool for egalitarian education.

Methods of Control:

The ways in which the programme and its influence upon relationships can also affect methods of control merits further comment, particularly as this aspect of the work received much comment in the evaluation of the programme. (Chapters Six to Eight).

The control ideology of the school is likely to change when integration and frame are affected. Both teachers and students assume more control - teachers over their professional role as educationists, and students over classroom content and process and responsibility for their own behaviour. It is possible for self-control and shared control to replace authoritarian discipline.

To a large extent, the curriculum of group work follows Eisner's image of the 'spiderweb' model of curriculum sequence, (1979: 123), where heuristic projects and act-

ivities will lead to diverse outcomes among students, and where the aim is to invite engagement rather than control. It is a model, as Eisner points out, which will appeal more to 'progressive' teachers who are student-centred in their philosophy and approach. The way in which such teachers conceive of their approach could be seen as fitting Holt's metaphor of the teacher as 'travel agent' (1970: 70-1):

- the teacher finds out what students are looking for;
- makes suggestions about what is available;
- the students make their choices;
- the teacher helps them make the arrangements to start.

The image would fit the teacher's role particularly when small groups of students embark on what is called by Button 'action research'. Here, they explore themes within the school and community, for example, what people in authority are really like and how they perceive their roles. Control over their research methods and outcomes, as well as their personal behaviour, remains in the hands of the students. It is a concept which values the students' right to choose, and presents opportunities for them to learn how to choose.

As Eisner points out (1979: 60), such an orientation does place an enormous responsibility upon the teacher - not to assume control for 'discipline', which is easy, but to establish rapport with the students. It is also an orientation which presents problems for the student, since it is inordinately easier to do merely what is expected. (Eisner, *ibid*: 60).

Apple (1982) reminds us that students, like people in the workforce, are adept at appearing to do what is expected of them, while actually ignoring the teacher as much as possible - day-dreaming, writing notes to each other, and so on. Group work has the potential for making such kinds of resistance more difficult: students are allowed to talk to each other and to bring their own content to the lesson; and the inclusive style of sitting in a circle, rather than an excluding arrangement of rows of desks, is likely to keep students more involved.

It would not be true to say that all students enjoy the style of control in group work. As Eisner says (ibid), it places more expectations upon them, and, from personal observation and the outcomes of the evaluation, it is clear that some students will strongly resist the methods, and that part of the reason for this may be that their accustomed opportunities for resistance have been removed. It also requires that we look closely at such programmes to see if they really present more subtle mechanisms of social control. The capacity to 'disarm' students and to make resistance more difficult indicates a 'pacifying' or 'domesticating' potential which the programme could be seen to possess.

Overall, however, the shift in methods of control will be associated with the conceived role of the teacher. Sugarman (1968: 3) reminds us that attention to a teacher's ability to "keep order" may ignore the possibility that the means of keeping order may interfere with the student's cognitive learning or moral education, or both. Developmental Group Work requires an 'expressive' style of leadership, where the prerequisite is the building up of the students' motivation for work, and where emotional or interpersonal factors which might be impeding work are removed or dealt with. (Eisner, ibid). It means being able to listen, compromise more, allow students to talk and encouraging their contributions; it means lecturing less, sharing a sense of humour and aiming for a more cordial relationship and less conflict.

Working with Process vs Technical Control:

Apple (1982) points out that the hegemony of technical control over curricular form, evidenced in the use of prepackaged sets of standardized curricular materials, has had two particularly deleterious effects upon education. One of these is the de-skilling of teachers; and the other is the reproduction of the 'possessive individual'.

A strong claim could be made for Developmental Group Work's counter-hegemonic influences in these two respects. Rather than being removed from curriculum deliberation, planning and design, with the consequent atrophying of skills, teachers become closely involved in these areas. In addition, because content is not 'fixed', teachers are required much more to work with process. It is a long way from pre-packaged sets of 'teacher-proof' materials, which cut down the interaction between students and between students and teachers.

Moreover, teachers and students have the power to mutually determine content, and there is scope for students to bring to the lessons their own experience and culture. The characteristics which Apple (ibid: 261) says are embodied in the modes of technical control of the curriculum, which are ideally suited to reproduce the possessive individual, are therefore not necessarily reproduced: or these characteristics could be picked up by a teacher who works with process, and could become the focus of group deliberation. Finally, the aims of the programme for the personal development of students and their skills for life, outlined on pages 32-33, envisage not the 'possessive individual' as an isolated consumer, but the person who, while guarding personal autonomy, will derive satisfaction largely from being mutually involved with others.

CONCLUSION:

Developmental Group Work can be seen as a programme of social education whose basic aims - for student growth and autonomy, teacher professional development, and influence upon school climate - promise the potential for a transformative effect upon the working of schools. The theoretical rationale of the programme supposes content-selection and teaching procedures which not only enhance the role of teachers in deliberation and planning, but make it possible for them to communicate more openly both with colleagues and with their students.

The ideological, political and social implications of the programme point to the potential for curriculum transformation. Not only are the values to be explicit, but the programme can focus on uncovering hidden values positions and challenging them. The wider aims and objectives of Developmental Group Work, if taken seriously, go well beyond the socialization functions of the school, and would open up the possibility of access to personal educational outcomes for a greater number of students. The potency of the hidden curriculum in the lives of teachers and taught may be examined; and the programme's influence upon integration and frame will alter content-selection, relationships and approaches to 'control'. The description of the programme presented here indicates its suitability as a vehicle for teachers to begin to work together in a 'process' model as outlined by Stenhouse. It shows how teachers can reduce the control over their own professionalism and over curriculum form that the increasing move towards 'technical' control has imposed upon what happens in schools.

However, as has been indicated (p.24f), one of the most powerful tools in the school's reproduction of the hegemony of society has been the reliance upon certain 'technical' methods of evaluation. The possibility would be that the programme's potential for transformation, described

here, would prove fragile if subjected, for example, to an 'objectives' model of evaluation. The 'illuminative' approach was selected for the evaluation for this reason, and also for its apparent congruence with the 'process' nature of the programme. The following chapter will discuss the illuminative model, examine its suitability for the research undertaken, and describe how the evaluation was conducted.

CHAPTER FOUR : AN EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK :
BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURES

SETTING UP THE PROJECT:

The Developmental Group Work programme described in Chapter Three became the basis of an experimental programme in social education for third formers which was set up in Wellington towards the end of 1982, and piloted and evaluated throughout 1983. The programme was set up as a result of teacher initiative: a local Guidance Adviser and some Guidance Counsellors negotiated with local Principals and the District Senior Inspector to introduce the work into their schools. A regional experiment was mounted where three schools became the focus of curriculum development in the social education area. In-service training time was made available for staff and senior students from the schools to train together; and the programme was focussed upon third-form classes and their form-teachers as a way of developing and enriching pastoral care in the school.

The dimension of collegial support was strongly underlined - Guidance Counsellors would act as co-facilitators in the classroom with form-teachers and student-tutors; a support network of teachers involved in the programme was created within each school; and the joint training sessions created a basis for a wider network of support which meant that teachers could learn from and share with each other in spite of the contextual variables of their schools.

It was agreed that the attempt would be made to integrate action and evaluation into a unified research model (Stenhouse, 1975: 140). The evaluator would attend and participate in training workshops, as well as visiting all three schools regularly to observe and interview, with

the hope of being involved, not as an external evaluator, but as a facilitator of the participants' own self-reflective, formative evaluation.

The issue of what will be the criteria for effectiveness is always likely to be a vexed question with a social education programme, as is the form the evaluation is to take. (Bernstein, 1971: 107). Different expectations of the programme are likely to be held by the parties concerned - the Department of Education, parents, the school organisation, as well as the adult and student participants in the programme. There could be a strong expectation that the programme will provide a 'cure-all' for the social problems of the school, making students more biddable, and supporting the hegemony of the school, whereas the values-stance of the programme was not to make students more quiescent, but more autonomous, confident, aware and assertive, and able to make independent decisions. The values underlying selected criteria should be made explicit, and judgments concerning whether criteria are met should be openly discussed. Also, any criteria of effectiveness not stated beforehand but discovered in process should be acknowledged as important (Stake, 1967).

The three different contexts for the project would also offer opportunities for making comparisons in the way the programme operated, which would be more likely to provide insight into its effectiveness or difficulties than attempting to compare the programme against some ideal, or against a set of predetermined objectives. In any programme in the affective area, comparison against fixed objectives will prove difficult, gains made being difficult to measure and subjective in their recognition, whereas comparing 'what actually happened' in three different situations could provide more concrete and valid bases for comparison, despite the subjective aspect of 'perceiving what happened'. It meant that objectivity of judgment could be sought through inter-subjective agreement.

A case-study approach to the contextual variables, a focus upon the criteria tied to these contexts, and comparisons made between the three situations would provide a basis for judgment of the programme itself - of any quality inherent in the programme - as well as for judgment of what actually took place in the different settings.

EVALUATION : QUALITATIVE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY:

Determining the Tasks of Evaluation:

Given the rationale, aims and objectives of the programme to be used as the basis for the innovation, an idea of the contexts into which the programme was to be introduced, and the procedures to be used in its introduction, the evaluator's main assignment was to determine what would be the tasks of evaluation; what characteristics of the programme and its implementation were to be focussed upon; what issues were to be taken into account; what practical problems of participants should be dealt with, and in what way to limit the elements studied, since not all could be considered. (Stake, 1967). This groundwork having been covered, the way would be cleared for determining the model of evaluation to be used.

A preliminary task was to address the ethical issue of whom the evaluation would serve. The evaluator must determine whether the evaluation serves the interests of outsiders, or of participants in the programme, and this will be allied to the question of who should participate in the evaluation. (Davis, 1981).

The evaluation was to serve the participants first, and other interested parties afterwards. A research contract from the Department of Education, applied for before the programme commenced, but finally granted only after its conclusion, did not influence the decision to ensure

that the evaluation was the joint property of the evaluator and the participants in the programme.

As Stake says, (1976), the rationale of the programme should suggest the reference groups for the evaluation, and six discrete groups suggested themselves as the main informants of the evaluation:

- students involved in the programme;
- teachers involved in the programme;
- students not involved in the programme;
- teachers not involved in the programme;
- parents of students (if possible);
- Principals of the schools.

The reference groups having been identified, the attention of the evaluator turns to the three contexts in which the programme is to be introduced, and considers the features the three schools have in common, as well as any contextual variables which would influence such a programme in the social education area, particularly since one of the agendas of the programme is to have a positive influence upon school climate. There would, then, be a degree of institutional evaluation included, reflecting the 'quality of life' of the school, as advocated by Apple (1974). It would therefore be important to discover whether participants felt that the programme had influenced the complex web of relationships which go towards making up the social climate of the school. The cultural mix of the school would be important to consider, since it is vital to know whether the programme of Developmental Group Work suits all students in the school - not only European, but Maori, Polynesian, and

those from other ethnic groups. This provides an important factor for the evaluation, since, as Jenkins et al (1979) remind us, traditional forms of evaluation have been unfair to cultural minorities.

The issue of the 'hidden curriculum' of the school promised to be an important facet of the evaluation, because of its potential effect upon any innovation, but particularly because of its possible inhibiting effect upon a programme such as this, which has the potency to bring into the open the covert but powerful issues of the hidden curriculum of the school. This aspect of the evaluation would clearly be involved with the values of the school.

The Advantages and Limitations of 'Illuminative' Evaluation:

The different forms that evaluation can take can be defined in terms of two main dimensions: control and understanding. The model which has customarily been used for the evaluation of school programmes, the 'objectives' model, is firmly set within the dimension of control, while the newer approaches are characterised by their search for understanding - for finding out what a situation means to the participants from their own outlook and their own frames of reference. The emphasis upon understanding is central to 'interpretive' methodologies, which have been termed, generically, the 'illuminative' approaches. Here, the primary concern is with 'description and interpretation rather than measurement and prediction' (Parlett and Hamilton, 1975: 88). There are three main stages to the illuminative approach, requiring investigators to "observe, inquire further, and then seek to explain" (ibid: 92). It is basically a 'case-study' approach to evaluation, aiming not at the analysis of the results of a project in terms of pre-specified goals, but at a comprehensive portrayal of the project viewed as a whole, with its intrinsic features opened to understanding.

Objectives selected by the evaluator focus upon the process rather than the products of the programme, or may be determined in process, and will form part of the attempt to reveal the meaning of the curriculum as much as to evaluate its worth. The aim is to see how the programme operates; how it is influenced by its context; and to find out what are the advantages and disadvantages of the programme as experienced by its participants.

The illuminative approach provides a more flexible, comprehensive and sensitive approach to evaluation than traditional models, one which appeared more in keeping with the processes at work in the Developmental Group Work programme, where measurement against base-line data and pre-specified objectives may not only produce little significant information, but miss the real essence of what is happening. Sometimes, only minimal differences have been reported as stemming from a traditional evaluation, whereas the participants and others may have felt themselves agreeing with Elton (1973) that "we feel in our bones there are beneficial inferences of a less tangible kind if only we can pin them down". The illuminative style of evaluation sets out to 'pin down' those elusive features by providing full descriptive data focusing upon the process and upon the experiences of participants. As Stake acknowledges, there is necessarily some trade-off in measurement precision compared with traditional forms of evaluation, but what is gained is a potential increase in the usefulness of the findings to those in the programme, whom the evaluation is intended to serve, as well as to other audiences.

The illuminative model, applied to the Developmental Group Work programme, would be concerned, then, not only with the traditional question of "How good is it?", but with the wider question of "What is happening?" It would give the evaluator the opportunity to focus on programme activities as they evolved, on the experiences

and increasing awareness of participants, to provide relevant kinds of information to the diverse audiences of the programme, and to consider the different value-perspectives of participants and audiences. The aim would be to 'tell the story' of the programme, capturing its unique features, its successes and failures, the issues surrounding it, with the evaluator acting as a mediator attempting to describe a surrogate experience, and, instead of producing precisely measured data on goal attainment, describing all the complexity, the uncertainty and ambiguity likely to be part of the experience of such a programme.

There are criticisms which can be levelled against the illuminative model; for example, its being too 'subjective' and 'impressionistic', and that it lacks rigour. Parlett and Hamilton (1976), discussing the concern over the subjective nature of the approach, point out that forms of research which are immune to prejudice, bias or human error do not exist. They advocate some precautionary tactics to avoid gross partiality, which include cross-checking of findings, discussion of principles and spelling out of criteria, with the open presentation of evidence for others to comment on. The subjective element will remain, and even the presence of the evaluator will have an influence on the conduct and progress of the scheme, so that it will be important to clarify with participants the evaluator's role and its possible influence.

The charges of lack of rigour perhaps arise from confusion with the rigidity of traditional, technological forms of evaluation. The model will not be 'technical' or 'theoretic' in form, but this does not mean that it is unmethodical. It requires planning and structure, and careful preparation; a plan of observations and negotiations is made, with constant reference to the various audiences; and the quality of recorded data and the evaluator's findings are checked against the perceptions and experiences of those involved in the programme. Without a degree

of rigour, the alertness to issues emerging in process which is part of the approach would not be possible, nor the 'progressive focusing' upon emergent themes which is the essence of the illuminative style.

The Evaluator's Role:

As has been discussed, the role of the evaluator is inherently a political one (p.24). Apple points out that the evaluator has ideological, methodological, epistemological and ethical issues to consider, and, in relation to 'affective' programmes, he emphasizes the need for the evaluator to look at the possible latent functions of the programme, the danger of students' private dispositions and personal meanings being brought under the purview of the school, becoming its 'property'.

Ethically, the evaluator must remain independent from the parties involved. However, she will bring her own sensitivities, preferences and style to the setting, cannot escape her own ideology, and needs to beware of her own value orientations subtly influencing the evaluation. These points were clearly important ones in the situation under discussion, where the evaluator was already experienced in using the programme, had found it effective and felt optimistic about it, and where contact with the participants was to include sharing their training workshops. The evaluator would not only need to be aware of these possible influences, but share the possibility of their effect with the participants. She would also attempt to control any such bias by checking the relevance, fairness and accuracy of her representations against the views of the participants - also taking care not simply to allow the biases of participants to replace her own. The evaluator's task becomes to see that the debate is heard, that a wide variety of perspectives is represented, that issues are cross-examined in an attempt to recreate the multiple reality of the programme. The evaluator would not pretend to aspire to the neutrality

of 'objective' truth, but to remain disinterested in the style of Scrimshaw's 'honest broker' (1979: 256), telling not only her own truth, but 'developing critical self-reflection' alongside the participants.

Confidentiality:

The ethical question of whom the evaluation was to serve having been resolved - it was to serve, firstly, the interests of the participants, who were to be the co-owners of the report - there remained the issue of confidentiality. One of the advantages of the democratic style of illuminative evaluation is that, while there may be many participants whose views and experiences are reflected in the final report, the model offers confidentiality to those whose views are represented.

This was clearly a very important issue, and one which the evaluator needed to discuss with and keep before participants throughout the process of the evaluation. Without such a guarantee there would be less likelihood of participants joining in discussion with the evaluator spontaneously, little hope of their revealing what they truly thought or experienced, and small chance of their feeling they were participants in the evaluation as well as the programme. It was particularly important to gain this trust, since it was hoped that permission would be given to audio-tape all interviews. This led to some interesting discussion with participants of the evaluation and the issue of confidentiality (p.142), but permission to audio-tape was granted by all participants. Responses recorded in the report are presented anonymously, and coded only to highlight the group the response represents (Appendix A).

Participation:

Since it was hoped that participants would share an active part in the evaluation, the model of illuminative evaluation,

and their proposed part in it, was explained to them from the start. This was particularly necessary for the teachers, who mostly tended to equate evaluation with the objectives model. For all participants, however, it was important that issues already referred to - of ownership, the role of the evaluator, the subjective nature of the work, the matter of confidentiality - should be clearly stated and understood. This also meant that certain participants could help the evaluator plan and negotiate for the time-table of observations and interviews required.

The notion was put forward that the evaluation should be a joint venture, and the fact that it would not become a judgment on their performance in the programme was explained. Their involvement, autonomy and capacity for shaping the evaluation, as well as the working of the programme, was made clear. They were also introduced to the idea that some of the features we would focus upon would emerge only in process. The possibility of a follow-up instrument such as a questionnaire, to be administered at a later date, was also discussed, as well as the idea of their maintaining diaries or log-books of their own experiences.

The level of openness, sharing, and mutual feedback anticipated in the evaluation offered the possibility of a degree of 'reflexivity' also, whereby the evaluation itself might feed into the programme, helping participants to focus on issues, be aware of the opinions of other groups and audiences, confront issues, or adapt the pace of the programme.

EVALUATION : PROCEDURES

Constraints:

One problem which appeared likely to place a constraint on the scope of the evaluation was the breadth of the

task compared with the time available, since the evaluator was also employed full-time as a Guidance Counsellor some distance from the centre for the programme. Stake's warning (1967), that the elements to be studied must be limited, was a salutary one. However, the chosen style of evaluation, enabling the participants to become evaluators, meant that a much broader, more detailed portrayal would emerge than could be painted by one person.

Observations and Interviews - Project Diary:

An illuminative evaluation requires planning, structure and careful preparation. The evaluator's attendance at preliminary workshops presented the opportunity, not only to observe training methods, but also an ideal arena for sharing and planning procedures for the evaluation.

The evaluator was to attend each workshop during the three terms of the programme, and attention was given to her role of participant-observer at these, so that all involved should understand the opportunity provided for a degree of reflexivity between the evaluation and the programme, and also be alerted to any danger of the evaluator being regarded in the capacity of co-trainer, or of her subjective views becoming over-emphasized.

In addition to this, the evaluator was to visit each of the schools involved twice each term - six visits in all over the year. These visits to the schools were to cover observations, as well as audio-taped interviews with the selected reference groups. It was therefore decided that she should confine observation to one class per school, but be in contact with as many other participants as the school could allow to be available on each visit. It was necessary for the evaluator to write and negotiate dates with the Principals and Co-ordinators well before each visit, and to give a clear schedule of the personnel she wished to be able to talk to each time. The effort was made to cause as little disruption as possible, but

every request, particularly to interview specific groups of teachers, meant that the school had considerable internal re-organisation to cope with to make staff available, and from time to time there were the added problems of teachers being away, being involved in school camps, or there being examinations. The evaluator therefore attempted to remain flexible in her plans and preparation, so that, where a school had been unable to meet written requests exactly, the time should still be employed profitably, there being so little of it. In fact, the normal interruptions and organisational events of school life became a part of the evaluation, an aspect of the context into which the programme was introduced, and an indication of the kinds of stumbling blocks a curriculum innovation must face and survive. The model's ability to focus upon what actually happens in process meant that such organisational contingencies could be absorbed. To some extent, also, the status in school of the Co-ordinator was reflected in the ability to have the necessary arrangements made. This became a considerable difficulty at School C, where the one person ultimately remaining from the original team was a Year Two teacher. The 'project diary' of visits, observations and interviews is provided in Appendix B.

For each visit, a list of possible themes was prepared, to be followed in interviews, but used flexibly, enabling the evaluator to focus upon issues emerging which were becoming important to participants. Permission to audio-tape interviews was sought from all participants during all visits, and the confidentiality of their contributions emphasized.

Teacher Questionnaire:

- a) Objective of questionnaire. It was decided to devise one instrument to supplement the findings of the evaluation, a questionnaire for teachers involved in the programme, to be administered during

the first part of the following year. The objective of the questionnaire was to collect the retrospective opinions of teachers, their mature considerations about the programme once the experimental phase was over and the programme had been introduced across the board at third form level in each of their schools. All remaining from the original teams at the end of 1983 were still involved in teaching the programme in 1984.

- b) Development and testing. The evaluator's advisory committee, and university personnel knowledgeable in questionnaire design, critically examined the objectives, format, language and forms of questions at progressive stages of development. In addition, colleagues who were teaching group-work in the evaluator's school, as well as colleagues in the guidance area, gave feedback on the same aspects. Attention was paid to clarity of questions, avoidance of jargon, and keeping questions as open-ended as possible in order to capture the idiosyncratic aspects of people's experiences. Since the questionnaire was to be issued to a relatively small group, pre-coding of questions was unnecessary, and the way could be left open for more personalized responses.
- c) Content. The questionnaire focused upon the three main aims of Developmental Group Work:
- the personal growth of students;
 - teacher professional development;
 - the climate of the school.

It provided teachers with a structure for recording more considered responses to the programme's influence upon their professional development, particularly their role in curriculum planning, innovation and

evaluation. It provided for a fuller description of the school context, and a longer-term view of the effects of the pilot programme. It also provided a more overt focus upon the issue of values - those of the programme, the participants and the schools - and a chance for teachers to evaluate the evaluation itself. The full questionnaire is presented in Appendix C.

- d) Administration and response rate. Questionnaires were posted to the teachers in July 1984, with individual covering letters and a request that they be completed and returned before the end of Term II. A further reminder was sent to Co-ordinators three weeks later urging them to remind teachers. Seven of the eleven teachers it was sent to completed and returned the questionnaire.
- e) Comments. The questionnaire was administered later than originally planned, during a very busy time in the school year, which may have reduced the response rate.

It was also long, which could have deterred people, although responses were extremely thorough in all but one case, and teachers frequently continued their responses on the backs of pages, which seemed to indicate a strong feeling of involvement in the programme. The questionnaire was used by some to indicate to the evaluator any difficulties they had experienced in maintaining the programme in its second year, which suggested they still saw the evaluation as serving their needs.

DISCUSSION:

The close involvement of participants in the process, and the resulting joint evaluation seemed to be particularly

suitable for a new programme, the value of which not only policy-makers, but participants, too, would need to be convinced. (Parsons, 1976: 259). It is suggested (Deakin, 2: 29) that the only way of creating the self-understanding and understanding of the conditions necessary for sustaining change is through evaluation for and by practitioners. MacDonald points out that in the United Kingdom most evaluations have been done by teachers on secondment rather than 'experts'. (1976: 239). In this case, teachers participated in the evaluation as an on-going part of their work, and their day-to-day practical decision-making.

All that remained before embarking upon the evaluation was to take note of the salutary reminders of Apple (1979:39), that new forms of evaluation are likely to be looked upon as suspiciously as the programme itself; and of Adelman (1984: 35), that the politics of evaluation centre around sustaining interpersonal relationships, since institutions, when threatened, have their own strategies for dealing with the threat, such as withholding information.

CHAPTER FIVE : THE SCHOOL CONTEXTS AND THE PARTICIPANTS

INTRODUCTION:

One of the tasks of the evaluator is to examine the contexts of the programme to be evaluated, so that features held in common, as well as contextual variables, and their possible impact on the programme can be understood. In this chapter, each context will be described and those aspects of the context most likely to interact with the programme will be interpreted. Because the programme aims to influence school climate, it is important to identify the contextual features most likely to have an impact upon the programme.

It was also hoped to discover what effect the criteria for selection of teachers had upon the running of the programme, and how much deliberation had gone into the selection, which was potentially critical.

THE SCHOOL CONTEXTS:

School A:

Set in a primarily working-class borough outside Wellington, School A is tucked away just off the busy main streets which are strongly marked by commerce and light industry, and just a stone's throw from the railway and a main motorway. Backing on to some open land, it possesses an air of comparative peacefulness after the bustle of the thoroughfares. The Nelson-plan buildings are set in grounds which are tidy and comfortable in appearance, but with no great effort made to impress or draw attention to themselves. The school foyer, bare and formal, a little imposing, opens on to the assembly hall; the staff-room is large, comfortable, somewhat garishly adorned,

with chair arrangements that suggest some sub-groupings within the staff, and a notice-board reflecting good-humoured banter as a means of communication. The rest of the 'blocks' are functional, utilitarian, ugly in parts, but with a businesslike and friendly enough atmosphere when inhabited. The Library, which was used for the developmental group-work programme in 1983, is carefully and attractively laid out and adorned with displays and art work, and looks as though a good deal of pride goes into its maintenance. Pupils are, on the whole, rather neatly clad in a very traditional style of uniform, and senior tutors even turned up in uniform at the early in-service training days where others were more casually dressed.

The school roll in 1983 was 882, with 160 (18.2%) Maori and Pacific Island students and a small number of Asian students. Students were described by the Principal and teachers as coming from a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds, from low income to wealthy, but with a predominance of working-class students. However, several teachers suggested that increasing numbers of middle-class parents were beginning to send their children to the school because it was seen as small and caring, and providing strong direction. The evidence for such a trend was not supplied.

In the school Prospectus, the aims stated include a caring attitude towards students; a broad-based education necessary for modern life; respect for individuality and the provision of equal educational opportunity for all; an emphasis upon discipline based upon self control and self respect and a need to respect and have concern for other people; and an attempt to educate the complete person and help students develop their full potential.

Comments made in the teacher's responses to the questionnaire endorsed these as being the school's aims, although one teacher suggested the aims were rather conservative,

and another suggested the school's aims were to please the parents and create a good image. Staff felt the school lived up to its aims averagely well - the school did its best, was not worse at fulfilling its aims than other schools, and was perhaps a little better. Some of the staff of the school were believed not to agree with the aims, or the methods of achieving them, but the school was perceived as succeeding in pleasing parents and creating a good public image, which would be verified by the increased numbers of middle-class parents choosing to send their children to the school. Even before the group work programme began at the school, a focus on caring had been provided by the Principal's setting up a 'buddy' system of older students looking after younger ones. To some extent the two programmes were seen as conflicting rather than complementing one another.

The teachers in the Group Work programme felt reasonably content with the climate of the school, and, in particular, spoke positively of the atmosphere and spirit amongst the students. They were seen as genuine, friendly and supportive; there was little conflict amongst them, and students of different cultural backgrounds mixed freely. On the other hand, the students tended to be non-assertive and to go along with things without questioning, which had some implications for the Group Work programme, which was likely to encourage assertiveness and questioning attitudes. In her assessment made after the year's experiment, one teacher described the climate amongst the staff as being non-supportive. Being involved in an innovation which some others did not understand was said to have brought the teacher unfair and unkind criticism. One teacher criticised the style of discipline in the school, seen as being too strict on infringements of school regulations, but not strict enough on 'aggressors', whom she said the school often equated with 'smokers' for discipline purposes. The 'aggressors' appeared to refer to those who did harm to other people, rather than infringing school rules, such as the 'no-smoking' rule.

When asked about the school's policy on streaming or banding, teachers' responses indicated some lack of consensus as to what degree of streaming there was, or should be, and even as to what constitutes streaming. One teacher stated that the school claimed not to stream, but did so: the top two third form classes that year and the previous year were streamed and this carried through to the fourth form. The other teachers described a system of banding or 'creaming-off' at third and fourth form level, based upon the 'top' mathematics and science students tending to be put in the same form or subject classes. A further level of streaming occurred through students' options choices, since certain choices would determine the class the students would go into. It was stated that there were no 'bottom stream' classes, but a lot of emphasis upon remedial or compensatory help 'at the lower levels'. The Principal confirmed that there was a top-stream third form class, which was expected to progress to six subject School Certificate classes, then on to University Entrance, Bursary and Scholarship. The remainder of the classes were unstreamed.

The effect of such policy was to be seen in the three classes involved in the programme. One class was described as being towards the 'lower end' of the range in reading and writing skills; the second was 'mostly average' in ability, but low in self-concept; and the third was described as being 'very low' in ability, poor at socialising, and considered by its teacher to be 'hard work' compared with a bright class. The 'top stream' third form class was not involved, but any policy decision behind this was not commented on. Some comments were made by teachers to suggest that the constitution of the class had little effect on how the programme ran, since academic ability was not the most important attribute in the programme, and some students of 'lower academic ability' proved thoughtful and outgoing and very successful in the programme.

The teachers involved in the programme presented a good cross-section in age, personal style and teaching experience. There were two males and two females, ages ranging from early twenties to about fifty, and attitudes at the beginning of the year varying from highly enthusiastic, through uncertain, to somewhat sceptical.

School B:

The school is built at the foot of gorse-clad hills on the outskirts of a prosperous suburb of Wellington. Built with its back to the road, the school sprawls around a green area and looks to the hills, providing a feeling on the campus of seclusion. No attempt to impress the visitor is made about the school's entrance and foyer - the area is unfussy, busy, and marked in places with the battle-scars of student pens and knives.

Next to the foyer is an impressively bright and spacious 'student centre', only once witnessed in use by the evaluator, when a teacher's in-service day was held there.

The staff-room is crammed with furniture - work-tables and comfortable old chairs, and, at morning interval and other communal times, is lively with chatter and activity. Many of the staff are young, some quite casually dressed, and people mostly appear busy and involved. The energy level seems high.

The Principal's room, while tucked away down a corridor behind the school office, appears to be open to staff and students, and, while the evaluator talked with the Principal on several occasions, students appeared at the door on various errands, such as depositing a guitar in his safe-keeping.

The classrooms and laboratory visited, where the group work was held, are functional and unprepossessing - it

seems more emphasis is placed upon people than the environment.

The 'mufti-clad' students thronging between classes appear vocal, relaxed, confident and friendly in their relationships with staff. Styles and colours of hair and certain items of clothing may have caused alarm in some schools; here, they apparently cause little or no consternation.

Staff described the school as serving a 'fairly affluent' population - about two-thirds of the students would come from an upper socio-economic background with middle-class parents from the professional and business community. The school roll in 1983 was 921. Of these students, 93.6% were European, 4.4% were Maori or Polynesian and 2% South-East Asian. Teachers tended to comment that many of the students' parents were well-off professionals, some of them well-known people nationally. For a long time the school was considered to be attractive to modern, liberal-thinking people, although it was suggested by some staff and senior pupils that this 'liberal' image now rests more upon reputation than reality, and that the establishment is more conservative and traditional than the persisting image suggests.

The school's aims, as described in the prospectus, focus upon the provision of an interesting programme which motivates students to have a continuing desire to learn, gives them a sense of achievement, and ensures they begin to acquire the qualities of good citizens. The school would hope to encourage an enquiring mind, a concern for others, and the desire for self-respect.

Teachers also saw the aims of the school in these broad terms. The promotion of independence and the development of autonomy were said to be the main aims, broad opportunities being provided for each student, with emphasis on individual attention for those with academic, behavioural or personal problems. Teachers saw the school as living up to these aims 'reasonably well'.

School climate was described as being relatively relaxed and informal, appearing to be very laissez-faire, but with 'ingredients of arbitrary autocracy', and this accorded with the opinions of some senior students, who saw the school's liberalism as being only 'skin-deep'.

The question of what constitutes streaming and what does not caused some conflict in teachers' responses on how the school manages this aspect of its organization, and, while one teacher reported that there was 'no streaming', another reported that there was streaming 'only in fourth form mathematics and fifth form mathematics and English'. The Principal clarified that classes from forms three to five are unstreamed, with the exception of mathematics classes, which are streamed.

Teachers' perceptions of the effect this policy had on the classes involved in the programme also conflicted. While one teacher reported that,

"the brighter students had to exert more tolerance",

another perceived that,

"some of the 'lower ability' kids got a real chance to participate and contribute - this was quite noticeable".

The teachers involved in the programme were young, although with several years' teaching experience, and considered by the school and themselves to be successful and proven classroom teachers. One was highly sceptical about the work, but the others were enthusiastic and initiating. The co-ordinator was male, and the rest of the team female. This was the team which, at the first in-service course, came up with a name for the programme - COPE - the 'Centering on People's Experiences' programme - which they and one other school used thereafter.

School C:

The school is surrounded mostly by state housing, just off the highway, in a predominantly working class district. The setting of the school is attractive, its undulating and wind-swept campus being well cared for, with glimpses out to the hills and water.

The school itself, with its Nelson-plan blocks set at different angles, subjecting personnel travelling between the buildings to wind and rain, has nevertheless a warm and friendly atmosphere, and there is a feeling of welcome upon entering the school.

The staff-room is set somewhat oddly apart from the rest of the school, and not easily accessible - large and bare-looking, with the impression of people positioning themselves around its edges. The Library looks attractive and interesting; the Work Experience rooms scruffy and inviting; and the Music Suite, where group work sessions were held in 1983, impressive, and in some sense characterless. Students seem friendly if spoken to, or given a job to do, such as directing the visitor, but otherwise fairly reserved except amongst themselves or with certain teachers.

The school roll in 1983 was 902, with 367 pupils (40.6%) described as 'Polynesian', which included Maori students. Most students were said to come from working-class families.

In the school Prospectus, the aims stated include setting sensible and wholesome standards in social behaviour, the code of behaviour being based on the notions of being 'sensible' and 'considerate'. The ideals of always acting properly and learning to do things well are embraced in the school motto:

"Akona te mahi pai" - "Learn to do the good thing"

In the teacher questionnaire completed by the one teacher who remained in the programme, the aims were described as falling into three categories: to provide an education for the students, which was considered by this staff member to meet with only limited success; to 'keep the students off the streets', which it was believed worked quite well; and to respect multi-cultural values and feelings, which the school was considered to be quite good at doing.

The teacher answering the questionnaire considered the climate of the school to be quite 'poor' in some ways, quite 'slack' and with a poor 'moral climate', but the response did not explain specifically what was meant by these evaluative judgments. Nevertheless, the teacher remained enthusiastic about the Group Work Programme and was instrumental in the decision to extend the programme, and also remained in it in 1984.

In 1983, the school was still streamed, although this policy was replaced by mixed ability grouping in 1984. The Principal had made a conscious decision when embarking upon the programme to involve the B-band, low-ability classes, since it was felt that these students would be the ones most in need of a social education programme such as Developmental Group Work. However, it had also happened that these classes had fallen to some of the least experienced teachers - one List A Year I, two List A Year II teachers - although the co-ordinator was an experienced teacher, skilled in group facilitation. The school had the misfortune to lose its co-ordinator part way through the year and, as mentioned, only one of the original young teachers remained in the programme for the full year. However, he did so with considerable success and helped with the induction of some new teachers into the programme.

The policy of streaming was seen as creating problems for the programme, since the classes included few role-

models for more assertive, sociable behaviour, and because many of the students lacked the verbal facility to discuss issues. Moreover, many of the students had already developed a strongly 'anti' feeling towards learning and education in any form offered by schools, so that it was particularly difficult to earn their trust or convince them that the programme could hold anything for them. At the same time, their obvious social and educational needs made it very apparent that the school was right in deciding to introduce the programme, although limiting the programme to these lower streamed classes placed some limitations upon the potential scope of the programme.

PARTICIPANT SELECTION - TEACHERS AND SENIOR TUTORS:

For a programme of social education to have any significant transformative effect upon the school, a degree of awareness amongst participants about the programme's potential for change would be vital. Moreover, ideological consensus about using the programme to promote change would be necessary from those agreeing to the programme - the Department and the Principals; and from those involved in it - the teachers, senior tutors, and preferably the third form students, also.

It was evident from talking to participants that such awareness and consensus did not exist: in this initial pilot programme, run as an 'experiment', it had not been sought. Principals appeared to have employed no consistent set of criteria in their selection of staff to run the programme. At School C it seemed to be mostly an accident of time-tabling, and resulted in junior and inexperienced teachers, lacking status in the school, becoming the programme leaders. At the other schools, the Guidance Counsellor appeared to have made an attempt to discover who was interested, and was said by some of the teachers to have "co-erced" them into becoming involved. Involvement

of senior tutors was voluntary, and somewhat arbitrary: those who were interested became involved if they had a free period which co-incided with a group-work lesson.

What united the participants was a degree of enthusiasm, tempered with some scepticism. It gave them a chance to be involved in something 'new', although their interest seemed to reflect the desire for a 'change' from the normal school routines, rather than a considered commitment to the programme itself. The programme did not begin with a level of awareness as to its potential for change, or with ideological consensus that it should be used in 'political' ways, for change.

DISCUSSION:

Examination of the three school contexts suggested some aspects of the organisations and certain variables which were likely to interact with the evaluation. The socio-economic backgrounds of the students; the school's philosophy and aims; its stance on structures such as banding or streaming; its perceived climate; and its level of informed decision-making when embarking upon the programme would be some of the features likely to influence the programme's course and also to interact with the evaluation.

Although the level of 'political' preparedness on the part of participants and their understanding of the programme's potential for transformation were low, it was anticipated that their involvement in the evaluation, and the illuminative model's capacity for 'reflexivity' would have some impact here.

Three focal areas for examining the programme's potentially transformative role were determined:

- the potential for student empowerment;

- the professional development of teachers, and their capacity to change education and schools;
- evidence of the structure of the school itself being affected by the programme.

The outcomes of the evaluation in these three areas will be examined in Chapters Six to Eight.

CHAPTER SIX : DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK AND STUDENT AUTONOMY

INTRODUCTION:

If, as Apple and others have argued, schools are hegemonic institutions reproducing the structures of society, it could be predicted that the likelihood of the Developmental Group Work programme's facilitating student empowerment, or bringing about change in the structures of the school at any deeper level, would be remote. The view that schools have a major role in preserving the status quo of society and maintaining social control, (Apple, 1979: 3), suggests that meaningful change to the structures of the institution itself will be resisted in overt and covert ways.

As Apple argues (ibid: 41), schools are not passive institutions, easily malleable by those who would be agents of change: rather, they present an active force, legitimating the economic and social forms and the ideologies of the dominant groups in society. Attempts to change schools will need to question the basic ways in which they operate, (Apple, 1982a: 8), and any attempt at transformation which fails to do this may be regarded as little more than 'tinkering'. (Olssen, 1985).

Button (1983) claims that Developmental Group Work has the ability to change school climate, but this evaluation set out to discover whether the programme could be used to examine the basic structural mechanisms of the school, and bring about some change at that level. It was an attempt to discover the possibility of significant change being instigated from within the school structure itself, without in any way denying the need for social strategy calling for structural changes in education and society. (Olssen, 1985: 20).

One particular difficulty with a 'therapeutic' programme such as Button's is that it can latently serve the ideo-

logical functions of the dominant group in society without this effect being consciously recognised by the participants in the programme (Apple, 1979: 13). Olssen, analysing the Department of Education's 'Schools without Failure' kit (ibid: 7) which holds some aims and ideals similar to those of Developmental Group Work, highlights the possibility of such well-meaning programmes supplementing existing practices rather than attempting to restructure education at a fundamental level. Olssen argues that alternative practices introduced within the existing educational structure - which is what happened to this programme - will have a null effect upon the deep structures of the school. The school's reproductive role, procedures such as national examinations, and the emphasis upon individual learning styles, will pre-ordain the success or failure of students (ibid: 7-8).

Nevertheless, the programme's potential for the 'empowerment' of students - its ability to help students gain autonomy over their own actions, participate in the decision-making, contribute to content, as well as understand the structures, overt and covert, of the school - provided a rich area for research.

Apple and Olssen argue that any real empowerment of students must entail their being enabled to understand and evaluate the deeper structures of the school. With their teachers, they would come to examine the content and the silences of the formal and the null curricula, as well as understand the covert messages of the hidden curriculum of the school. The raising of their level of awareness would not only be in terms of their interpersonal skills, which could merely reflect their more subtle induction into conformity, but also their level of social awareness and their critical capacities. Students would need to understand how some school experiences constrain them and limit their personal autonomy. They would need to understand that some students have greater access than others to the 'cultural capital' and 'high-status' knowledge which schools reproduce.

From the start, there were aspects of the pilot programme itself which militated against the work becoming transformative in any significant way. It had to be incorporated into the existing, subject-bound school curriculum, into time spaces that were 'borrowed' from other subjects, so that subject boundaries were still maintained. To some extent, particularly at School C (pp.73-4), the work was overtly treated as a 'remedial' programme to help the less able students of the school's 'lower' streams fit into the school structure.

In addition, the teacher-training which had taken place had been minimal in nature, even though the in-service time granted was generous by current standards. No thorough examination of Button's aims and objectives or of the values of the programme was undertaken, and, although it was presented to teacher participants as having, potentially, a transformative role to play in the school, in practice, no examination was made of schools and their deeper structures, or of the programme's ability to examine and influence these. Such observations are made, not as being critical of the participants, but as illustrating that changes in education at a deeper, more philosophical, as well as practical level, were not anticipated or sought at the outset by those giving permission for and organizing the programme. (See 'Expectations', Chapters 6, 7, 8).

The schools themselves had made only a token commitment to the work. Neither Principals nor teachers had apprised themselves fully of the aims, techniques or content of the programme. They had mostly not read Button's texts. There was by no means the 'ideological consensus' which Bernstein (1971) emphasizes is vital if an alternative, integrated code is to be effective, or which Button (1983) also maintains is necessary. Any shared ideology discovered in the early stages of the evaluation came close to what Olssen (ibid: 10) dismisses as an 'ideology of niceness' -

of pious hopes for students gaining confidence and self-esteem, and coping better in the school system. There was little expression of the need for schools themselves, or for society, to change.

This was illustrated in the limited expectations expressed at the beginning of the year concerning the gains which students would make from the programme. Such expectations were checked out, since what was eventually achieved was likely to be greatly influenced by these.

Principals hoped the programme would raise students' confidence and self-esteem, and help 'at risk' students cope better with the school year.

"I would look at how the children in those classes who could potentially become the most restless, unsettled and perhaps unhappy don't become so because they have got a feeling of being able to expand and develop."

(P. School C)

[Reference code for transcripts: Appendix A]

Teachers' expectations focussed upon changes in student behaviour, including improved self-esteem, coping abilities, caring, making the adjustment to high school and learning skills which would aid them in school and in life:

"... socializing; shyness; bringing them out of themselves; perhaps modifying the attitude of some of the heavier bullies. Perhaps just to make the kids happier at school or their home situations."

(T. Sch. A)

They hoped students would develop greater tolerance and self-control, and more sensitivity towards others, and that they would learn to be honest about their emotions. At School C, where teachers felt many of their students started off with a severe social deficit, it was hoped they would develop self-confidence and overcome the negative attitudes towards school which were ingrained in them.

It suggested some expectations of the programme were coming close to the idea of 'compensatory education', a concept which Bernstein (1984) has argued serves to direct attention away from the internal organization and educational context of the school and focus our attention on the families and children. (ibid: 65). There was no suggestion from teachers that perhaps the schools, and the society in which they are embedded, should change.

Some of the expectations for students which were expressed indicate that the programme has the potential to support and confirm the hegemony of the school, rather than bring about change. To be transformative, the programme would require that participants' expectations be less limited, less related to fitting students in to the system, and more related to revealing and attempting to transform the messages of the hidden curriculum. The changes teachers hoped would take place in students, while they may be worthwhile in themselves, would fail on their own to empower students so that they became socially and critically aware of their position within the social structure maintained by the school.

Raven (1984: 27) argues that, in order to change schools, teachers need to shift from their commonly held concept of teaching from 'neutral' educational objectives to value-laden objectives reflecting their own commitment to trying to influence the operation of schools and of society. The Developmental Group Work programme, with its strong values-base, would offer teachers a platform for such a conceptual shift.

However, these teachers, who were not consciously expecting the programme to reinforce the values and deeper structures of the school, were not perceiving the programme as the kind of 'value-laden' curriculum advocated by Raven, either. In a sense, they embarked on the work in a spirit of naivety which itself would tend to preclude any political stance for change.

CURRICULUM FORM AND PEDAGOGICAL STYLE:

According to Apple (1982b), one of the ways in which teachers can contribute to the transformation of schools is by becoming more active in the influencing of curriculum form. Developmental Group Work presents a curriculum form which not only has implications for transforming the formal curriculum, but which could examine the hidden curriculum more closely and fill some of the silences of the null curriculum. It also presents a pedagogical style which alters what counts as 'the valid transmission of knowledge' (Bernstein, 1971: 85), with a considerable relaxation of frame and a strong shift in the pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught.

The programme makes a move from the collection type, subject-bound curriculum to an integrated curriculum which is teachers-based and which crosses subject boundaries, involving teachers from a number of subject areas. The content areas can be wider than those specified by Button (Chapter Three, p.32), but even the areas Button lists indicate a relevance to a number of subjects, and the crossing of subject boundaries.

The relaxation of frame implicit in the programme's required pedagogical style means the boundaries between what may or may not be transmitted are relaxed and the control over what is transmitted and received may be apportioned differently between teacher and taught. (Bernstein, op. cit: 89). The everyday community knowledge of teacher and taught can be transmitted, as well as "educational knowledge", and this became a feature of the programme which teachers eventually began to see as increasing student control over the content of their education, and making success available to a greater range of students. Academic ability was not the only criterion for a successful contribution to the programme. Whereas the formal curriculum commodifies knowledge and emphasizes its 'ownership' by a few, Developmental Group Work was discovered

to allow students to contribute content, and at the same time to emphasize the class working together as a community rather than achieving and competing as individuals, so that a strong challenge was potentially being offered to the values of the hidden curriculum. Teachers saw students attaining new kinds of 'success':

" ... especially the kids who normally wouldn't (contribute) in an ordinary class, the kids who feel they are at the bottom of the class and therefore their views are not worth listening to ... or that no-one likes them anyway. It gives them a real chance, as well as the ones who are outgoing."

(T. Sch. B)

Teachers described situations where students they would have considered to be 'failures' by traditional criteria proved to be very good at role-play, at problem-solving, or in helping others. One of the students reported:

"It's quite good that you get to show people sometimes that you really have got some talents that people don't know you have got."

(F.3 School A)

A teacher commented:

"I have started talking to my group about things that are bothering them, the things that they would like to talk about ... "

(T. Sch. A)

Nevertheless, the amount of student control over content remained fairly minimal in the first year. Part of the difficulty for teachers was in becoming skilled at working 'in process' and allowing issues which had not been planned for to emerge. Another problem was that they felt untrained to handle the kind of 'personal' content which students occasionally brought up, and teachers reported that it was late in the year before they felt comfortable enough to allow the students more control over content.

Students also reported that this happened only "once in a blue moon", and:

"One time we sort of suggested we could have a say about what we wanted to do, but I guess he sort of forgot about it, because he never said anything."

(F.3 Sch. B)

Some students suggested it would be better if they were allowed to plan the lessons sometimes, while others, used to having such decisions made for them, suggested it was preferable for the teacher to plan content, because "it saves a lot of squabbles".

It was an opportunity for the silences of the 'null' curriculum to be tapped. Students had the chance to bring their own concerns and goals centre-stage, and to tackle issues from their experience which the null curriculum ignores. However, although there was evidence of this happening in small ways, it was not an aspect of the work that flourished in the first year.

An area where students did believe they had more control than usual was in the making or negotiating of rules, and several classes had been allowed to make rules. However, these were generally excessively punitive and seemed to reflect the influence of years of schooling rather than any new approach to sharing power brought about by the programme.

Bernstein argues (1971) that when frame is relaxed to include everyday realities, it is often for 'remedial' programmes aimed at controlling certain kinds of deviancy (ibid: 99) and this fact seemed to be well understood by some pupils at School B, who began by resisting the programme (see pp.89-90 to follow).

Bernstein points out (ibid: 101) that the integrated curriculum code and relaxing of frame have the effect

of reducing the 'discretion' of the teacher over what is taught, and increasing that of the pupil: it brings about a shift in the balance of power and in the pedagogical relationship. This change in the nature of authority relationships, increasing the rights of the taught, and blurring the boundary between what may and may not be taught, results in more of the teacher and the taught being likely to enter into this pedagogical frame. The results of this change in pedagogical relationships received a good deal of comment in the evaluation. Teachers described their relationships with the students as becoming more positive, close, enjoyable and mutually trusting. The relaxation in frame required by the programme allowed teachers to set aside their stereotypic 'professional persona', so that students came to know them as 'real people'. One teacher commented:

"(it is) another relationship with the kids - it develops a better feeling between them and me. I'm not the big master anymore, I'm somebody in the circle telling them about me ... I'm being honest with them and therefore it extracts something out of them, and, hopefully, they're being honest with me."

(T. Sch. B)

Students were also reported as becoming more open and honest in relationships with teachers, as becoming more respectful and courteous, but also as expecting to receive respect and courtesy:

"I have got the authority over them when I'm teaching (in the 'ordinary' classroom) but for them to be able to give and expect courtesy from 'authority' and for them to have fun at the same time is what I want to see as a teacher."

(T. Sch. A)

The change in the balance of power was also reflected in students' comments:

"You can talk a lot louder than you usually do in class ... you can speak up ... you can get your say and everything. You can voice your opinion on things."

(F.3 Sch. A)

The limitation implicit, however, was that most often it appeared to be the teacher who decided which things opinions could be expressed about.

As teachers gradually discovered it was safe to have a more equal relationship with students, and became willing to share more 'power' with students in an open way, there was still no suggestion even at this stage of using this more equal, autonomous relationship to examine structural aspects of the institution which brought students and teachers together.

One of the most taxing issues resulting from the relaxation of frame and the change in the balance of student-teacher power concerned whether students should be allowed to "opt out" of the programme, or parts of it, if they felt it became too 'personal' for them. In principle, most of the teachers believed this should be permitted, but in practice it raised problems: How would the institution react? Where should the student be placed? Would the student be perceived as wasting time if 'work' was not set? It proved one of the most contentious values issues that arose during the programme, and, when students did opt out, this was permitted for a time, then teachers 'persuaded' them back in.

However, for these teachers, new to the programme and to the concept of bringing about changes in schools through their own manner of working, there were developments which felt to them like real signs of students having more control. Some of these were not significant in a major way, being limited by narrow expectations for the programme, but they included students beginning to

take a more active part in proceedings, initiating more and having more control over content and process:

"It's no good imposing it. You can impose things in the ordinary classroom, but it's much harder to impose your ideas in this."

(T. Sch. B)

Third form students themselves were enthusiastic about the new working relationship developed with teachers, although, in terms of equality, they perceived the change as teachers 'coming down' to their level rather than themselves gaining more control. Students discussed whether the more equal relationship caused them to lose respect for the teacher, and believed this was not the case:

"... you get to like them more, and you respect when you like someone."

(F.3 Sch. A)

They felt other teachers could well emulate the style of interaction, and felt more aware of their own rights as individuals:

"This way, a teacher could get to know that a child counts as much as a teacher."

(F.3 Sch. A)

However, group-work teachers were still seen as authority figures, although they tended to use their power differently. In a discussion about whether group work or ordinary lessons required greater self-control or self-discipline, the conclusion reached was that these were more developed in group work, where control was largely self-imposed. It also appeared that students used their own, subversive kind of power differently:

"We know we could wreck it (group work)."

(F.3 Sch. A)

The qualitatively different relationship meant teachers appeared more friendly, human and caring, much closer to the students:

"Mr X is sort of family - we think of him as part of the class rather than being the teacher."
(F.3 Sch. B)

Students felt they became real people in the eyes of their teachers:

"The teacher gets to know you as a human person and different individuals instead of just names on a roll."
(F.3 Sch. A)

The fact that this more personal relationship between teachers and students did evolve carries with it a warning that such programmes can bring about a more powerful and insidious form of control. Apple (1979: 165) argues that such programmes can empower the school "in extending its rationalizing ethos to even the most private and personal dispositions of students so they can be better controlled". Bernstein (1971: 109) suggests that, since more of the 'inner' attributes of people are made public in such programmes, where the pedagogy is masked by a relaxation of frame, then socialization of students can become much more intensive and penetrating. Bernstein suggests that an outcome of this could be that pupils begin to produce new defenses. Apple also suggests that students are adept at resisting the overt and covert norms and values of school curricula.

In the initial stages of the Group Work pilot programme, students did put up a good deal of resistance. This was reported by the third formers themselves, by senior tutors and by teachers. A teacher reported:

"(I have) difficulty controlling those students who wish to disrupt, or keeping the concentration of students for any length of time ..."
(T. Sch. C)

A senior tutor reported after some weeks:

" ... they are still unco-operative; they refuse to do things, there's ringleaders; the boys won't sit with the girls; they won't let you join in anything that you ask them to."

(S.T. Sch. C)

One explanation for this strong student resistance could be that the change in the style of classroom management 'disempowered' the third formers further: they had to develop new ways of relating in a more open, risk-laden environment, where some of their old ways of resisting the messages of the school, such as ignoring the teacher, were redundant. For a while, some of the classes intensified their resistance to the work until they succeeded in restoring the status quo. One teacher reported:

"Difficult children had to be given rules. To start with I was too easy-going and students tried me on."

(T. Sch. A)

Some of the students at School B, where students were reported to be generally "more able and middle-class", appeared to resist the work at the beginning because such 'therapeutic' programmes which do not rely upon 'high-status' knowledge tend usually to be offered only to students in 'remedial' classes. It could appear that these students had a clearer notion of how schools operate than those at Schools A and C, and they resented having to participate in a 'low-status' programme:

"I think they have got a bit uptight that they were sort of chosen to do the programme, and they didn't have a say whether they were going to do the programme or not. They resented everything at first and tried to rubbish it and put it down. They just didn't like the idea of being told to be in that class."

(S.T. Sch. B)

Students also resisted the personal and private areas of their experience being brought into classroom interactions. Teachers felt pleased that:

" ... you get to know things about the kids you would never pick up in any other way, not in the classroom, and you watch them and see how they are acting - whether they are very selfish, whether they are very giving people."
(T. Sch. B)

However, students found that the programme made them "sensitive" and "embarrassed", and sometimes expressed openly their resentment about this:

" ... the reaction I got was I was prying: 'Why should I tell you anything like that?'"
(T. Sch. C)

Some students realized that the programme made them more vulnerable to each other, as well as letting teachers and the school know more about them:

"It makes you fight more ... because you know how far you can push one another."
(F.3 Sch. C)

Senior tutors found that students who related to them in an open and friendly way in the programme would disguise this when they were with their peer-group around the school:

"They act as if they don't like you and make jokes at you."
(S.T. Sch. C)

The resistance shown by the students to the programme could be explained in terms of them defending the power they had developed during years in the school system. Some resisted the work because they saw that it made more of their personal experience available to the school; others, because they had a sense of being 'fobbed off' with a low-status (and therefore second-rate) programme.

The irony in this was that the programme possibly did have the power to begin to change things for them in school - provided that the expectations of teachers and the level of ideological consensus permitted this. In fact, by the end of the year, resistance from students had almost totally ceased, and most students wanted the programme to continue into later years. However, whether this indicated the programme having developed in them the social awareness to understand the hidden curriculum of the school is doubtful. Students seem to have automatically resisted the programme when they perceived it as making them more personally vulnerable to the school. Without their understanding the concept of 'the hidden curriculum', they possibly perceived, nevertheless, the programme's power to implement its messages, making them more available to school scrutiny and assessment. However, their comments recorded only their feelings of discomfort, rather than any degree of understanding in the area. They seemed to respond to such discomfort at an affective level, but with little cognitive recognition of what made them wary.

The way in which they spoke of their enthusiasm for the programme in fact could indicate a good deal of conformism: it was 'fun', a 'break', a 'rest', and 'not the same old things'.

EFFECTS UPON STUDENTS : LIMITS AND POSSIBILITIES

By the end of the year, the changes which adults and students felt most confident to comment upon were in the area of psychological and behavioural changes which had taken place in students. Not surprisingly, these fitted closely the expectations, or objectives, which schools had set for the work at the beginning of the year.

Teachers and senior students were enthusiastic about the fact that third form students were becoming more aware of each other socially, and that bullying was reduced:

"Very positive for most, especially between groups who would otherwise be 'at' each other ... the 'heavies' became more tolerant and the 'wimps' more assertive."

(C. Sch. A)

There was more co-operation, less insensitive behaviour, and general gains in confidence, so that students began to move away from their 'cliques' to relate more openly with more people in the class:

"They are certainly more together in the class than they were at the beginning. They don't knock each other as much as they did ... they really get to work together as a team."

(S.T. Sch. C)

This developing ability to work co-operatively rather than competitively suggested some changes in student behaviour which ultimately could have a transformative effect upon the school. Whereas the formal, subject-bound curriculum of schools is geared towards individual achievement and based upon competition, the wider objectives of Developmental Group Work meant that students could work as a team. Potentially, this could give them more power than is allowed by the fragmentation caused by the formal curriculum, which tends to result in individualism, competition and ultimately student impotence. Students were said to become less reliant on "one-upmanship" and "putdowns" in their communication, behaviour typically fostered by the traditional curriculum and the emphasis upon assessment, which also results in students combating each other or teachers rather than the organizational structures and covert messages of the institution. A spirit of 'community' gradually permeated most classes, overcoming some student animosity and competitiveness:

"You might not get along with someone in the group ... then you have to talk to them and you find out all about them ... we are starting to not argue and kind of do things together."
(F.3 Sch. C)

However, while many instances were given of students working co-operatively in activities and 'action research', such as interviewing visitors, there was no indication of this real nerve of group work being used to examine the messages of the hidden curriculum, or to understand the deeper structures of the school. Subjectively, the changes were seen as being beneficial - they made people feel better about themselves and each other. Olssen, in his paper, "Idealism in Educational Policy: A Critique of the Schools without Failure Project" (1985), makes the charge that there is a danger that teachers, thinking they are bringing about change in schools, are achieving little more than 'psychological tinkering' backed by an 'ideology of niceness'. If Developmental Group Work is confined to the somewhat limited aims given to it by teachers within this pilot programme, then Olssen's criticisms would apply just as well here. What is required now is an evaluation of the programme by experienced teachers over a period of time, and preferably with the programme operating at all levels through the school.

An aspect of student relationships which received considerable comment was the development of positive relationships between senior tutors and third formers, which Bernstein (op cit:104) says might be expected from the integrated code:

" ... very positive - it strengthened vertical relationships and closed the gap in many real ways: some very good friendships and support were established."

(C. Sch. B)

This area also promised to be one development of the programme which had the potential to affect school structures.

The vertical organization of schools, from most junior students to most powerful staff, reflects the hierarchical structuring of society, and, as in society, the school maintains its ethos of control and reproduction very much through the separatist structure of its 'layers' of power. For the senior tutors, the 'successes' of the school system, to be working with and relating to younger students promised the potential for a coalition of student strength not often seen in schools. The fact that this was an unusual development in schools was commented on by a third form girl:

" ... One of the things you notice a lot at this kind of college is seventh formers - they'd never mix with third formers. You just have your own little groups of society - the seventh formers have their common room, the third formers playing in the playground."

(F.3 Sch. B)

However, for the vertical relationships to help make students more powerful, it would be necessary to enable them to see and understand such potential themselves. It would also be important to begin with the empowerment of the least powerful people in the school, the third formers. This the Wellington programme did offer, but for reasons more to do with expediency. The potential for power was placed where it was traditionally least experienced, but without any deliberate design. If some degree of student empowerment did not come about, then it could be argued that even the vertical relationships which did develop could help support the reproductive role of the school, with the seniors being used more subtly to control younger students and encourage them to conform, by being 'nice' and 'helpful' to them, and by modelling conformist behaviour.

The personal and psychological gains which the seniors themselves made could be interpreted as their being fitted into the status quo even more powerfully. They began

to feel good about themselves and the younger students, and very sensitive to the feelings of the third formers, but no mention was made in their interviews of perceiving how the school was structured or wanting to affect this in any way. It could be said that they were being initiated in a process similar to that experienced by their teachers in their own teacher-education, resulting in an idealism about people 'working together pleasantly', and a belief in the neutrality of education. The limited expectations for the programme, described at its outset, would covertly allow a potential arena for autonomous behaviour from students who were becoming more confident and united to be turned into a more insidious form of control, where students felt happier about fitting in to the school, without any changes to schooling itself being demanded.

However, one feature emerged, if only in a limited way, which exemplified a degree of 'institutional' criticism by students: this was their criticism of "angry" teachers who made classrooms "noisy" because they were "yelling", or teachers who were arbitrary about dispensing punishment:

" ... heads you get ten discredits, tails you get ten detentions ... "

(F.3 Sch. A)

Students also commented on the fact that you generally did not get noticed in the 'ordinary' classroom unless you were "clever"; and that little was asked of you as long as you looked as though you were listening and writing.

CONCLUSION:

One of the anomalies of the evaluation in the area of the development of student autonomy was the fact that a great deal of change in students was reported, but examination of the 'changes' indicated that these were

modest in terms of empowering students and enabling them to understand the school organization and their part in it. From the data, it would be possible to argue a case in support of the thesis put forward by Apple, Bernstein and others, that such 'therapeutic' programmes can be used to make the student conform to the school and its hegemonic role. This was not what teachers set out to do, but, having no clear ideology or consensus as to how the programme should influence students or the school, their stance was still a 'political' one, likely to support the status quo by default.

Nevertheless, changes were taking place in students, and in their relationships with each other and with teachers, which felt significant to the participants and raised their awareness about how relationships could be different and could develop. There were embryonic changes, for example in vertical relationships, which certainly had the potential to affect school structures. Perhaps a one-year experiment is too short a time to expect deeper changes. Moreover, the point could be made that more significant change would be unlikely to come about unless these 'psychological' changes in participants and their relationships had first taken place, to give them confidence and produce the conditions for more open participation. On the other hand, it is unlikely that, even with time, these 'psychological' changes would significantly affect the deeper structures of the school unless teachers eventually became politically aware of the capacity for transformation which the programme placed in their hands, reached a level of ideological consensus about their aims, and shared this awareness with their students.

CHAPTER SEVEN : PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - TEACHERS IN
CHANGE AND AS AGENTS OF CHANGE

INTRODUCTION:

One of the wider aims of Developmental Group Work concerns the professional development of teachers, and the evaluation set out to discover whether teachers in the programme felt that they had grown professionally through the work. It has been suggested (p.21f) that Button's programme has the potential to offer teachers a model for professional development akin to Stenhouse's "teacher-as-researcher" model.

Teacher involvement in curriculum decision-making and evaluation in New Zealand is still somewhat in its infancy, but the Developmental Group Work project promised to cast teachers in the role of curriculum developers, creators and investigators, as advocated by Stenhouse (1975). It was partly the 'outsider' status of the programme which contributed to this possibility. Being new, not part of the core-curriculum, non-examinable, the programme offered teachers some creative scope not easily found in the traditional school curriculum. Some of the 'disadvantages' of the programme's status promised to offer a productive arena, in the way that Apple suggests that such 'contradictions' in the curriculum may do. (Apple, 1982a: 61).

Moreover, their involvement in the illuminative evaluation of the programme offered teachers the chance to judge the programme on the terms Stenhouse suggests for curriculum development (op cit:125), that is, not by whether it was 'right', but by whether it advanced knowledge, was intelligent and penetrating, the focus being upon the study of problems and responses to them, rather than 'solutions'. The programme promised to offer an illustration of the principle laid down by Stenhouse (ibid: 24), that curri-

culum development must rest on teacher development, and that curriculum innovations need to be concerned also with the betterment of teaching. (ibid: 38).

The implications of Stenhouse's 'teacher-as-researcher' model are exciting in terms of the professional development of the teacher, the continual raising of the level of expertise, and the level of autonomy implied by the emphasis on the teacher's own perception of his work and his situation, (ibid: 134). Such emphasis upon teacher-participation is unusual in New Zealand, where there has traditionally been a very highly centralised curriculum, but Stenhouse emphasizes that, whatever the system, not all teachers will relish the level of responsibility accompanying such autonomy: some will still prefer 'solutions' from 'experts' - until the professional self-image and work conditions of teachers improve sufficiently to encourage them to possess this field of research. This resistance was something the evaluation also set out to explore. The way in which the Wellington programme was set up offered the opportunity for an extended piece of action research by teachers through which they could begin to develop a 'capacity for autonomous professional self-development through systematic self-study, through the study of the work of other teachers and through the testing of ideas by classroom research procedures'. (ibid: 144).

One of the ways in which this ideal could be worked towards was through the setting up of 'three teams within a team', offering a structure akin to Stenhouse's 'scientific community': not only would each classroom, shared by form-teacher and co-ordinator-trainer, become a "'laboratory', unique in its own context", but the school team and the total team offered extensions of the community. Moreover, the fact that the teachers came from a variety of subject disciplines made it possible for a degree of teachers-based integration to take place through the programme. (Bernstein, 1971: 93).

Stenhouse reminds us that such innovation will change the social structure of the classroom, as well as relationships between teachers and pupils. The reminder was particularly apt in this case, where these changes were deliberately held up as aims of the programme, but so was Stenhouse's suggestion that, as the teacher's role undergoes change, the new definition of the role will need to be taught to the pupils (op.cit: 155). The evaluation set out to discover how teachers and pupils coped with the role change and any likely role-conflict.

Some of the possible difficulties, for teachers and students, emanating from a change in the professional role of the teacher, are commented upon by Bernstein (1971). In accordance with what Bernstein says, Developmental Group Work invites teachers to restructure the pedagogy system, to relax the 'frame' - the form of the context in which knowledge is transmitted and received - thus affecting the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organisation, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received (ibid: 89). Importantly, for this programme, this also affects the relationship between non-school, everyday knowledge and 'educational' knowledge, so that the teacher is much less guided, or controlled, by any set syllabus or curriculum package. As Bernstein points out, not only do the boundaries between what may and may not be taught become blurred, resting much more in the power of the teacher and the taught, but authority relationships are changed, more of the teacher and the taught is likely to enter the pedagogical frame, with possible ensuing threat and role-conflict for both (ibid:102).

Teachers would be required, as Raven (1984: 26) suggests they should be, to move away from the mode of 'telling' to one of 'facilitating growth'. One of the most severe threats to be faced would be the burden of 'incompetence' the teacher is temporarily asked to assume, and the concomitant loss of identity as she becomes 'deskilled' in the process of innovation. However, the process would

be different from the spiralling deskilling and disempowerment which Apple (1982a: 250) suggests is increasingly forced upon teachers by the trend towards self-contained curriculum packages. In the Developmental Group Work programme, the aim is for the teacher to become reskilled, after letting go of some inhibiting classroom 'skills': it is the opposite from the manipulation of teachers into 'managers' brought about by 'curriculum packages', for these teachers had the opportunity to learn to work 'in process', to become more autonomous in the classroom, and to share autonomy with the students. These aspects of teacher 'deskilling' and 'reskilling' and their effects were sought in the evaluation.

The psychological and social barriers to the teachers' assuming their new roles were likely to be strong. Stenhouse (op.cit: 158) warns against the possibility of the teacher being besieged by expectations - his own and those of others - of attaining 'objectivity', whereas what he will need to do is develop faith in the value of a sensitive and self-critical subjective perspective, and not aspire towards unattainable objectivity. The nature of the illuminative style of evaluation would also underline this potential dilemma.

Other pressures were likely to arise from the school context, not only from restriction of resources, but from resistance to change, or from the innovation not being implemented as whole-school policy. Allied with this is the degree of values-conflict teachers might experience because of the very nature of this programme and its aims. Firstly, the teacher would need to understand the implicit values of the programme and those of the school, and be aware of the degree of match and mismatch. Secondly, the teacher would need to be clear of her own values-stance in implementing the programme, for as Apple has warned (op.cit: 13), such 'ameliorative' or 'therapeutic' programmes may have the effect of supporting the hegemony of the school, rather than producing change to the deeper structures of the

institution and its curricula. Moreover, as Bowers points out, (1976: 59), teachers themselves have been 'processed' by society and the education system, their self-esteem and their values-stance are closely tied to their activities in schools, so that it may be hard for them to imagine any alternative. It is a matter close to the heart of teacher professional development that such values issues be considered by the teacher as innovator, if the teacher is to be seen as a professional educator rather than a practitioner.

The foregoing offers an optimistic and idealistic preview of the scope the programme might offer for teacher professional development. Although there is advocacy by some educationists for increased teacher autonomy in practical curriculum decision making, (Davis, 1981; Codd, 1982), this needs to be balanced against the arguments of Apple, (1982a), Olssen (1985), and others, that teachers have only limited power to effect change, that they are not free to restructure education, and that therefore their professional development is often limited to technical expertise rather than a capacity for educational deliberation. Moreover, the limited nature of the preparation and training of these teachers for their new role, the limited scope of the project itself, and the fact that teachers were undertaking this new curriculum on top of their normal load of teaching, duties and occupational stress, have to be taken into account.

The reported expectations regarding teacher professional development through the programme reflected that the theme formed little part of teacher expectations early on: it tended to become an aspect of the work more discovered in process and through reflection upon the evaluation itself.

Nevertheless, teachers had some expectations of the professional gains they might make. One teacher wanted

to overcome the futility and redundancy of much of the content he 'taught' his classes, and sought:

"the satisfaction of knowing that something is working, that something may actually be getting through to them, because a lot of teaching we do doesn't seem to be getting through to a lot of kids".

(T. Sch. C)

A second-year teacher expected the programme to help him develop early in his career a professional approach to his work, in keeping with the idealism experienced whilst training:

"... like putting into practice some of the things you learn at university or teachers' college. We were told to find our own way, sort of try things and see how they work. You can't really do that in your first few years, it's virtually impossible. This is a way of doing something similar to that ... you could actually try something different to what has traditionally been done and see how it works."

(T. Sch. C)

The most common expectation was that the work would help break down the teacher-pupil barrier and allow a better kind of relationship to develop, but teachers did not set out with any clear expectations for themselves in terms of their own professional development as curriculum planners or innovators, or as agents of change.

However, through the evaluation, teachers did report gains they had made professionally in a number of areas, including:

- changes in pedagogical style and classroom relationships;
- alternative classroom techniques and strategies;
- content and planning in process;
- deskilling and reskilling;

- collegial support;
- changes in perceived self-image;
- values and attitudes;
- their role in the evaluation.

While these will be treated as discrete areas in the following section, in practice they tended to be very closely inter-related.

CHANGES IN PEDAGOGICAL STYLE AND CLASSROOM RELATIONSHIPS:

One of the first and most obvious demands made upon teachers was adjustment to a different mode of classroom management and organisation which required a different 'style' on the part of the teacher. Physical factors formed a strong influence - the absence of furniture, sitting on chairs or the floor in a circle - as did the requirement to develop a 'facilitative' leadership style. Some of the teachers described themselves as having been fairly authoritarian formerly in their classroom management and teaching style, and they found the adjustments difficult to make.

One teacher described his initial difficulties in establishing the desired working relationship with his students:

" ... difficulty controlling those students who wish to disrupt, or keeping the concentration of students for any length of time ... "

(T. Sch. C)

Another commented on the role-conflict for the teacher, which also caused confusion for students:

"There is the effect on the form-class expectations, since it's so different from the normal classroom ... some difficulty for the teacher

and the class adjusting to the difference in teaching habits and milieu ... some role-conflict for the teacher."

(T. Sch. A)

It was not easy for teachers to find the level of facilitation where they were being neither authoritarian nor laissez-faire. One teacher described how she ultimately coped by reverting to being authoritarian:

"Difficult children had to be given rules. To start with, I was too easy-going, and students tried me on."

(T. Sch. A)

With the low-stream classes at School C, teachers experienced particular difficulty in trying to be less authoritarian. Some of the difficulty could be attributed to the inexperience of the young teachers involved with these classes, but teachers also put problems down to the previous socialisation of the students, and the possibility that the streaming of the classes provided few role models for different behaviour.

In most cases, it took time for teachers to develop the style they preferred, and which worked for them, and they described some of the changes they had to go through in adjusting to the necessary relaxation of frame. The two co-ordinators described their style as moving from directiveness towards facilitation.

"I became less directive - more of a facilitator. Similarly in my work with staff - directive, then facilitative as they became more autonomous."

(C. Sch. A)

Teachers also began to describe a move from directiveness to facilitation:

"I was initially quite directive, using Button techniques. Then I drew back, became more of a facilitator, and the students became more autonomous."

(T. Sch. A)

However, for some teachers, the classes worked best when they were directive, and, eventually some individuals opted for this classroom style:

"My leadership became stronger - more directive? A move towards more typical classroom management perhaps - although my classroom management was also changing at the same time."

(T. Sch. C)

The comment suggests that this teacher was, in fact, working towards a new individual style, where he was less laissez-faire in group work, and less authoritarian in the ordinary classroom.

Some of the changes in their teaching style that teachers commented upon tended to be more to do with attitude than technique:

"I became more aware of and sympathetic towards students' problems and difficulties, and more 'mellow' in my approach to occurrences ..."

(T. Sch. A)

"It has given (me) some insight into the way students think."

(T. Sch. A)

It was, perhaps, the content of lessons as much as the pedagogical style that brought about such attitudinal changes, and the point is re-iterated that the perceived developments described in this chapter would be closely inter-related. One teacher pin-pointed the subjective change demanded of the teacher by the relaxation of frame, as well as the personal cost which Bernstein (p.44) argued was likely to be involved:

"You are much more a person and a teacher than a teacher of a subject, and I think that is a gain ... I think you pay for it to do it.
I mean I feel as though I pay for it to do it."

(T. Sch. B)

In spite of difficulties and conflict experienced, however, and the length of time it took teachers to feel comfortable with the change in pedagogical style, the outcomes in terms of improved relationships with students were considered to be highly rewarding. Once teachers had set aside their stereotypic 'professional persona' - even before some of them felt they had really managed to do this - relationships with third form students were described as becoming more positive, close, enjoyable, mutually trusting and healthy:

"The programme built up trust between the teacher and students."

(T. Sch. A)

"We became closer."

(T. Sch. B)

"A healthier relationship with students came about, with students perhaps developing more respect for teachers' views."

(T. Sch. B)

Because the new relationships were mutually enjoyed by teachers and students, it is difficult to distinguish between comments which illustrate student development and those illustrating teacher development: clearly, much growth was occurring for all participants in the programme. One teacher described how the changes she was making brought about changes between herself and the students:

" ... (it is) another relationship with the kids - it develops a better feeling between them and me. I'm not the big master anymore, I'm somebody else in the circle telling them about me ... again, it comes back to the honesty thing. I'm being honest with them, and therefore it extracts something out of them, and, hopefully, they're being honest with me."

(T. Sch. B)

However, not all teachers believed the work was helping them develop better relationships with their class. One teacher, who eventually withdrew from the programme, felt that the development of a closer relationship with his class was a touch-and-go matter, and possibly disadvantageous:

"Possibly it breeds contempt ... I can switch off from being a teacher, be a sort of friend type, but they can't, they can't distinguish between the relationship."

(T. Sch. C)

On the whole, however, students reported more, rather than less respect for the teachers they had in group-work, because of the extra help they felt they received and the fact that they were treated as individuals (pp.88f).

One unexpected spin-off that teachers discovered was that the time available for group-work seemed to them to be fully used compared with the wastage of teaching and learning time in the ordinary classroom:

"What gets me is the fact that, in the (ordinary) class, you're lucky if you get any teaching done, really. Most of the time is spent disciplining the small misdemeanours."

(T. Sch. A)

"You are not wasting it, you are not wasting any time ... I have been astounded at the amount of work we have got through ... "

(T. Sch. A)

ALTERNATIVE CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES:

The style of classroom management in the programme depends heavily upon the use of some techniques and strategies which would seem foreign to the traditional classroom situation.

Most of the techniques the teachers absorbed into their own style with ease. The technique of students working in two's and four's to share ideas and experiences before talking in the open group was generally handled with ease, and quickly reported as becoming a useful strategy in other kinds of classroom or group situations. However, teachers did have to learn how to cope with adverse reactions from students occasionally, when the closer contact which this brought about with others also brought the charge of 'prying'. As Bernstein (1971) and Apple (1979) point out, more of the student becomes available and open to assessment in such programmes, and the teacher needs human relations skills, both to keep students safe and to handle possible confrontations.

The 'warm-up' activities received comment from a number of teachers, who said students quickly began to find this aspect of the work 'babyish' - but also complained if the activities were omitted. The teachers' concern tended to centre on the fact that the 'games', and students' comments on them, might give others the wrong impression:

"When X was doing it with his class, they used to make comments like, "Oh, he plays games with us, he's easy ... you know, we can do anything with Mr X." And that annoyed me, because X isn't an 'easy' teacher."

(T. Sch. C)

Some of the techniques, such as role-play and socio-drama, were ones which teachers had not handled before, and they tended at first to rely upon the co-ordinator when such techniques were used:

"I had difficulty handling role-plays because of lack of experience and training."

(T. Sch. B)

However, by the end of the year, many of the teachers were using these techniques, some in situations other than group-work.

Most of the teachers reported a generalising of these newly learned group-work skills to other teaching situations:

"I have used various action methods, and feel much more free about changing seating arrangements for class discussions ... "

(C. Sch. B)

" ... I use activities, role-play, socratic discussion in Third Form 'Leisure Education' and Sixth Form 'General Studies' ... "

(C. Sch. A)

"I have more confidence to break into action methods, to use continuums and role-plays ... I feel more experienced and somewhat more skilled."

(T. Sch. B)

CONTENT AND PLANNING IN PROCESS:

The wider aims and objectives of Developmental Group Work mean that issues which are important to students themselves, and the culture they bring with them to the school situation, can form an essential part of lesson content. It is virtually impossible for teachers to totally plan lesson content in advance of the session: the relaxation of frame requires that content be dictated as much by the students' current interests and needs as by the teacher's planning. Although Button himself eventually produced 'lesson plans', after initial reluctance to do so, these should be treated as catalysts for the students' own input into the content of the lesson. Other attributes than academic ability became focussed upon, and teachers were quick to appreciate and applaud this facet of their work:

" ... a kid says to me that he hates school, and he is sick of school, he can't see any value in it ... and they get into a situation like this and do exercises that bring them out of themselves. Two kids today I couldn't see much in really impressed me ... it is giving them a chance to show that school has something to offer them."

(T. Sch. A)

Clearly, the teacher was also providing students with the chance for them to show the school they had something to offer. One student commented:

"I guess they learn about what we want, but the ordinary teachers don't get to know us in the same way."

(F.3 Sch. A)

Early on, one teacher had felt like stopping the programme, being unclear of her own direction. When she discussed this with students, she discovered their quite opposite point of view: the programme was worthwhile to them because it provided a forum to discuss matters which were really important in their own lives:

"... when I talked to the kids about stopping the programme because I couldn't see where I was going, it was obvious that coping with real issues was the advantage: they were able to raise real issues in a way that didn't come out of anything imposed on them ... it gives them the chance to raise real issues, instead of having to make excuses to raise them in an ordinary class."

(T. Sch. B)

The need to be able to plan in process and to pick up the immediate concerns that were of current importance to the class, rather than relying on prepared, pre-structured lesson plans, caused teachers considerable concern. Part of this was an ambivalence they felt about not being structured enough, not planning lessons thoroughly:

"You have to be organised and have some guidelines to work on, and that's where I have fallen down this year, that I haven't followed any scheme."

(T. Sch. C)

At the same time, teachers increasingly came to believe that such a structure was not always desirable:

"It's essential every now and then to give up the structure and let what's coming out of it come out, but to do that, that's the really hard thing."

(T. Sch. B)

The satisfaction to be gained from planning in process was described:

"When you actually pick up on those electric currents and take that risk, that's when it becomes really exciting ... "

(T. Sch. B)

Overall, teachers felt that both structure and the ability to plan in process were desirable:

"I think it's very important to have structure and to have lessons that we know we can do ... but it's really important sometimes to say, 'I don't need to have a structure'. Sometimes, when I have a structure, I can give that up and give it over to what the kids are saying and follow something that they say is relevant."

(C. Sch. B)

Ultimately, the teachers who found it comfortable to work in process, with content which the students brought to sessions, discovered that relatively little time was spent on planning lessons as they increasingly dealt with concerns important to the group and raised in process:

"I spend about fifteen minutes a day or two before the set spell and plan what we would be doing."

(T. Sch. A)

"Going along with your feelings is the best way, that way you don't do a lot of real planning."

(T. Sch. C)

However, the feeling of not being 'in control' of the content caused stress for some teachers, and one teacher reported spending more time planning a group-work session:

"I spend more time planning this for the time it takes to do it than I spend on my other lessons ... I can't do this off the top of my head ... there's an in-put in thought which I perhaps don't have to have for my other classes".

(T. Sch. B)

'DESKILLING' AND 'RESKILLING':

As might be expected, one of the greatest pressures experienced by teachers was the feeling of becoming 'deskilled', as the techniques they had been taught to rely on and had practised in the 'ordinary' classroom became increasingly redundant. Allied to this pressure was the need to become swiftly 'reskilled' in practices and techniques that were new to them.

The amount of disorientation and role-conflict this led to was commented upon:

"It's hard trying to decide what level to pitch yourself at. The kids don't automatically push themselves to the right level, so you have got to do that in a way that isn't totally authoritarian, and that's hard, that's the hard part."

(T. Sch. B)

The need to become quickly adept in different classroom strategies has been described (p.107f). Moreover, while teachers experienced themselves as being constantly required to learn new methods and techniques, they also went through stages of finding it very difficult to maintain motivation for the students. Teachers described how the programme reached 'plateaus', when they felt stale, or tired, or 'stuck', and allowed sessions to become too repetitive or dull:

"We have got to the stage now where the material is becoming repetitive ... I think they need to get into more gutsy things ... but I'm a little worried about moving on."

(T. Sch. B)

For a time, the changes faced in terms of classroom management, facilitative style and the learning and practice of new techniques meant that a number of the teachers experienced an intense period of becoming 'deskilled'. Their former classroom competence could no longer be fully relied upon until they became 'reskilled' in the programme's procedures. The feeling of becoming 'deskilled', with the attendant discomfort, was described:

"It was difficult dealing with disruption and open confrontation - felt very scary, though by the simple working through and allowing expression of feeling, a significant cathartic effect was noticeable. Had to learn to stick to re-emphasizing the ground-rules, e.g. taking responsibility for own feelings, making 'I' statements."

(C. Sch. B)

The threat to teachers and students presented by the relaxation of frame, required new skills from teachers:

"There wasn't the safe distance between students and teachers common in the ordinary classroom - both felt more uncomfortable. The teacher had to show more 'humanity', and they had to learn to accept it."

(T. Sch. A)

One teacher commented, with humour:

"More patience was required. (And cotton wool!)"
(T. Sch. A)

These teachers, themselves in a state of transition, experienced conflict between the desirable role they wished to model - "non-authoritarian, student-centred, self-controlled" - and the "teacher-oriented, authoritarian control" they frequently resorted to. One teacher reported:

"I resorted to directive disciplinary action on occasion, but reinforced the wish for pupil self-control, and was honest to staff and the class about my feelings."

(C. Sch. A)

Another teacher's description of the 'reskilling' process and its difficulties was particularly graphic:

"I had to learn a lot of new ideas and approaches and some attitudes quite fast. It was like trying to keep a completely fresh set of twenty-five corks under water at the same time with only one pair of hands."

(T. Sch. A)

Part of the phenomenon of feeling 'deskilled' was attributed by one teacher to insufficient emphasis having been placed upon the aims of the programme in preliminary training sessions:

"At first I did not see any structure in the programme and very little aim - I would like to see this point raised when training teachers ... aims must be clearly defined."

(T. Sch. A)

Again, teachers becoming involved in such innovations need not only practice in techniques, but education in the philosophy, aims and values of the curriculum they are to 'introduce'.

COLLEAGUIAL SUPPORT:

The fact that teachers worked as part of a collegial support team, akin to the 'scientific community' advocated by Stenhouse, was described as one of the most important aspects of the project. Teachers quickly appreciated the value of working closely with others and having more opportunity for planning and discussing work together. Working alongside others brought teachers closer:

"It has meant a closer tie with the teachers involved, and discussion with some teachers I normally would not talk to."

(T. Sch. C)

A young teacher appreciated the fact that:

"There was greater opportunity for discussion with other teachers ... it was a useful experience having assistance with running the class, and sharing ideas."

(T. Sch. B)

In two of the schools, the ranges in age, experience and teaching-subjects promised to bring about a degree of teachers-based integration, with teachers of different subjects entering into social relationships with each other (Bernstein, 1971: 104). The boundaries described by Bernstein, of senior staff having horizontal, peer relationships, based upon status, and junior staff having vertical, hierarchical relationships within their subject departments, were broken down to some extent: the centre of gravity of relationships became the bond of support and common concern, and the fact that all teachers were undergoing a new learning situation, however experienced they were.

Because teachers worked together in on-going training, both formally and informally, they had a mutual learning base. Some had not experienced peer-training before, and emphasized the value this had in helping each other cope with problems and difficulties. Professional shyness and reluctance to speak of 'failures' were generally overcome:

"Being part of a peer group who underwent the experiences later offered to the students proved an enjoyable method of learning. There was scope for comparing problems and difficulties."

(T. Sch. A)

The co-ordinators, in particular, found this a helpful experience. One reported that staff became more prepared to approach him about group work and classroom techniques generally; he regained confidence in his own classroom skills and gained the respect of other teachers when his classroom ability was proven.

Although teachers had not voiced expectations about the skills and experience they would gain as planners, implementers and evaluators of the embryo programme, they soon discovered that these responsibilities were their own, and that they enjoyed this aspect of the work. The responsibility had the effect of raising the level of professional awareness:

"I had to be more organized and methodical ... I have learned to look at things and work out just why I am doing them, the objectives, rather than just going in and doing something for the sake of it."

(T. Sch. C)

The role in curriculum planning and implementation, although perforce carried out in an ad hoc way much of the time, built up a feeling of professional commitment:

"We felt committed to the programme because it was definitely our programme, to learn in, adapt and develop our own style. The constraints of time and energy still applied and were the most serious limitations, but we definitely felt able to choose our own course of action based on our own perceptions of the day-to-day utility of the programme's techniques and activities."

(C. Sch. B)

The effect this had upon teachers became wider than just their interest in the programme: their level of awareness generally was increasing. A science teacher said his involvement made him look at the different social aspects of education which he had previously ignored. All of the teachers spoke of becoming more aware of their students and their needs. Several teachers spoke of becoming more 'politically' aware of the school organization and how it ran:

"I am greatly more aware of organizational problems within the school - time-tabling, staffing, interdepartmental jealousies and such idiot-syncretacies (sic)."

(T. Sch. A)

A co-ordinator commented on how he had to learn to confront the school organization:

"I had to become more assertive with the power structure of the organization - Principal, time-table, Heads of Departments."

(C. Sch. A)

Teachers appreciated the chance to learn from each other: one teacher described how the co-ordinator's modelling of a facilitative style helped her "not to get so uptight", and teachers attributed many of their newly learned skills to the fact they had been able to observe the work of others:

"There was greater opportunity for discussion with other teachers ... it was a useful experience having assistance with running the class and sharing ideas."

(T. Sch. B)

They also discovered that they learned much more about each other, which helped develop a new level of awareness and trust:

"I got to know them better and learned a lot from the co-operation and sharing."

(C. Sch. A)

"There was better communication, a greater sense of sharing and mutual reliance."

(T. Sch. A)

"Relationships were excellent - much closer."

(T. Sch. B)

The added closeness could bring with it its own problems, and situations were described where it put strains on relationships - as when a co-ordinator established a better rapport with a class, and was charged with getting 'too involved' by the form-teacher.

On the whole, however, the outcomes were seen as beneficial, and one way in which the programme provided a learning environment for teachers was in the way they began to give and seek personal feedback from each other. The changes teachers said they perceived taking place in each other included increased tolerance, revitalisation of enthusiasm for teaching and raised professional standards:

" ... much more tolerance, more enthusiasm for teaching - sharing ideas across departmental boundaries ... interest in comparing development, sharing classroom strategies - generally a higher level of interest in how their class was going."
(T. Sch. A)

One aspect of the 'scientific community' which teachers later felt they had not developed or benefitted from as fully as they might, concerned their collegial role vis a vis the senior tutors. It was acknowledged that, apart from the joint workshops, this aspect of working and learning together had not been very thorough and both teachers and seniors could have gained much from spending more time together planning and evaluating the work. Seniors also commented on this gap in their own training, and the small attention given to their own experiences and feelings during the course of the programme.

CHANGES IN TEACHERS' PERCEIVED SELF-IMAGE:

The way in which teachers experienced the work was likely to influence their self-image which, in turn, would affect their chosen role as facilitators, and the way they projected this to students. It could lead to some re-definition of the teacher's classroom role, and a need to discuss this role and clarify it with students. The ways in which teachers' self-images were affected by, and in turn affected, their classroom relationships with students have been discussed (p. 87f). Teachers made several comments about escaping from a stereotypic professional persona:

"I became known by the students as a 'person',
not a 'counsellor'."

(T. Sch. B)

Obviously, from students' comments, teachers had made some attempts to clarify the role they wished to achieve:

"Mr X said, 'I want to be just like you. I want to be on your level. I want to be one of you.'"

(F.3 Sch. A)

"In the programme, they would like to come down to our level."

(F.3 Sch. A)

"We are sort of meant to think of him as part of the class rather than being a teacher ..."

(F.3 Sch. B)

Reporting on the changes in self-image which had enabled them to relate as openly to students, teachers spoke of gaining "more personal satisfaction" from the work, of becoming "more tolerant", "more relaxed", and of experiencing "more joy", and one commented on her increased assertiveness.

Generally, there was a marked strengthening in the self-image of staff involved, but also an increased awareness and confidence that could enable them to consider inadequacies without becoming overly threatened:

"... more aware of my own fears and perceived inadequacies - I'm not always able to leap in with a creative solution to real problems."

(C. Sch. B)

Teachers believed they were learning to be "more honest", "less angry" and better at listening to others.

These personal gains became reflected in their classroom management, and most teachers spoke of improved classroom confidence and ability to establish a good rapport with students:

"I feel more confident and relaxed in front of a class now."

(C. Sch. A)

"Have gained in confidence - more able to open up and discuss real problems. Students tend to see (me) as more 'human' than before."

(T. Sch. A)

VALUES AND ATTITUDES:

While teachers had embarked upon the programme without undertaking any study of the values of Developmental Group Work or of their schools, the issue of values did assume importance as the work proceeded. In the area of personal values, in particular, teachers became more aware. Their own improved rapport with students, and their better understanding of them, brought about some attitudinal changes which were values-based.

Teachers started to become more aware of students' rights. They were pleased that they began to receive respect and courtesy from students without having to 'demand' it, but, as one teacher acknowledged, it was also satisfying to find students expecting to be treated so themselves:

"... for them to be able to give and expect courtesy from 'authority' ... is what I want to see as a teacher."

(T. Sch. A)

The students perceived that they came to matter as people to these teachers:

"The teacher gets to know you as a human person and different individuals instead of just names on a roll."

(F.3 Sch. A)

Teachers, also, spoke of being more 'aware' and 'sympathetic' and 'insightful' in their relationships with students,

valuing them as individuals, and valuing the culture and content they brought to the classroom. The more open communication in group-work, while making more of teacher and student available, had also made it possible for teachers to know students in such a way as to value them more.

Nevertheless, even these positive changes brought dilemmas. Students did not abandon disruptive or difficult behaviour, and, in a sense, it was harder for teachers to tussle with concepts of teacher power versus student power, and of what was appropriate discipline, when they had come to know and appreciate students better and feel closer to them. It was difficult at times not to deal with negative or disruptive students in an authoritarian way, instead of using action methods to examine the group process leading to the incident. Some teachers regretted being too strict; others regretted not being strict enough. By the end of the year, several teachers averred that students had to be 'accountable' for their own behaviour. There was no evidence of teachers recognizing the influence of school structures on student behaviour. It seemed that the experience of enjoying a good deal of 'nice' behaviour from students had created some expectation of this as the 'norm'. It also appeared that, unwittingly, some teachers were subscribing to an ideology of individual responsibility which blamed student 'deviancy' for disruptive behaviour.

However, some teachers were re-examining their concepts of what discipline was, the role of discipline in the classroom, and how it was best maintained. One dilemma was caused by the noise level, sometimes legitimately quite high, which others might interpret as the teacher being out of control. This led to suggestions that group-work should be conducted: "quite away from other classes" ... "away from other rooms" ... "where you can't interrupt others". There was no questioning of what the "quiet"

in other classrooms meant in terms of teaching and learning. Nor was there any examination of the view put forward by Apple (1979), for instance, that one of the ways in which schools maintain the ideology of the dominant groups of society is through their own institutional forms of social control. Apple argues that schools do this, in part, through the methods and style of discipline they employ. The ideology requires a style of control which is imposed and arbitrary, not one that is negotiable and shared with students.

Several teachers saw the problem of discipline as being related to their own role-transition. One teacher commented:

"... I have been very tentative about telling kids off when they behave badly, you know, I have held back and bitten my tongue."

A number of teachers did find that the best way to maintain discipline was to share power with the students and allow them to help negotiate the rules for desired classroom behaviour; and the fact that students then tended to reproduce the punitive methods already learned in schools has been referred to (p. 84).

A number of values-related issues emerged over the year which teachers became aware of, but the year-long project was too short for them to find resolutions then. They tended, however, to be issues which confronted teachers with the nature and values of schools as organizations, especially when accepting an innovation whose values may not match the institution's, and centred around autonomy, power, discipline, rules and self-control.

TEACHERS' ROLE IN THE EVALUATION:

It was hoped that the selection of an illuminative model of evaluation for the programme, drawing upon the exper-

iences and contributions of all participants, would also offer a contribution to the professional development of teachers.

For one thing, the model's capacity for 'reflexivity' - for the evaluation to begin to feed back into and influence the programme - gave teachers insights into the experiences of other participants, feedback upon their own performance, and hints as to gauging programme pacing and content. An interesting thing was that, as teachers began to discover what students and other teachers, including those outside the programme were thinking, they began to learn that it was possible to request feedback themselves, and several began to do so. This, in itself, increased the participative aspect of the illuminative evaluation, as well as contributing to the professionalism of the teacher.

Teachers suggested they had felt "highly involved" in the evaluation, and felt a sense of ownership: it belonged "to all of us involved". The understanding of the role the evaluator had attempted to perform was well understood, and the evaluation was also seen as a supportive aspect of the programme, supplementing the training programme, because it required teachers:

" ... to have regular meetings with those involved and provide a forum for mutual discussion and support."

(T. Sch. A)

The aspect of reflexivity was also commented upon here, because the evaluator's joint interviews with students and teachers:

" ... brought us face to face with some real student opinion."

(C. Sch. B)

It seemed that teachers found the choice of an illumin-

ative evaluation one that was helpful - and less threatening - to them, allowing open, two-way communication between all participants, and an additional forum for learning. It also added to their own professional repertoire by demonstrating the value of participant, descriptive evaluation as opposed to the objectives model, which tended to be the only one they had known.

The extent to which teachers appeared to perceive that the evaluation itself had contributed to their professional development raises some interesting questions. It appears that, for a programme such as Developmental Group Work to be capable of fulfilling its potential in the area of professional development, much more is required than a facility in handling programme content and techniques. Reference has been made to the need for ideological consensus amongst the people involved (p. 34), and Chapter Nine will present a theoretical framework which it is believed would support the programme's counter-hegemonic potential. The question of evaluation is a vital one if the programme is to be able to carry weight as a valid newcomer to the curriculum and if informed participants are to be able to gauge their effectiveness in the transformative role. The evaluation suggested that the 'illuminative' style of evaluation had the effect of bringing issues to teachers' attention, raising and maintaining their level of awareness, and constantly promoting questions they needed to consider instead of ignoring or taking for granted some of the issues which the programme raised. The evaluation was deliberately formative, and therefore part of the programme itself. Although it often appeared to be the evaluation which raised the theoretical questions considered in this thesis, the formative nature of the model used meant that, reflexively, these questions became issues considered by the programme's participants. Thus, the evaluation continued to raise the level of teacher awareness, and was perceived as making a significant contribution to their professional development.

CONCLUSION:

In general, the evaluation provided ample evidence of how working in the programme brought about changes in teachers' classroom management and teaching skills, their attitudes and values, and their self-esteem, all of which contributed to their professional development. Teachers experienced a new level of collegial support and a degree of peer-training from which they felt they had benefitted, and became participants, not only in the programme itself, but in the formative evaluation which became part of the programme. They were highly aware of being in a state of transition themselves, as their comments recorded in this chapter have revealed. They had experienced the opportunity to become 'action researchers' as Stenhouse (1975) advocates for teacher professional development.

The aspect of their professional development which was less clearly understood by teachers was the potential they were developing to become agents of change within the school and in teaching. It has been reported here that they did a number of new things within the programme, and also did some 'old' things differently. However, rather than perceiving themselves as effecting changes, teachers tended to underestimate or feel threatened by the impact of what they were achieving. Although the work was providing them with professional satisfaction - as well as challenges and difficulties - there was a tendency to fear how the rest of the school would perceive their work, with its concomitant changes in control methods, relationships and even noise level. This tendency for teachers to underestimate their own development as agents of change was likely to have a strong impact upon the programme's potential for influencing the school organization, to be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER EIGHT : THE INFLUENCE OF THE PROGRAMME UPON THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION

INTRODUCTION:

To substantiate the claim that Developmental Group Work can provide a genuinely transformative curriculum, its potential for working in schools in ways which can influence the way schools work would need to be demonstrated. The programme would have to be seen as not only bringing about personal changes in participants, but as helping people focus upon what is really happening in schools. It would also be recognised as being able to influence the deeper structures of the school itself.

In fact, the claims that can be made for the pilot programme in these areas are modest. The school organisation proved to be the arena most resistant to change, powerful enough to change the programme, if needs be, rather than submit to change itself. As has been stated (p. 75), the pilot programme began with no degree of ideological consensus about using the work in 'political' ways, for change. It was discovered, therefore, that, whereas changes in individuals - students and teachers - were effected relatively easily, cultural institutions such as schools are structured not to be easily changed.

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM:

An important question for the evaluation of Developmental Group Work concerns the programme's capacity to reveal the hidden curriculum of the school at work. The hidden curriculum presents one of the most potent forces in the school organisation. It represents what teachers and students learn from the structure rather than the content of school interaction, and is an aspect of school life

which people in schools are rarely encouraged to examine. The school's symbolic order of rituals, values and implicit assumptions, as well as its expectations, will be conveyed, often tacitly, through the hidden curriculum. It is a curriculum which will be better understood by 'informed' middle-class students than by the working-class student or the one from a different culture. It could also be expected that the illuminative model of evaluation would assist the programme in examining some of the school's covert structures and messages.

The expectations of the programme expressed by participants - and, perhaps more especially, those not expressed - may indicate the hidden curriculum at work.

Participants in the programme appeared to have little or no expectation that schools could be changed at the structural level. When such changes are not sought, nor need for them is perceived, it is unlikely they will be effected. In some ways, participants hoped that the programme would have some influence on the schools. One Principal commented:

"We feel that schools should become much more positive places, and if we can assist children to identify with the school more closely and realise the school can do lots of things other than straight classroom teaching, that is good."
(P. Sch. C)

Another Principal expressed that he did not have any specific expectations for the programme at the beginning of the year, although later he reported that his expectations of the programme's potential effect upon school climate had been raised:

"There will have to be a lot of recognition that this style of operation is more appropriate to the age we live in ... I hold quite strongly that schools have to move away from their traditional style of operation ... "
(P. Sch. B)

Neither comment, however, suggested that the deeper structures of schooling required examination or change: the focus was upon a caring atmosphere and good relationships rather than structural change.

The expectations of teachers tended to be even more narrowly and specifically prescribed; in fact, they tended not to have formed expectations of the programme's affecting the school organisation.

"... we are just trying to come to terms with it ourselves and understand it ... I certainly haven't seen it from a school perspective yet."
(T. Sch. C)

"I think it's a long-term thing - the ideal that you would like to think you might achieve, but you don't know."
(T. Sch. B)

Generally, teachers' expectations for the programme centred upon students, and fitting students into the system, rather than on changing the system itself. Moreover, the expectations expressed for students, and, perhaps more especially, those not expressed, seemed to indicate the hidden curriculum itself at work, rather than any intent to expose or change its potent influence. The claims of Bernstein (1971) and Apple (1979) that such programmes may reinforce the social control functions of the school seemed apt. One Principal commented:

"I would look at how the children in those classes who could potentially become the most restless, unsettled, and perhaps unhappy, don't become so."
(P. Sch. C)

Aims were expressed for increased student confidence and self-esteem, as was the desire for a level of behaviour management - better behaved classes, less 'blowing up' - which the programme did go some way to fulfil. There

was no statement of any expectation that students would become more aware, except in areas of their own behaviour, or that they would become more critical of the programme or the school system. Teachers had embarked on the programme with unclear aims and objectives and limited expectations, which suggested the kinds of changes they would attempt to promote would be similarly limited.

It is not surprising, then, that changes reported by teachers tended to centre round the school's improved 'pastoral care' of students, and the nature of student development reported rested largely in psychological and relationship changes which took place. It was felt the form-teacher's role had been supplemented through the programme:

"Form teachers are more likely to believe real support is available for their role."

(C. Sch. B)

At School A, the co-ordinator felt they now provided a better 'orientation' to high school for third formers, while at School B, seventh formers were assigned to help look after junior forms the following year.

Most of the other changes reported which would influence the climate of the school, were in terms of staff and student 'personal growth' and in 'improved relationships' within the school. These changes had been sought, but not as having any potential for influencing the school organisation. They may be perceived as containing the potential for significant change, however: the interpersonal relationships of the school form an important integral part of its organisational arrangements. Where there was ideological consensus amongst programme participants to work for change, the social system of the school, and more open relationships between teachers and students, would be an obvious target: a means of developing the mutual exploration of the hidden curriculum and the

other structures of the school. The relaxation of curriculum frame in the classroom activities, which enabled teachers and students to relate more honestly, openly and closely, appeared to be underestimated as a significant introduction of change within the school system.

Interestingly, senior tutors quickly perceived how one aspect of the hidden curriculum - the covert messages transmitted through the school's vertical rankings - was being influenced by their own participation and the beginning of an 'integrated' code:

"It is almost unheard of, really - sixth formers and third formers. Usually, we make third formers feel like lonely little people at the bottom of the stairs, so we can look down on them."

(S.T. Sch. C)

Later, a similar observation of this organisational change through the closing of vertical rankings came from a Principal:

"Here we are in a place that has a school castle: over the years there has been more segregation ... but these seventh formers were saying that they're meeting with their third formers round the corridor and discussing with them ... "

(P. Sch. B)

It was an influence of the programme discovered 'in process' and revealed through the reflexivity of the evaluation, and consequently was not developed very fully during the pilot programme.

Another influence discovered in process, but not voiced as an expectation, was the increase in student assertiveness and the beginning of a more critical appraisal of what they experienced in school. The programme allowed them to contribute, question and criticise, and the evaluation required these abilities of them also. Students

offered some strong resistance to the programme, and a good deal of criticism. While the hidden curriculum tacitly asserts that student criticism of the system is not required, in the programme students had the chance to assess their education and express their evaluation openly. As one co-ordinator commented:

"They (students) did not become a passive group, lacking individuality."

(C. Sch. A)

Another co-ordinator commented on:

"More assertiveness (being) shown by staff and by senior and junior pupils."

(C. Sch. B)

However, teachers made no comments which suggested that they perceived more examination of the hidden curriculum taking place, nor was this embraced as an aim of the programme.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOOL ORGANISATION:

In the area of teacher professional development which might be expected to have a strong influence upon school organisation, considerably more was reported (Chapter Seven) than teacher expectations at the beginning of the year anticipated. In spite of the difficulties associated with 'deskilling', most teachers did move towards a more facilitative pedagogical style; coped with the concomitant threats and pressures of relaxing frame and working in process; and emerged more aware and with an improved self-image. It might be expected that such changes could make them more functional as agents of change within the school. By the end of the year, however, they were still not perceiving the programme or themselves as having the potential to change the school in significant ways.

They did express considerable dissatisfaction with some traditional aspects of teaching which are strongly associated with a hidden curriculum of teacher power over students and teacher control over knowledge. They expressed dissatisfaction with the irrelevance of much of their teaching content; distress over the amount of time devoted to discipline rather than to teaching and learning; and a desire for a more spontaneous relationship with students. Their own disillusionment with the traditional classroom was highlighted by glimpses students gave of regular classroom dynamics: teachers who 'could learn not to be so angry'; classrooms that are noisy because the teacher is shouting; teachers who set up 'no-win' situations for themselves and their students - and schools which condone all of this, and where such behaviour is accepted as the 'norm' for good discipline. The extent to which students had internalised the messages of traditional schooling was witnessed as they began to participate in rule-making within the programme: their self-made rules tended to be punitive, and their effectiveness to rely upon isolation from the group and being made to feel stupid - for example, having to stand up and recite a nursery rhyme for talking out of turn. The internalisation of traditional school methods was powerful, and the programme at these times offered the opportunity for such methods to be reinforced.

Some other claims can be made for the effect the programme had upon the three schools in 1983, which, although not reported in this context by teachers, were reflected through the evaluation. These aspects have mostly been described in Chapters Six and Seven, and will be referred to again only briefly.

THE PROGRAMME'S INFLUENCE UPON VALUES:

The attitudinal and behavioural changes of teachers and students that have been recorded suggest that participants

in the programme were becoming imbued by the values stance of Developmental Group Work: a belief in the worthwhile-ness and uniqueness of individuals; their capacity for autonomy and decision-making; their need for human interaction; the belief that a certain kind of interaction between teacher and taught is desirable. These values were particularly reflected in the comments describing teachers' increasing awareness of their students as individuals, and the students' own comments about how these teachers regarded them as human beings. It might be anticipated that such a shift in the values stance of teachers might ultimately lead to their examining more closely the values-stance of the school, and its match, or mis-match, with their own values and the values of the programme. However, such examination, or any criticism of the values of the school tended to be made only incidentally.

INFLUENCE OF THE PROGRAMME UPON CURRICULUM FORM:

Some of the clearest evidence of the programme's potential to affect the school organisation was to be found in the impact the work began to have upon curriculum form. The wider aims and objectives of the programme came to be incorporated into teachers' lessons, and they came to look for other qualities in students than academic potential, and to absorb the actual experience of students into classroom content to some extent. This implied a shift from the examination-assessment syndrome which has traditionally obsessed curriculum aims and strongly influenced school organisation. Teachers also began to embrace the programme's aims for their own professional development: they discovered the value of peer-support and sharing, and of a level of integration which cut across both the traditional hierarchical staff relationships and the teacher isolation which can be fostered by the traditional organisation of schools.

The effect these teachers had upon curriculum integration and frame within their schools, although limited to twelve teachers and nine classes, became noticed. Many other teachers visited the lessons over the year and it would seem that teachers liked what they experienced, since the work was extended to twenty-four classes the following year. Moreover, a teachers-based integration code was developing, where teachers of Mathematics, Social Studies, Science and English, as well as Guidance Counsellors, worked together, so that the basis of relationships shifted from subject-allegiances to a common professional experiment.

The relaxation of frame considerably altered what was going on in the classroom - not only in group-work, but in 'subject' lessons, as teachers found that their new skills could be transferred and generalised. The classrooms were described as 'looking' different, and also 'sounding' different, where there was more movement on the part of students, and a larger amount of student-talk, and less teacher-talk, to be heard.

As teachers became more comfortable with working in process this also affected curriculum form, allowing students further opportunity for input into content. Some degree of student critical reflection upon what happens in schools was able to emerge. Frequently, they wished to discuss punishments they had received or misdemeanours they had perpetrated in other classes. The resolution of these difficulties was often found through discussion, role-play, and decision-making exercises, but, basically, the power to improve situations was placed in the hands of the students. Students felt very involved in what was happening:

" ... in an ordinary classroom you sit down and you do what you are told, but here you have to open up and you have to say things ... in the (ordinary) classroom you don't have to do anything but think and write ... here (in group work) you don't get a rest."

(F.3 Sch. A)

One way in which this began to affect the school organisation more widely was that students began to let the organisation know their thoughts. However, it must be pointed out that it was chiefly through the evaluation that they did this:

"I'd like it (the programme) to go on ... in all the years, it would be really good. I don't like it to stop."

(F.3 Sch. A)

It was suggested to the evaluator by third formers that part of her role was to make sure "the powers that be", which included "the Minister of Education, or whatever", Principals, and the school hierarchy, should know the students' wishes, although they said they felt they also had the 'power' to do this for themselves.

One thing that the relaxation of integration and frame appeared to facilitate was the development of a 'group identity', as opposed to the individual competition common in the classroom. All students received the chance to be valued, even if they could not meet the academic criteria traditionally associated with 'success'. One co-ordinator commented:

"Non-academic pupils participated as equals - were sometimes the best in role-plays, social skills. These students gained in confidence, did not 'switch off' at school so often."

(C. Sch. A)

A teacher mentioned the satisfaction of:

" ... discovering the skills and abilities possessed by students who were not strongly academic, and who had been labelled as not able. During sessions, they revealed dramatic ability, perception, confidence, social skills."

(T. Sch. A)

The ensuing improvement in classroom climate was described by several teachers, but most succinctly by one teacher at School A:

" ... there was more laughter than previously."
(T. Sch. A)

CHANGES IN METHODS OF CONTROL:

The loosening of curriculum frame and the emergence of a less authoritarian pedagogical style called for alternative methods of control in the classroom. The issue of control in schools, both overt and covert, presents one of the most important aspects of the school's reproductive function. Group work teachers were taxed by the issue: contrary to some of their expectations, they discovered that all students did not become 'good' in sessions, and that students could present new kinds of resistance to subvert the work. The most important feature of this dilemma was not how teachers did keep control, but the degree to which they now began to think about the whole issue of control and discipline in schools.

"I'm not the big master anymore."
(T. Sch. B)

Teachers discovered that they could survive even difficult situations without punishment becoming necessary: there were no reports of students receiving detentions, extra work, or being sent to a senior staff member for discipline throughout the year.

Other teachers became interested by seeing control in the classroom being shared by teacher and taught, with causes of disruptive behaviour being explored rather than symptoms punished. It was not an aspect of the programme's effect upon school organisation which group work teachers emphasized as revealing a potential for change; but the

evidence did speak of the work's having a wider effect upon the school.

Students appreciated the difference between the group work and the ordinary classroom situation: they believed the teacher did not have sole responsibility for discipline.

" ... that is what makes the teacher different from other teachers ... "

(F.3 Sch. A)

They found teachers prepared to negotiate and re-negotiate with them, and students saw these teachers as running less risk of having their authority defied. Evidence that the effect upon classroom control spread wider than group work was gleaned from other teachers: students were said to have "more self-control", "more tolerance towards others", "a high standard of classroom behaviour". One teacher observed:

"The class became better behaved - other teachers commented on it."

(T. Sch. B)

However, it is observed that the issue of control focussed upon students becoming more 'biddable' and 'self-controlled', rather than upon the school reviewing its authoritarian stance or its role in reproducing social control.

DISCUSSION:

The observation that the programme's influence upon school organisation was modest, and, where detectable, only embryonic, can be accounted for in several ways. The impact of a year-long experimental programme could not be expected to be profound or extensive. Also, the level of teacher education and training in understanding any such potential of the programme was not developed, and no consensus existed in this area. Perhaps the clearest indication of the

programme's offering little challenge to the school organisation is seen in the lack of overt resistance which the schools evinced. Bernstein (1971) comments that attempts to modify educational codes will meet resistance at a number of different levels, irrespective of any intrinsic educational merit. The Wellington programme met with almost nil open resistance from the schools. This could mean the programme was perceived as supplementing, rather than threatening, the norms and values of the school. When the programme was extended the following year, it was largely because it was regarded as being effective in 'settling students in to the school'. Features of the programme which did seem to be potentially effective in influencing the school organisation were sometimes revealed to the evaluator through the reporting of participants, but without the latter interpreting the possibility for change to the status quo. The most obvious example of this was the fact that only two teachers from one school mentioned the fact that the programme was to be introduced for all third formers the following year when completing the teacher questionnaire. It was not possible to tell if teachers had overlooked this as the programme's having an impact on the school, or whether they believed that even this extension of the work could not influence the school organisation significantly.

INFLUENCE OF THE CONTEXTS UPON THE PROGRAMME:

Although the programme's influence upon the school organisation was not major in the first year, the working of the hidden curriculum was discernible in the obvious influence which the school contexts had upon the programme itself. The power wielded by Principals and the extent to which innovations depend upon their support was revealed. Although none of the Principals had much knowledge of the aims and methods of the programme, their agreement to its operating with three classes was sufficient for

the programme to get underway. No staff consensus was sought in any of the schools.

The evaluation yielded an inconsistent picture of the extent to which the programme's survival was facilitated by the school organisation. Teachers were not selected according to any particular criteria. This arbitrariness was most apparent at School C, where too many demands were made on junior, inexperienced teachers who were 'told' they were running the programme. When these teachers lost their experienced co-ordinator during the year, only one, year two teacher felt able to continue.

The question of teacher status seemed to have some influence upon programme organisation throughout the year - another example of the influence of the hidden curriculum of the school. This point was to prove specially significant where the evaluator's visits to the school were concerned. Although the Guidance Counsellor's position in school is acknowledged as a senior one, administratively, the role does not necessarily carry the power to re-organise the 'legitimate' time-table or structures of the school. No-one in any of the teams held more senior status than Guidance Counsellor, and, at School C, the programme was ultimately left in the care of a year two teacher. Consequently, personnel had some difficulties in arranging teacher-meetings during school hours, because of the problems of providing teacher relief. In addition, in time-tabling the programme, there was difficulty in finding an hour per week for each class. Subject disciplines traditionally guard time-allowances with some jealousy, and in none of the schools was it possible to find curriculum time for 'pastoral' work. It therefore fell to Heads of Departments to agree to permit use of 'subject' time for the programme, and it says something for the Heads of Departments concerned that they were prepared to do this. Another difficulty, associated with appropriate space, reflects upon the traditional planning of our schools, and also

the fact that some highly suitable places, such as libraries, or drama rooms, become so 'sacred' as to be of little use. Associated with this is the traditional assumption that noise is to be taken as indicative of poor teaching. Teachers were hard pressed to find a place where they would not upset the room or the neighbours. Perhaps this suggests a use for some of the classrooms which will fall empty as schools' rolls reduce.

Sometimes, the 'problems' which teachers experienced in the programme were attributed to the nature of the students they worked with, rather than to any problems created by the structures of the school, or of society. At School C, the selection of the low-stream classes for the programme was considered to hamper progress because of the 'level of ability' of the students and the dearth of role models. At School B, it was suggested that the able, socially-adjusted students found the programme 'beneath' them, or were angry that their class had been selected. It seems these students had already learned from the ways in which schools are traditionally organised, and from the influence of the hidden curriculum, that such programmes were not 'educational' in the basic sense, but 'remedial'. Some of this could be attributed to the teachers' inexperience in the programme that first year, since content is flexible and can be pitched to the students' level. Moreover, the programme provides the medium for communication with the students, to let them know its extended aims. It appeared, however, that such moves to counter the well-learned lessons of the hidden curriculum were not made by teachers.

Another influence of the organisation upon the programme emanated from the influence that the attitudes of colleagues had upon the teacher-participants. There appeared to be operating, on the one hand, an impenetrable indifference, and, on the other, a strong level of scepticism, suspicion and criticism. In view of the positive con-

tribution other teachers made to the evaluation and the fact that so many became involved in the programme the next year, it may be that the number of staff being negative about the work was small. Nevertheless, it came through in some of the teacher questionnaires that such undermining, particularly when based upon uninformed prejudice, placed extra stress upon teachers, and lowered morale.

The programme did survive and was extended in each of the schools, but teacher responses to the questionnaires suggested that the problems, rather than being removed, were somewhat exacerbated the following year. It would be unwise to feel complacent about the place of the programme in any of the schools. Kemmis (1982) reminds us of the "formidable array of wet blankets (there are) to meet the fires of enthusiasm for change, even when change is believed to be for the better by those promoting it". He points out that whole schools and educational systems can run quite smoothly on the 'wet blanket principle', just waiting for new ideas to burn themselves out, never actually committing the school to the idea. Thus, Kemmis tells us, new ideas can be "tolerated to death". Time will tell whether this will be the fate of the Developmental Group Work programme in the three schools discussed here, or in other schools. Although gaining in popularity with Principals and teaching staff, the style of working is still in its infancy. It seems that every group of teachers that decides to take up the work has to negotiate the kinds of organisational difficulties described here without any guarantee of the work's continuing, despite high levels of commitment and evidence of considerable success. It could also be speculated that, were the aims of participants more 'political', the level of resistance would be increased.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE EVALUATION:

One aspect of the pilot programme which appeared to be very strong was the relationship between the programme

and the evaluation. It was the illuminative evaluation's quality of reflexivity which often picked up any potential the programme revealed for transformation of the school organisation. The evaluation became a 'partnership', in keeping with Stenhouse's model of the teacher-as-researcher (1975).

Teachers had the style of evaluation explained to them at the first training workshop and understood their own part in it. They subsequently reported feeling 'involved' and 'listened to', and felt a strong degree of ownership of the evaluation themselves. The evaluation became a supportive part of the programme, continuing to bring them together for professional discussion and assessment, though not for training, throughout the year, and it raised in them some expectations that the evaluation would help them achieve better conditions for the work, such as time being found for training.

Students also appreciated their own participation in the evaluation and the autonomy provided by the fact that their experience of the work would be listened to and recorded:

"It's good how you come and ask us, too, not just going to the Principal, so we get a chance to be involved in the big things ... instead of being pushed back into a corner, saying, 'You're too young; you can't do that'. That way ... it comes from us."

(F.3 Sch. A)

The issues of confidentiality and telling the truth as they perceived it were discussed. At first, there was some tendency not to believe they had this right. Understanding school organisations, they thought it debatable whether their confidentiality would be respected if teachers were excluded from the audio-taped interviews with students:

" ... if he's not here anyway you'll be playing it back to him."

(F.3 Sch. A)

They finally accepted the assurance that teachers would only hear what they said if they were present at the interviews. In the event, no classes excluded their teachers from the interviews, and teachers did learn a good deal from students' comments which helped their own facilitation, indicating some real empowerment of students in terms of getting their opinions heard and noted.

This capacity of the illuminative model for reflexivity - the evaluation feeding back into and influencing the programme - became quite marked. Teachers began to understand more clearly what third formers and senior tutors were thinking about the programme. This helped them gauge when programme pacing or content needed to be changed, and also let them see what were the students' views of their autonomy in the programme, their ability to make rules and suggest content, what they felt of teacher leadership style, or whether seniors felt they were being sufficiently consulted for their ideas. Having these features revealed to them, teachers were able to do something about them. In particular, teachers tended to include both juniors and seniors much more in programme assessment as the year went on. This aspect of the work strongly influenced the hidden curriculum's messages about teacher power over students and knowledge, although little could be claimed in terms of any evidence that this sharing of autonomy affected the wider structures of the school.

The evaluation sessions also provided a forum for teachers to hear from and learn from each other - what ideas or resources were being used; how difficulties had been overcome. Also, an aspect of reflexivity here was that the evaluation served as a safety valve, and when teachers had been able to air problems and listen to others, they seemed more able to keep going despite some difficulties. It helped to break down further the hierarchical, subject-bound allegiances common in the teaching profession, which also help to support the power and control structures of the school.

The reflexive aspect of the evaluation seemed to work particularly strongly where Principals were concerned. There was a slight tendency for some defensiveness early on when classes had not yet been visited, certain requests could not be met, and some issues raised had not been considered:

" ... if I'd known the specific nature of the questions, I'd have spent some more time doing some homework on it ... You are asking embarrassing questions ... I am not making a good impression on you ... You have certainly spurred me on to go and find out what it is about, and I shall do that."

(P. Sch. B)

It became important to convince people that the evaluation was not putting people 'on trial', only reflecting what happened and how it did, amongst all the contingencies and difficulties of the life of a school. Subsequently, Principals did visit classes, had sometimes prepared answers to questions previously raised by the evaluator and had talked to teachers and senior tutors. However, the style of evaluation had demonstrated that 'assessment' of performance is not necessarily the only valid criterion for a system working well.

Another example of reflexivity arose when teachers outside the programme had been interviewed, and it was becoming clear through the evaluation that there were discrepancies between the perceptions of participants and those not involved as to the need for and quality of communication. It meant that teachers wasted no further time in communicating more closely with colleagues while their level of interest was aroused.

A further effect of the evaluation upon participants was that it directed teacher attention much more towards their own professional development, enabling them to see themselves not just as people 'giving something a go', but

as professionals involved in curriculum decision-making, in peer-training and in evaluation. The evaluation also pointed their attention much more closely to questions of values - their own, those of the school and of the programme.

CONCLUSION : CONDITIONS FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK

Although there was evidence of some embryonic changes taking place in the organisation of the schools as the programme proceeded, the deeper structures of the schools could not be said to have been affected in significant ways. There appeared to be every possibility of only 'cosmetic' changes to the school organisation being effected, even if the programme were to continue in the future. There were signs of the potential for transformation beginning to emerge, but in the pilot year these indications of change were sometimes not recognised and were underdeveloped.

Experience in the programme and in its evaluation suggests that there are certain conditions which will be pre-requisite if Developmental Group Work is to provide any effective counter to the hegemony of the school, and also avoid becoming a facet of the school's role in reproduction.

The first requirement will be in the area of teacher education, not only in the programme and evaluation techniques involved, but in values and in political awareness. Bowers (1976: 59) has made the point that conservative values continue to be taught because they reflect the prior socialization teachers have undergone in the generally more affluent milieu in which they have grown up. Ramsay (1973), commenting on the selection and socialising of teachers, demonstrates that New Zealand teachers have increasingly been drawn from middle-class and upper middle-class groups, and that their education as teachers is

itself a powerful socialisation process which inexorably influences their autonomous thought or action. What is ultimately reflected in many teachers is the 'value complacency' which Eraut comments on (1984: 26), a general lack of awareness of the values which other sections of the community might hold. A difficulty will therefore be found within the style of the Developmental Group Work programme, when other values are allowed to be confronted, for, as Bowers has pointed out (op.cit: 66), teachers can become threatened if the values with which they identify become challenged. Education in values awareness will be vital if the values of student groups, and of different cultures, are to be respected, and if teachers and students are to be able to recognise, and even contest, the values of the school.

Unless teachers can develop an understanding of the role the wider society plays in their work in schools, unless they come to recognise the sociological functions of the education system and discover in themselves a willingness to engage in political activity, as Raven suggests they should (1984: 26-7), then the counter-hegemonic potency of the programme will be lost. Moreover, teachers need to weigh not only the programme's ability to counter the hegemony of the school, but also its capacity for reinforcing that hegemony. This will require, as Bernstein suggests (1971: 107) that the aims of the programme are spelled out, so that a degree of consensus is reached, without which, a programme such as this, belonging to the integrated code, is unlikely to achieve its aims.

Another important area of teachers' education that will require attention is in social education itself. As Raven points out (op.cit: 28), teachers' social needs tend to be in precisely the area of social education which we identify as being urgent for students. Teachers, however, require social education and training in the teaching of social education. This may extend even further, into the development in teachers of facilitative approaches

to teaching, and even to the criteria for selection for teaching: Sugarman suggests (1968: 5) that a pre-requisite for moral education, of which the programme could be considered a part, is that students should feel that teachers care about them. He also conjectures that a connection exists between approaches to teaching and whether moral education takes place. The programme itself can offer some of this teacher education and training, as well as raising political awareness, through the collegial way of working which it offers, but there is a need in the area of pre-service training also.

Another requirement will be in the education of students to understand the programme's potential for changing schools, and what it is aiming at. As Apple has shown (p. 46), students have great power to act upon schools: perhaps this would be less likely to reproduce the dominant ideology in spite of their efforts, as tended to happen with Willis' 'lads' (p. 15), if they were afforded the civic and political education which Raven maintains is the teacher's most important task (op.cit: 29).

Certainly, any evaluation of the work would need to be carried out jointly by teachers and students, and the illuminative approach provides a suitable model. If teachers and students are to be politically aware of the programme's hegemonic power, then they need to share the evaluation of the work also.

The position being argued for pre-supposes a belief in the possibility of schools becoming inhabited by "critical communities" of teachers and students, and it is a position which fits well with the aims and style of Developmental Group Work. It is also an extension of Stenhouse's 'teacher-as-researcher' model, which similarly regards teachers as critical and active agents. As Raven suggests (ibid: 27), teachers who wish for change will need to do more outside the school, on a societal basis, but they should not lose

sight of Sugarman's point (1968) that the formal organisation of the school is susceptible to planned change.

To effect changes, teachers will need to seek more ideological commitment to the work at a departmental and at a school level. They will need to be prepared to have their work observed, and to participate in more research and evaluation. They will need to 'educate' the decision-makers - preferably by involving them in the work, using the experiential approach of the programme which is its major strength. Most of all, they will have to keep the style of working alive in the classroom, for, as Kemmis has said (1982:186), relationships in a school change, not by changing the organisation, but by working on the relationships. The Wellington programme of Developmental Group Work revealed, if only in embryo, a style of working which was essentially educative for all participants, teachers and students, and potentially more democratic than we have seen in schools. It could be argued that the programme could foster a shift towards democratic justification in education which did begin in the classroom, for, as Codd has pointed out (1981), "democracy in education is ultimately dependent upon education for democracy".

CHAPTER NINE : CONCLUSION - IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION:

If the programme of Developmental Group Work is to be considered capable of having a transformative effect upon the school curriculum and the ways in which schools work, then there are a number of implications arising from the present study which would need to be taken into account in trying to develop its role in schools.

The current tendency to see the programme as fitting in with the aims of the new Health Education syllabus means that the theoretical rationale of that syllabus requires close examination. The nature of schools, and those features of their organisation which preclude rather than encourage the development of social education curricula need to be understood by teachers embarking upon the programme. Above all, those who would attempt to use such programmes in order to challenge the dominating structures of schools need strong theoretical convictions which can support them in their role as agents of change and heighten their awareness of the obstacles to be overcome. These are the implications which will be discussed in this final chapter.

THE HEALTH EDUCATION SYLLABUS:

The draft of the new Health Education syllabus has been welcomed as promoting a better educational climate in New Zealand schools. Pioneers of Developmental Group Work have received encouragement from the fact that their work fits in closely with two of the aims of the syllabus:

Building Self-Esteem: "By becoming aware of their own strengths and abilities and by understanding

their feelings, students learn to value themselves and gain a sense of assurance."

- Relating to Others: "Developing skills and understanding in relating to others helps students build confidence in themselves and satisfying relationships with others."

(Draft Health Syllabus, p.23)

Schools have been encouraged to use Button's programme in the pursuit of these aims. However, if Developmental Group Work is to be seen as being compatible with the philosophy of the Health Education syllabus, an analysis of the theoretical rationale of the latter is vital.

In considering the ethos of the Health Programme, it is necessary to examine its assessment of needs and interests, and discover whether these simply reflect the prevailing needs and interests of the dominant group in society. If this proves to be so, then the curriculum can be seen as fitting into the social engineering model, fostering conformity and conditioning that preserve the status quo, health being valued for its importance in production and reproduction. Such an ethos would argue not so much a concern with real freedom from ill-health as with training people in conformity.

If school health education was based upon a rationale concerned to treat health and preventative health care as genuinely political areas, seeking change, a curriculum would emerge capable of becoming an agent of social reconstruction. It would perceive 'health' as being socially constructed and culturally embedded. (Already, the revised New Zealand Health Syllabus has been criticised for ignoring the concepts of health of Maori and Polynesian people.) Such a rationale would fit well with the perception of Developmental Group Work as a programme capable of bringing about curriculum transformation.

It would mean that the Health programme would be capable of focussing on the socio-historical circumstances of ill-health in society: it would be based upon a critical social theory and a political theory.

At the classroom level, this suggests an image that suits well with Developmental Group Work: teachers and students actively engaged in determining the teaching-learning transaction, the content including such 'political' problems as the unequal distribution of health care services in society. It requires a willingness from participants to be involved in the processes of social and political change, since, ultimately, the existing states of ill-health and their causes cannot be counteracted in the classroom alone.

When the philosophy of the New Zealand Health Education syllabus is compared against such a paradigm, what emerges is something embedded much more in social reproduction and the maintenance of the status quo. It is intended to be a very different syllabus from the one it replaces, as the comments of the Director-General of Education, included in the "guidelines" for schools, indicate:

"New approaches to health teaching are embodied in the syllabus statement, and each school's planning should reflect the broad objectives of the syllabus."

In the "Notes for the Principal", it is stated that a wider interpretation has been given to 'health', and that positive aspects of health are emphasized in 'the attitudes and practices that contribute to a healthy life-style' rather than focusing on specific health problems. There is no suggestion that the 'attitudes or practices' of society which are based upon preserving its reproductive role require any examination or change.

There is more emphasis than previously upon parent involvement in planning and a collegial approach by teachers, but we are told that the possible results of an effective programme might include "[students who] are absent less frequently, and present fewer discipline problems in the classroom". The Foreword also comments on the extent to which "current health problems have their origins in the attitudes and practices that develop in the early years of childhood and adolescence". The comments come close to finding the causes of ill-health in the 'deviancy' of students and their parents, rather than the structures of society, and find the 'solution' in the social maintenance role of the school.

It can be argued that to have adopted a more 'political' stance would have been rash, considering the set-backs sustained by the Health syllabus even in its revision stages. However, it suggests that those wishing to view Developmental Group Work as a transformative curriculum should heed carefully the ethos of the Health syllabus before seeing the two as complementing each other. Not only the philosophy openly stated in the Health syllabus, but also its silences - the things not said - suggest a curriculum rationale which is not intended to be counter-hegemonic. If the Health Education syllabus is to be seen as complementing Developmental Group Work in having a transformative effect upon schools, then a strong degree of ideological consensus on the part of teachers, students and parents will be required to overcome its more obvious potential for social reproduction.

OBSTACLES TO SOCIAL EDUCATION CURRICULA:

In New Zealand, as in other western countries, the last decade has not been a time of radical growth in education, and such changes as have taken place have often been structurally constrained and conservative in nature.

An example would be the emphasis upon transition to work programmes which help to disguise the structural nature of current large-scale unemployment. New Zealand is just emerging from a decade of reactionary politics and a strong 'back-to-basics' movement which did nothing to further the influence of social education in schools.

Davis (1981) comments that attempts to change curricula or to increase the autonomy of schools face the danger of a reactionary backlash: something of this was seen quite plainly in New Zealand at the end of the 1970's, following the Johnson Report; and also in the politically enforced delays in facilitating the draft of the Health syllabus into schools, as well as the precipitous attempt to Review the Core Curriculum. (1984).

Apple comments (1982b) that it has not been a good time ideologically or economically for teachers to engage in overt resistances, and with cuts in educational spending and teacher training and threats of re-introducing 'teacher assessment', with all its overtones of political power, teachers in New Zealand have seemed much more the victims of political control than agents of change. One result of this has been the development of in-growing cynicism amongst teachers, which is a further form of disempowering the teaching service.

Awareness of the hegemony of the school, and the difficulty of initiating change, have led to the 'reproductive image' of schooling (Codd, 1985), the ideological stance of which emphasizes the role of the school as an agency of social reproduction, assuming that reform of schools is not possible without radical transformation of social and political institutions. This is the position of Olssen's (1985) analysis of the Schools Without Failure Project. It is a pessimistic stance (Apple, 1982a), seeing schools as fundamentally determined institutions, so integrated into the larger framework of social control that they can be ignored as arenas for action.

Codd argues (1981) that the 'social determinants' of education in New Zealand have traditionally been very strong, and that the requirement of both the overt and hidden curricula has been the continuity of prevailing values and the existing social order. Even the stormy debate over the Johnson Report had its ironical aspect, since the main emphasis of the Report was primary socialization, the 'social functions' of the curriculum, without examining if social practice itself is worthwhile. As Bates has pointed out (1978), social education is different from socialization.

Codd comments (op.cit: 44) that the debate over the New Zealand curriculum has not produced a politically defensible policy because the democratic practices through which it has been carried out have not provided a procedural framework of principles within which substantive solutions to the moral and political problems involved could be sought. Even the 'progressives', the agents of curriculum change, while striving for consensus, have generally not subscribed to democratic ideals: curriculum decision-making, to be considered democratic, requires more than the power of consensus - it requires justification. (ibid: 48).

If the school's ethos is saturated by the hegemony of society, then it may appear, to answer Reid's question (1978: 70) that curriculum change cannot be planned, but that its evolution is determined by social forces that tend in a particular and irreversible direction. As Apple says, (1979: 10), the over-emphasis schooling and curricular form continue to place upon the individual helps maintain society's manipulative ethic of consumption, and its latent effects can make curricular and teaching practices impotent. Moreover, the resistance to change generally found in conservative institutions such as schools, and their ability to go on being the same in spite of attempts at change, suggest the danger that,

with programmes such as Developmental Group Work, the school will alter the message rather than the message alter the school. (Eisner, 1979: 65). To some extent, this is what happened in the three Wellington schools in 1983: it was what Olssen calls the 'ideology of niceness' that was fostered, rather than institutional criticism and curriculum change, although the germs of significant change were discernible.

The most threatening possibility for such programmes is outlined by Apple (1979 and 1982a) and Bernstein (1971). Apple underlines the need to examine the motives for introducing 'therapeutic' programmes into schools. We need to examine whether their covert role is, in fact, one of creating hegemony (1979: 164), all the more powerfully, perhaps, because the school can intrude further into the private and personal dispositions of students through such work. If that is so, then the school's control becomes stronger: Apple likens it to the way human relations research has been used to increase control in the workplace. (1982a: 47).

Bernstein points out that one of the effects of 'relaxed' frames, such as we find in Developmental Group Work, is upon authority relationships: more of the teacher and of the taught enters the pedagogical frame (1971: 102). As more of student behaviour becomes public, so it becomes available to assessment, so that socialization could be more intensive through such programmes than through traditional ones. (ibid: 109). Bernstein points to the fact that, to date, the relaxation of frame in schools has often been in work with 'less able' and 'deviant' students, who have been placed in 'special' classes specifically designed to restore social control and conformism. It was explained in Chapter Three that Button's programme followed a social skills rather than a social skills training approach (p. 31), but it became clear during the Wellington project that the programme lent itself

to a remedial role: at School C, the three classes selected were the 'bottom' stream classes, deemed to be 'most needy' in the social skills area, and most likely to find difficulty fitting in with the mores of the school (p. 73). At School B, it appeared that some third formers balked at the programme because they had already learned that such work was usually confined to 'less able' students (p. 89).

The obstacles which make it difficult for programmes of social education to gain a footing in the school curriculum do not disappear once that notch has been gained. The survival rate for such programmes is not strong. Reference has been made (p.141) to Kemmis' diagnosis of how schools cope with such innovations by 'tolerating them to death'. This certainly appears to have been the fate of many of the programmes which schools, lacking any real central directive, introduced during the 1970's. In a national survey of health-related programmes (Harris: 1982), many of these were reported as being no longer in existence, while respondents to the survey emphasized the need for policy in the area.

BEYOND REPRODUCTION : POLITICAL WAYS OF ACTING UPON SCHOOLS

Not all of the writers operating from a Marxist or neo-Marxist framework would subscribe to the view that the school's role in social reproduction presents an impenetrable force. Apple suggests a way out of the stalemate of the position which maintains that change in schools is impossible without radical social transformation. He argues that there are political ways of acting upon schools, and of resisting the power of reproduction (1979: 160). He suggests that the feeling of personal and collective futility which can result from awareness of how hegemony is economically and culturally maintained by schools should be avoided. This very feeling of powerlessness

is an aspect of an effective dominant culture which is to be resisted if change is sought. (ibid: 161). The sense of futility experienced serves the hegemony of the school, removing the impetus for challenge. Cynicism amongst teachers - those who should be the agents of change in schools - provides hegemony with one of its most powerful tools: it not only disempowers teachers to make them believe they can bring about no change, it also has the effect of motivating the cynics to prevent attempts at change made by colleagues. Kemmis (1982) describes the process clearly in his account of the 'Addison Hills' exercise, where the 'cynics' exercised great power over both the 'reformers' and the 'traditionalists', not by seeking power themselves, but by exerting their influence to obstruct the proposals of the other two groups.

In spite of this well-known phenomenon of schools, Apple argues (1982a) that serious action can evolve in the education system, but not if schools are viewed as fundamentally determined institutions, so integrated into capitalist society, that they can be ignored. Apple claims (1982c) that the school's very role as a state apparatus makes it a location where serious conflict is to be expected. He suggests that there are several ways of uncovering and counteracting the hegemony of the school, one of the keys being to focus upon conflict in the curriculum (1982: 83). The ideological contradictions and tensions within schools may also open up possibilities for action, and Apple argues that it is in exploiting conflict and contradiction that activists will find spaces in which they can act. (ibid: 61). State intervention in an institution such as education opens up the state itself to criticism, Apple suggests. The technological curricular forms, which he has well demonstrated to embody new forms of control (p.17f), also open up possibilities for political action: where so many aspects of school life are political, to engage

with them is to engage in political action.

From Apple's point of view, it could be argued that, for a social education programme such as Developmental Group Work, it is an advantage to have no 'proper' place in the curriculum, as it is at present. It is an example of the conflict existing in the curriculum, an area of contradiction and tension in the life of the school, and it is a programme which can also focus on these aspects of school experience, particularly through the promotion of teacher professionalism. While having no 'status' in the curriculum, it can also be argued that its potency can remain active without being essentially undermined. It also seems to offer that rarity in the curriculum - work that is enjoyed by teachers and students. It can be used, as Apple suggests (1982a: 26) to 'win' people to the other side.

It would be a mistake to dismiss the potential of the programme merely because the results of a year-long experiment were modest. It has been pointed out (p.156) that the feeling of futility which may be experienced is one of the potent and disabling effects of a hegemonic system, and to be avoided.

Some psychological and experiential gains were made by students and teachers. The fact that these were in some ways trivial perhaps indicates a transitional stage in a new kind of work. What can be argued, however, is that, unless these 'psychological' changes take place, making students and teachers feel more confident, higher in self-esteem and more assertive, then they will never be brought to act powerfully upon the deeper structures of the school. People who feel totally powerless and lacking the skills even to reach out and form relationships are unlikely to assume they have the power to influence the school. One of the covert messages of the hidden curriculum has been to keep many students precisely

in this powerless, non-assertive position, labelled as 'deviants' and 'failures' by the school, themselves and other students. Students who become united as a caring community not only have more power: they may wish to create a wider community in which they can work together, rather than compete. Teachers, too, discovered that the sharing with a collegial support group set them free from the traditional teacher isolation.

It remains an idealistic position, but one which might be worked towards as long as teachers and students are able to understand the mechanisms of the school and set out to influence them. Where this does not happen, the other likelihood is that the structural basis of education may be reinforced, so that, as Olssen suggests (1985: 22), the programme presents an advanced form of cultural hegemony.

There is another important point that Apple makes which suggests that such a programme can have an impact. What some social reproduction theorists fail to take sufficiently into account is the point made by social phenomenologists, that the way in which we act upon the world is determined in part by how we perceive it. If we see the school as not being wholly determined by the hegemony of the state, some space is found for action.

Linked with this, is the importance of considering the role students play in school, and the power that they possess. This is vital when considering the Developmental Group Work programme as one aiming to promote student autonomy and to help them understand their role in sharing the power-base of the school. Apple (1982c: 8) maintains that students do not passively accept the hegemony of the school: they re-interpret, partially accept or reject the planned and unplanned meanings of the school. Students act in contradictory ways, and both support the reproductive process and partially penetrate it (1982a: 27). Willis'

'lads', for example, partially defeated the ideology of individualism of the school; although, at a deeper level, they also helped reproduce ideological meanings and practices which supported the hegemony of the school (1982b: 267). However, much of the way schools function is related to students' rejection of the messages of schooling: students contradict the expected norms in a variety of creative ways. Like the workers in the factory, they can 'work the system'; they can ignore the teacher; they can assume informal control over what goes on in the classroom. These last points appear to explain a particular kind of resistance to the Developmental Group Work project which students sometimes exhibited. They did not need to ignore or work the system - it was shared with them, it was theirs. It was also harder to 'ignore' the teacher who was not adopting an authoritarian role, but facilitating the students' role. Although this potentially fostered student autonomy, it also removed their accustomed arena for action/rejection, and made some of their strategies impotent: it is hardly surprising to have met some frustration on their part. Nevertheless, the programme does suggest a role for students in the process of change - they, too, could be 'won' over, be employed for serious structural change, a role which Apple emphasizes we should not underestimate (1982a).

What all this points to is the need for those who would change schools to subscribe to a world-view which does not see human beings as helpless, incapable of affecting the established social order. It requires an image of schooling which sees individuals in schools as maintaining relative autonomy, able to believe that democratic principles will eventually prevail and that cultural renewal and social reconstruction can be brought about. Such an image is presented in what Codd (1985) terms the "transformative image" of schooling. The assumptions behind this reconstructionist view comprise belief in the individual as a morally responsible agent, and in

the possibility of improving social institutions through processes of reform and a commitment to rational approaches to the identification and solution of social problems. (ibid: 34). It embraces the belief that the school, properly organized, can become a major force for planned change in society: schools are perceived as having the capacity, not only to change themselves, but to bring about some degree of cultural renewal.

Codd demonstrates that this reconstructionist view of schooling has some historical basis in educational discourse in New Zealand, reflected in the Thomas Report, 1943, the Report of the Educational Development Conference - 'Educational Aims and Objectives' (1974) - and in recent comments made by the Director-General of Education. (ibid: 35-7).

The transformative image of schooling, emanating from a critical viewpoint, provides the prospect of a way of working in schools, and a way in which schools might work, which would complement the potential for transformation offered by a programme such as Developmental Group Work. It also suggests an image of schooling where Stenhouse's model of 'teachers-as-researchers' would become, not only the norm, but requisite. However, as Codd points out (ibid: 37), a commitment to a reconstructionist image will not achieve change unless there is also commitment to political action. Above all, teachers will need the willingness and commitment to work with change, and with uncertainty, as the process of transformation and of cultural renewal continues to evolve.

APPENDIX A : CODING OF PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES

P	-	Principal
C	-	Co-ordinator
T	-	Teacher involved in programme
O.T.	-	Other teacher, not involved in programme
S.T.	-	Senior tutor
F.3	-	Third former
Sch. A	-	School A
Sch. B	-	School B
Sch. C	-	School C

APPENDIX B : PROJECT DIARY

- Term III 1982: Guidance Adviser and Education Officer talked to Principals of the three schools and gained consent to the project.
- District Senior Inspector gave support to the project and provided four days in-service time.
- Guidance Adviser and Evaluator arranged to incorporate the evaluation as part of the project.
- 3-4 March 1983: Two days' workshop for teachers and senior tutors at Rossmore House, attended by evaluator. Introduction to the nature and terms of the evaluation.
- 15 March 1983: Evaluator wrote to Principals and Co-ordinators seeking permission to visit on 29 April, and outlining requirements.
- 29 April 1983: Evaluator visited the three schools:
- School C:
- Principal interviewed
 - teachers involved in programme interviewed
 - senior tutors interviewed
 - third form class observed and interviewed
- School A:
- third form class observed and interviewed
- School B:
- one teacher involved in programme interviewed
 - Principal interviewed
 - senior tutors interviewed

- other teachers involved in programme interviewed
- third form class observed and interviewed

27 May 1983: Second workshop at Rossmore House

30 May 1983: Evaluator wrote to Principals and Co-ordinators in preparation for school visit.

17 June 1983: Evaluator visited the three schools:

School C:

- teachers not involved in programme interviewed
- senior tutors interviewed
- third form class interviewed again and video-taped
- different, low-stream third form class interviewed

School B:

- Principal interviewed again
- third form class involved interviewed again
- teachers not involved interviewed

School A:

- Principal interviewed
- third form class involved interviewed
- teachers not involved interviewed

30 June 1983: Evaluator wrote to Principals and Co-ordinators in preparation for next visit.

19 July 1983: Evaluator visited the three schools:

School C:

- Principal interviewed
- third form class observed and interviewed again
- third form class not involved interviewed

School B:

- third form class involved interviewed again
- teachers involved interviewed

School A:

- teachers involved interviewed
- third formers not involved interviewed
- third form class involved interviewed

16 September 1983: Third workshop at Rossmore House

20 September 1983: Evaluator wrote to Principals and Co-ordinators in preparation for school visit.

28 October 1983: Evaluator visited the three schools:

School C:

- teacher involved interviewed with other interested staff
- third form class involved observed and interviewed again

School B:

- teachers involved interviewed
- teachers involved and some not involved interviewed together

- third form class involved interviewed again
- third form class not involved interviewed

School A:

- senior tutors interviewed
- teachers involved interviewed

7 November 1983: Evaluator wrote to Principals and Co-ordinators in preparation for next visit.

30 November 1983: Evaluator visited the three schools:

School C:

- teacher involved and others intending to participate interviewed
- third form class interviewed again

School B:

- teachers involved and others hoping to participate interviewed
- third form class observed again
- third form class just beginning to participate observed

School A:

- third form class observed and interviewed again
- teachers involved and others hoping to participate interviewed

December 1983: Research contract with Department of Education for the evaluation of the programme granted.

- May 1984: Teacher questionnaire constructed.
- 18 June 1984: Meeting of evaluator and Advisory Committee of Department of Education to discuss background paper to evaluation, progress of report and teacher questionnaire.
- July 1984: Teacher questionnaire trialled with group-work teachers at evaluator's school and other guidance personnel.
- 21 July 1984: Questionnaire and covering letter sent to all teachers involved in the programme.
- October 1984: Article about the pilot programme in PPTA Journal : "Group Tutoring for the Form Teacher - A Way to alleviate Stress? - co-authored by Guidance Adviser/Trainer and Evaluator.

APPENDIX C : TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name and School:
(Optional)

DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP WORK (COPE/THE BUTTON PROGRAMME) -
Wellington 1983

[N.B. The subjective nature of the responses requested in the following questionnaire is acknowledged, and you may feel there are some questions you cannot answer. In keeping with the evaluation conducted during the experimental programme in 1983, the aim is to discover how it felt to be a participant involved in the programme. The confidentiality of all responses will be safe-guarded.]

I. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS:

a) In what ways, if any, have you changed as a teacher since becoming involved in the programme? You may wish to refer to some of the following points:

i) Working as part of a collegial support team:

ii) Being involved in peer training with other teachers:

iii) Being involved in planning, implementing and evaluating the programme:

- iii) Do you now use any of the methods in other teaching situations? Describe briefly.
- iv) Describe the way of leading or facilitating the group work which worked best for you.
- v) What changes, if any, took place in the way you led the group as time went by?
- vi) What qualities or characteristics were you attempting to model for your students?
- vii) Did you go through any stage of feeling that the methods which were normally successful for you in the 'ordinary' classroom were not working, or that there were new skills you needed to gain? If so, what did that stage feel like, and how did you get through it?

viii) Add any other comments on how you had to change as a teacher:

II. YOUR SCHOOL:

a) Describe briefly the socio-economic-cultural mix of:

i) Your school:

ii) The class you worked with last year:

b) How do you feel about the climate of your school?

- c) What would you say your school has as its aims?

How does the school live up to those aims, or not?

- d) What is your school's policy on streaming or banding?

What effect did this have on the class you took for the group work programme?

- e) Describe any 'special difficulties' you feel your school situation presented.

How did the programme survive, adapt to or influence any of those difficulties?

- f) What kind of room, if any, do you consider to be 'ideal' for the programme?

Describe the room you worked in and comment upon its appropriateness.

- g) What did you most strongly feel the lack of in 1983 that would have helped you in the programme?

If you are still involved in the programme, to what extent have those problems been remedied?

What were the kinds of outcomes which, in the end convinced the school of the programme's effectiveness?

Were there any outcomes which convinced the school of the programme's failure?

f) Do you believe any changes have taken place in your school as a result of the programme?

g) What disadvantages or weaknesses do you believe the programme has?

IV. PROGRAMME CONTENT:

- a) Button suggests the following themes for the programme. Please tick the ones you incorporated in your own programme:
- the pupil's place in the school;
 - the pastoral group as a small, caring community;
 - relationships, the self, and social skills;
 - communication skills;
 - school work and study skills;
 - academic and careers guidance;
 - health and hygiene;
 - personal interests.
- b) What other topics, themes or issues became part of your content?
- c) Did the class suggest topics, or did issues important to them become part of the programme content?

V. EFFECTS OF THE PROGRAMME:

a) Upon Participants:

i) What kinds of changes took place in students which you became aware of, or which others commented upon?

ii) What changes do you believe took place in colleagues also involved in the programme?

iii) What changes took place in yourself which may have been attributable to the programme?

b) Upon Relationships:

What effects did you feel the programme had, whether positive or negative, upon the following sets of relationships in the school?

i) Between yourself and the students in the programme?

ii) Between teachers involved in the programme?

iii) Between group work teachers and other teachers who were not involved in the programme?

iv) Between third form students?

v) Between senior student tutors and third formers?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ADELMAN, C. (ed.) The Politics and Ethics of Evaluation. Beckenham, Kent, U.K. : Croom Helm Ltd., 1984.
2. ADELMAN, C. The Politics of Evaluating. In Skilbeck, M. (ed.) : Evaluating the Curriculum in the Eighties. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1984, pp. 30-36.
3. APPLE, M.W. The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict, in Interchange, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1971, pp. 27-40.
4. APPLE, M.W. The Process and Ideology of Valuing in Educational Settings. In Apple et al: Educational Evaluation : Analysis and Responsibility. Berkeley : McCutcheon, 1974, pp. 3-34.
5. APPLE, M.W. Ideology and Curriculum. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
6. APPLE, M.W. Education and Power. Boston, Mass. : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982 (a).
7. APPLE, M.W. Curricular Form and the Logic of Technical Control : Building the Possessive Individual. In Apple, M.W. (ed.) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982 (b), pp. 247-273.
8. APPLE, M.W. Reproduction and Contradiction in Education. In Apple, M.W. (ed.), Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982, pp. 1-10.
9. APPLE, M.W. Controlling the Work of Teachers. In Delta 32, Massey University : August 1983, pp. 3-16.
10. ARONOWITZ, S. and GIROUX, H.A. Education under Siege : The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate over Schooling. Mass : Bergin and Garvey, 1985.
11. BATES, R.J. Socialization, Social Education and the Johnson Report. In Delta 22, Massey University : June 1978, pp. 26-29.
12. BATES, R.J. and CODD, J.A. Theory and Practice in New Zealand Education. Palmerston North : Dunmore Press, 1980.

13. BECKETT, L. Contemporary Curriculum Theory and School Health Education. In Proceedings of 7th Commonwealth and International Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. Brisbane, Australia : Sept. 1982, (cyclostyled).
14. BERNSTEIN, B. On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge. In Young, M.F.D. (ed.) Knowledge and Control. London : Collier-Macmillan, 1971, pp. 85-115.
15. BERNSTEIN, B. Education cannot compensate for Society. In Cosin et al. School and Society, London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971, pp. 64-69.
16. BERNSTEIN, B. Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.
17. BOGGS, C. Gramsci's Marxism. London : Pluto Press, 1976.
18. BOURDIEU, P. Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In Brown, R. (ed.) Knowledge, Education and Social Change. Birkenhead : Tavistock, 1973, pp. 71-112.
19. BOURDIEU, P. The School as a Conservative Force : Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities, in Eggleston, J. (ed.) Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education. London : Methuen, 1974, pp. 32-46.
20. BOWERS, C.A. Curriculum and our Technocracy Culture : The Problem of Reform. In Teachers' College Record, Sept. 1976, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 53-67.
21. BOWLES, S. and GINTIS, H. Schooling in Capitalist America : Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
22. BUTTON, L. Developmental Group Work with Adolescents. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1974.
23. BUTTON, L. Group Tutoring for the Form Teacher : Lower Secondary School. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1981.
24. BUTTON, L. Group Tutoring for the Form Teacher : Upper Secondary School. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1982.

25. BUTTON, L. Social Education as a Whole School Activity. In NZPPTA Journal : Towards a Full Life : The Future of Health Education, Term II, 1983, pp.34-39.
26. CODD, J.A. Moral Discussion in the Classroom : How neutral should the Teacher be? Social Studies Observer, Social Values Edition, October 1977, pp. 23-30.
27. CODD, J.A. Democratic Principles and the Politics of Curriculum Change in New Zealand. In Clark, M. (ed.) The Politics of Education in New Zealand. Wellington : NZCER, 1981, pp.43-65.
28. CODD, J.A. Teachers as Curriculum Evaluators : An Agenda for Professional Development. Paper presented at the 4th National Conference of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Christchurch, 3-5 December 1982.
29. CODD, J.A. Images of Schooling and the Discourse of the State. In Codd et al, Political Issues in New Zealand Education. Palmerston North, New Zealand : Dunmore Press, 1985. pp. 23-41.
30. CODD, J. et al (eds.). Political Issues in New Zealand Education. Palmerston North, New Zealand : Dunmore Press, 1985.
31. CODD, J.A. and HERMANSSON, G.L. Directions in New Zealand Secondary Education. Auckland : Hodder and Stoughton, 1976.
32. COSIN, B.R. et al. (eds). School and Society : A Sociological Reader. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
33. DAVIS, E. Teachers as Curriculum Developers. Sydney : Allen and Unwin, 1981.
34. DEAKIN UNIVERSITY. Open Campus Programme : Curriculum Evaluation : Perspectives in Practice. Victoria, 1982.
35. DRAFT SYLLABUS for Health Education in Primary and Secondary Schools (Syllabus Revision). Wellington : Department of Education, 1982.
36. EGGLESTON, J. (ed.) Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education. London : Methuen, 1974.
37. EISNER, E.W. The Educational Imagination. New York : Macmillan, 1979.

38. ERAUT, M. Handling Values Issues. In Adelman, C. (ed.) The Politics and Ethics of Evaluation. Beckenham, Kent, U.K : Croom Helm Ltd., 1984, pp. 25-30.
39. FREIRE, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Harmondsworth : Penguin, 1972.
40. GIROUX, H.A. Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling. Sussex, England : Falmer Press, 1981.
41. GOLBY, M. et al (eds). Curriculum Design. London : Croom Helm, 1975.
42. GRAMSCI, A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Hoare, Q. and Nowell-Smith, G. (eds + tr.) London : Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
43. HARGREAVES, D.H. Deschoolers and New Romantics. In Flude, M. and Ahier, J. (eds) : Educability, Schools and Ideology. London : Croom Helm, 1974, pp. 186-210.
44. HARKER, R. Schooling and Cultural Reproduction. In Codd et al (eds) Political Issues in New Zealand Education. Palmerston North, New Zealand : Dunmore Press, 1985, pp. 57-72.
45. HARRIS, D.V. Survey of Health-Related Programmes in New Zealand Secondary Schools. Unpublished research report for Senior Fellowship in Education, Massey University, 1982.
46. HARRIS-SPRINGETT, D.V. Evaluation of a Pastoral Role Training Programme : Developmental Group Work. Research Report for the New Zealand Department of Education, 1985.
47. HIRST, P.H. Toward a Logic of Curriculum Development. In Taylor, P.H. and Walton, J. (eds) The Curriculum : Research, Innovation and Change. London : Ward Lock Educational, 1973, pp. 9-26.
48. HOLT, J. The Underachieving School. Harmondsworth : Penguin, 1970.
49. JENCKS, C. et al. Inequality. New York : Basic Books, 1972.
50. JENKINS, D. et al. Racism and Educational Evaluation. In Verma, G.K. and Bagley, C. (eds). Race, Education and Identity. London : Macmillan, 1979, pp. 107-132.

51. JOHNSON, J.G. (Chairman). Growing, Sharing and Learning : The Report of the Committee on Health and Social Education. Wellington : Department of Education, 1977.
52. KARIER, C.J. et al. Roots of Crisis : American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago : Rand McNally, 1973.
53. KEMMIS, S. Alienation and Transition from School : Addison Hills High School. In Curriculum Evaluation : Perspectives in Practice. Deakin University, 1982, pp. 161-194.
54. KOHL, H. The Open Classroom. New York : Vintage, 1970.
55. LABOUR PARTY MANIFESTO, 1984, cyclostyled.
56. LAWTON, D. Cultural Analysis and Curriculum Evaluation, in Skilbeck, M. (ed.) Evaluating the Curriculum in the Eighties. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1984, pp. 21-24.
57. MACDONALD, B. Evaluation and the Control of Education. In Tawney, D.A. (ed.). Curriculum Evaluation Today : Trends and Implications. London : Macmillan, 1976.
58. MARTIN, J.R. What should we do with a Hidden Curriculum? Curriculum Inquiry, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1976, pp. 135-151.
59. MCPHAIL, P. In Other People's Shoes : Lifeline. Schools Council Project in Moral Education. London : Longman, 1972.
60. MCPHAIL, P. et al. Moral Education in the Secondary School : Lifeline. Schools Council Project in Moral Education. London : Longman, 1972.
61. MINOGUE, W.J.D. (ed.) Adventures in Curriculum. Sydney : George Allen and Unwin, 1983.
62. NICHOLLS, A. and NICHOLLS, H. Developing a Curriculum: A Practical Guide. London : George Allen and Unwin, 1978.
63. OLSSSEN, M.E.H. Idealism in Educational Policy : A Critique of the Schools without Failure Project. Delta 36, Massey University, August 1985.
64. ORLOSKY, D.E. and SMITH, B.O. Curriculum Development: Issues and Insights. Chicago : Rand McNally, 1978.

65. PARLETT, M. and HAMILTON, D. Evaluation as Illumination. In Tawney, D.A. (ed.) Curriculum Evaluation Today : Trends and Implications. London : MacMillan, 1976, pp. 84-101.
66. PARSONS, C. The New Evaluation : A Cautionary Note. In Curriculum Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1976, pp. 125-138.
67. PETERS, R.S. The Education of the Emotions. In Dearden, Hirst and Peters (eds) Education and the Development of Reason. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962, pp. 466-483.
68. POST-PRIMARY TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION. Education in Change : Report of the Curriculum Review Group. Auckland : Longman Paul, 1968.
69. POST-PRIMARY TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION. Towards a Full Life : The Future of Health Education. Journal, Term II, 1983.
70. PRATT, D. Curriculum Design and Development. New York : Harcourt Bruce Jovanovich, 1980.
71. PRING, R. Knowledge and Schooling. London : Open Books, 1976.
72. RAMSAY, P. (ed.) Curriculum Issues in New Zealand : Year Book of Education No. 8. Wellington : NZEI, 1980.
73. RAMSAY, P. The Autonomy of New Zealand Teachers : "There's a fraction too much friction". In Delta 32, Massey University, August 1983, pp. 17-34.
74. RAVEN, J. The Evaluation and Improvement of Provision for General Education. In Skilbeck, M. (ed.) Evaluating the Curriculum in the Eighties. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1984, pp. 24-29.
75. REID, W.A. ' Thinking about the Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
76. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND. (Currie Report). Wellington : Government Printer, 1962.
77. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECONDARY EDUCATION. "Towards Partnership". (McComb's Report). Wellington : Government Printer, 1976.
78. REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MORAL DELINQUENCY IN CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS. (Mazengarb Report). Wellington : Department of Education, 1954.

79. REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON IMPROVING LEARNING AND TEACHING : "Improving Learning and Teaching" (Lawrence, P.J., Chairman). Educational Development Conference. Wellington : Government Printer, 1974.
80. REVIEW OF THE CORE CURRICULUM. Wellington : Department of Education, 1984.
81. RICHARDSON, E. Authority and Organization in the Secondary School. Schools Council Publications. London : Macmillan, 1975.
82. ROSS, J.A. (Chairman). Human Development and Relationships in the School Curriculum. Wellington : Department of Education, 1973.
83. SCRIMSHAW, P. Illuminative Evaluation : Some Reflections. Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1979.
84. SIMON, S.B. et al. Values Clarification : A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Students and Teachers. New York : Hart, 1972.
85. SKILBECK, M. (ed.) Evaluating the Curriculum in the Eighties. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1984.
86. SNOOK, I. Moral Education : Past, Present and Future. In Ramsay, P. (ed.) Curriculum Issues in New Zealand. Year Book of Education, No. 8. Wellington : NZEI, 1980, pp. 203-224.
87. SNOOK, I. Contesting the Curriculum : The Politics of "Basics and Frills". In Codd, J. et al (eds) Political Issues in New Zealand Education. Palmerston North, New Zealand : Dunmore Press, 1985, pp. 248-262.
88. SNOOK, I. and McGEORGE, C. More than Talk. Wellington : Department of Education, 1978.
89. STAKE, R.E. The Countenance of Educational Evaluation. Teachers' College Record, Vol. 68, No. 7, 1967, pp. 523-540.
90. STAKE, R.E. Evaluating the Arts in Education : A Responsive Approach. Columbus, Ohio : Merrill, 1976.
91. STENHOUSE, L. An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development. London : Heinemann, 1978.

92. SUGARMAN, B. The School and Moral Development.
London : Croom Helm, 1973.
93. WARWICK, D. Curriculum Structure and Design.
London : University of London Press, 1975.
94. WILLIAMS, R. Marxism and Literature. New York :
Oxford University Press, 1977.
95. YOUNG, M.F.D. (ed). Knowledge and Control. London:
Macmillan 1971.
96. YOUNG, M.F.D. and WHITTY, G. (eds). Society,
State and Schooling. Sussex, England : The
Falmer Press, 1977.