



UNIVERSITY
of
GREENWICH

Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA)
– the University of Greenwich open access repository
<http://gala.gre.ac.uk>

Citation:

[Ware, Jennifer Helen \(1993\) A study of English workshop provision. MPhil thesis, University of Greenwich.](#)

Please note that the full text version provided on GALA is the final published version awarded by the university. “I certify that this work has not been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not concurrently being submitted for any degree other than that of (name of research degree) being studied at the University of Greenwich. I also declare that this work is the result of my own investigations except where otherwise identified by references and that I have not plagiarised the work of others”.

Ware, Jennifer Helen (1993) A study of English workshop provision. ##thesis type##. ##institution##

Available at: <http://gala.gre.ac.uk/8759/>

Contact: gala@gre.ac.uk

1565359

A STUDY OF ENGLISH WORKSHOP PROVISION

by **JENNIFER HELEN WARE**

SUBMITTED FOR M.PHIL. DEGREE

TO UNIVERSITY OF GREENWICH

IN JANUARY 1993

Collaborating College: North Oxfordshire Technical College

Theses
UNIVERSITY OF GREENWICH
374.02
WAR
NICH LIBRARY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank my tutor, Dr Jocelyn Robson, for her help and unflagging support during the writing of this thesis.

Thanks are also due to Drs Ian MacCullum and Monica Ralph for their helpful comments and to Dr Brian Austin-Ward and Mr Michael Mahoney for generously lending me their own work.

Finally, I should not like to forget the patience of my husband and son throughout this process of extending my education. I am also extremely grateful to my husband for the generous way in which he has put his skills in Information Technology at my disposal.

CONTENTS

Chapter One	AN OUTLINE OF THE RESEARCH	1
	The Purpose of the Study	2
	The Design of the Thesis	3
	An Account of the Research Methods used and Why They were Chosen	5
	An Overview of the Construction of the Research	16
	The Main Results and Conclusions	18
	Notes to Chapter One	20
Chapter Two	A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	23
	Introduction	24
	Why the Workshop Approach?	30
	The Study	46
	Notes to Chapter 2	48
Chapter Three	THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH	56
	Introduction	57
	Preliminary Activity	61
	Design of the Interview-Schedules	63
	Classroom Observation	72
	Analysis of Teaching Materials	74
	The Room Checklist	76
	The Survey of institutions of Higher Education	76
	The Local Education Authority Survey	77
	Notes to Chapter 3	78
Chapter Four	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESEARCH AND A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS	80
	Introduction	82
	Preliminary Activity	83
	The Interview Schedules	92
	Classroom Observation	118
	The Analysis of Teaching Materials	124

The Room Checklist	130
Survey of Institutions of Higher Education	130
The Local Education Authority Survey	132
Notes to Chapter 4	134

Chapter Five INTERPRETATION & DISCUSSION

OF THE RESULTS	137
Introduction	139
The Nature of the Clientele	142
Students' Wants and Needs	142
The Effectiveness of Workshops in Fulfilling Students' Needs	143
The Importance of Teacher Autonomy	157
Administrative, Financial and Political Support	160
The Effects of Government Policies	165
The Effects of the New Education Act: ERA	174
The "Ideal" Workshop	175
Staff Development	176
Conclusions	177
Notes to Chapter 5	184

Chapter Six A SUMMARY OF THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Introduction	192
The Extent and Success of the Provision	192
A Summary of the General Points that Emerged from the Study	192
The Main Differences between ILEA and non-ILEA Workshops	195
Recommendations for Staff Development	197
Final Conclusion	198

APPENDIX A: THE INITIAL SURVEY	i
APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE	vii
APPENDIX C: THE SCHEDULE FOR TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS	lxx
APPENDIX D: THE SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS	lxxxix
APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION	cxxxiii
APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS	cliii
APPENDIX G: WORKSHOP LAYOUT	clx
APPENDIX H: THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION	clxii
APPENDIX I: THE LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY	clxvi
APPENDIX J: DOCUMENTATION FROM COLLEGES	clxxi
GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS	clxxxi

A STUDY OF ENGLISH WORKSHOP PROVISION

BY J H WARE

ABSTRACT

During the past decade students with particularly low-level literacy skills have imposed special demands, some colleges of Further Education meeting their needs by means of workshops. There was an information-gap about how best to enable linguistic acquisition in 16+ mainstream students and that need prompted this investigation.

The author set out to identify and describe good workshop practice in individual LEAs or colleges and to define the features of a model workshop. The central question was whether or not the workshop strategy was effective in meeting the literacy needs of FE students.

After a preliminary survey to discover suitable colleges, students and tutors were interviewed. Workshop sessions were observed using two contrasting instruments and HE and LEAs surveyed. Teaching materials and the learning-environment were scrutinised.

Two kinds of workshop emerged: the ILEA Communications Workshop and the Literacy-support workshop found in the non-ILEA colleges in the sample.

Because of their individuality, it was not reasonable to delineate a model workshop. Nevertheless clear principles of good practice were established, for example that there was a need to create a careful balance between the following emphases:

- learning individually and within groups;
- experience of oral and written work;
practice in formal and informal talk;
- the development of basic skills and wider learning-experiences;
- student autonomy and teacher-guidance.

As a result of the study it became clear that, whatever the lost opportunities discovered in individual workshops, in contrast with school they represented a positive educational experience for those who had been failed by traditional teaching-methods and students thought they were more effective in meeting their literacy needs. It also became clear that there was a need for staff development in the sample colleges and therefore probably in the FE sector as a whole in order to enable tutors to make more effective use of literacy workshops.

CHAPTER ONE

AN OUTLINE OF THE RESEARCH

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

THE DESIGN OF THE THESIS

**AN ACCOUNT OF THE RESEARCH METHODS USED AND
WHY THEY WERE CHOSEN**

**AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE
RESEARCH**

THE MAIN RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER ONE

AN OUTLINE OF THE RESEARCH

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In the early 1980s a chain of events, described in Chapter Two, led to the admission into FE of a new clientele with needs that were vastly different from those for which colleges had previously provided. The consequent debate led to the recognition that many of the courses which had traditionally been offered had no relevance to these students, many of whom had low-level skills and a need for literacy and numeracy support.

This led to some radical changes in the curriculum and a re-examination of the way in which courses had traditionally been delivered. An important change in the delivery of language and numeracy work occurred particularly early in the development of the workshop approach in ILEA; this method then began to appear elsewhere. Reminiscent of some of the best practice in primary schools, but quite new to FE, this approach appeared to offer a learning-experience that was more congenial to students and similar to that already encountered by those on vocational preparation-style courses.

The scarcity of documentation about workshops made it imperative to attempt to create a coherent picture of an approach which appeared to have a great deal to offer students. A preliminary survey revealed a great deal of activity and suggested enormous dynamism; additionally a few underlying principles were observable. It was not possible, however, to detect in the variety of styles any clear definition of a workshop or what its boundaries might be and, in particular, how to define best practice. Neither was it clear that there was any guidance available in the form of staff development.

The purpose of this study was therefore to obtain a clear definition of a workshop's role, examine its effectiveness and establish a model derived from best practice.

THE DESIGN OF THE THESIS.

Chapter One: An Outline of the Research.

This chapter has been designed as a guide through the work, providing a chapter-by chapter summary of the contents. It also includes an explanation of the purpose of the study and an outline of the main results and conclusions.

Chapter Two: A Review of the Literature.

Having defined the term "Workshop", this chapter goes on to explain that the workshop approach to language acquisition has developed in response to two factors with an important influence in FE. One has been the continual rise in the demands upon the literacy skills of the population by a society with increasingly sophisticated technology; the other has been the entry into FE in recent years of a new client group with low-level literacy and numeracy needs as well as low levels of motivation.

The learning-theory shows how traditional educational methods may have failed such individuals and advocates student-centred approaches. From this literature have been drawn seven theoretical principles which seem fundamental to workshops. Eight workshops were to be investigated for the presence of these principles, their appropriateness in practice and for the effectiveness with which they were being applied.

Chapter Three: The Design of the Research.

This chapter provides a detailed description of the instruments employed in the research and the reasons why these were used, with a discussion of their theoretical background. The most important of those employed were interview schedules for workshop tutors and students as well as for craft tutors who were likely to refer students to the workshop. The aim was to elicit a rounded view of the appropriate role of workshops and their effectiveness and in particular to investigate students' experiences of this approach to learning and invite their reflections upon it.

The range of groups interviewed was intended to provide checks upon the data obtained from any one group. For this purpose questions overlapped, although

expressed in different ways in order to render them appropriate for the different subjects in the study. Further checks were built in by the use of two instruments employed for classroom observation as well as a room checklist. Wider implications, for example of the effectiveness of HE in the preparation of teachers or the role of LEAs in promoting literacy teaching and the workshop approach, were explored by means of postal questionnaires.

Chapter Four: Implementation of the Research and The Results.

This chapter includes a discussion of the effectiveness of the research instruments in the light of their use and the difficulties that were encountered during implementation as well as the ways in which these were dealt with.

The results of the research are then recorded. They have been summarised here, and at this point some distinct differences were emerging between colleges within the then ILEA and colleges outside the ILEA and where this was the case the differences have been highlighted.

Results obtained from the researcher's own collaborating college are also clearly indicated in the appendices.

Chapter Five: Interpretation and Discussion of the Results.

In Chapter Five the implications of the important distinctions between the then ILEA and non-ILEA colleges are explored. These can largely be encapsulated in the different concepts of the Communications and the Language-support workshops, the main distinctions relating to client group, compulsory as opposed to voluntary attendance and traditional classroom dynamics as opposed to student-centredness. These issues are explored in the light of what they have to offer each other since the research indicates important omissions in each.

The wider picture in relation to Government policy and its likely effect upon the development of learning-support workshops is also considered.

Chapter Six: A Summary of the Conclusions.

This chapter consists of a summary of the main discussion-points arising from the research. These are tied tightly to the original seven points delineated at the start of the research as a theoretical check-list for the effectiveness of the workshops seen in practice.

Appendices: All the data from questionnaires, interview schedules, classroom observation and materials and room scrutinies has been recorded in the appendices. The colleges in the sample have been listed and the researcher's own collaborating college distinguished from the rest. A distinction has also been made between the ILEA and non-ILEA colleges.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RESEARCH METHODS USED AND WHY THEY WERE CHOSEN.

Aim of the Research:

The literature dealing with linguistic development in individuals indicated that student-centred methods of learning were likely to be more effective than the classroom approach that had traditionally been employed. It also pointed to the central importance of negotiating the learning-agenda with students. The ideal enabling environment was thought to be the (then) ILEA model of the Communications workshop (See Chapter 2). The aim of the research was to investigate this model and to seek ideas which would contribute to the concept of an ideal workshop. Flowing from this aim, the main objectives were to investigate students' learning-experiences on their own terms and to check teachers' perceptions and practices against these.

Research Strategies:

After a survey (The Initial Survey see pages 61, 83 and vi for further details) to discover suitable research locations, selection was based upon the willingness of the subjects to cooperate, as far as possible within the parameters laid down in Chapter Three. (See page 62). The extent to which this was successful is discussed in Chapter Four. (See page 83.) Although constraints imposed by unwillingness to cooperate can limit the ability to generalise from the data, it was always the intention to study the workshop method in the context within

which it operated and never to obtain a representative sample of the general population in order to make general predictions of a quantitative nature. Nevertheless, in order to obtain a good random sample the relatively large number of eight colleges was selected. A considerably smaller number of institutions has been regarded as acceptable elsewhere ⁽¹⁾.

The dominant notion of student-centredness and the consequent emphasis upon the investigation of the experiences and opinions of individuals indicated the selection of research instruments lying within the ethnographic range:

"The great strength of the case-study method is that it allows the researcher to concentrate on a specific instance or situation and to identify...the various interactive processes at work" ⁽²⁾.

This decision was reinforced by the fact that, as a serving teacher who had set up a workshop and taught in it, the researcher was naturally an "insider" who shared experiences with one of the subject-groups. Other researchers have considered this factor to be sufficiently useful to create such a situation artificially. The approach falls within the ethnographic perspective on research and is linked with an emphasis upon the actors' experience of the processes under observation. In Chapter Three there is a description of the methods used to overcome any possible constraints upon student responses resulting from this role as well as from the additional involvement mentioned next. This relationship with the work is fully acknowledged and provides the advantage that it has been written from a teacher's perspective.

The further aspect of the researcher's "insider" nature mentioned above was as an employee of one of the sample colleges (the "collaborating college" mentioned on the front sheet and elsewhere in the thesis). The potential for bias in the subjects' responses as well as that of the researcher in assessing the data was carefully considered. It was felt that the professional respondents in all the sample colleges were equally likely to wish to present their activities in a positive light and that whilst the researcher's relationships within and detailed knowledge of her own institution created a difference from the others in the

sample any possible "halo effect" would probably not be any greater than that present in the other professional subjects' responses. In the event, staff replies in the collaborating college proved to be more open and critical than those of staff in the other colleges in the sample, presumably for the reasons just mentioned. In this sense, in the collaborating college, the researcher was an actor as well as an information-gatherer. Reliability and validity were ensured by the use of triangulation and this is discussed in detail later below ⁽³⁾.

A polarity has developed between researchers advocating qualitative methods and those who employ quantitative methods, "where the former is considered to be soft, subjective and speculative, while the latter is described as hard, objective and rigorous." Yet the possibility of successfully combining the strengths of both has been demonstrated ⁽⁴⁾ and this study set out to supplement the advantages of ethnographic methods with some of the intrinsic strengths of quantitative methods. This is also discussed in more detail below.

A major preoccupation was to be the collection of detailed information about people studying within a particular context rather than data that would be generalisable to the population, or even workshops, as a whole and since emphasis was to be placed upon internal validity rather than external validity ⁽⁵⁾ the case study was considered to be ideal for this purpose. Nevertheless it has been argued that since classrooms share many characteristics it is possible to "clarify relationships, pinpoint critical processes and identify common phenomena" ⁽⁶⁾ and "if case studies are carried out systematically and critically ... they are valid forms of educational research" ⁽⁷⁾; further, they provide a "relatively formal and fairly definitive analysis of a specific aspect of ... classroom life" ⁽⁸⁾.

Because of the particular emphasis of the study the weaknesses of ethnographic methods, in particular their low level of reliability, were of less importance than their advantages of naturalism and inclusiveness, since the research was clearly setting out to interpret "the subjective meanings which individuals place upon their actions" ⁽⁹⁾. Ethnographers are interested in the "sets of meanings which people use to make sense of their world and the people within it" and their

research emphasises "The search for meaningful relationships and the discovery of their consequences for action" ⁽¹⁰⁾. The aims and objectives of this research, which emphasises the students' experience, would therefore seem to fall clearly at the ethnographic end of a scale which has experimental methods at the opposite end emphasising the importance of high internal validity and "objectivity". The disadvantages of employing the survey method on its own in this small-scale study, with its focus on detail, lay in its low inclusiveness and general application to large-scale research projects ⁽¹¹⁾.

Positivists believe that the world can be accurately interpreted only by means of scientific observation and experiment and that enquiry must therefore be limited to the acquisition of knowledge that can be gained by reason alone:

"the central belief of the logical Positivists is that the meaning of a statement is, or is given by, the method of its verification. It follows from this that unverifiable statements are held to be meaningless...." ⁽¹²⁾.

From this viewpoint the methods used to investigate the natural sciences are the only valid means for the investigation of social phenomena. The investigator is an observer and an analyst rather than a participant in society and his or her results must manifest themselves in terms of general laws. Further assumptions of Positivists concern predictability, empiricism and parsimony.

Anti-Positivists criticise this approach on the grounds that its deterministic nature excludes concepts of choice, freedom, individuality and moral responsibility. Kirkegaard argued that the subjectivity of the observer was an important factor, since it was necessary to recognise his or her relationship to the social world. Anti-Positivists hold that objectivity has a dehumanising effect and an individual's behaviour can be understood only by someone participating in his or her frame of reference:

"The purpose of social science is to understand social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how their views shape the action which they take within that reality. Since the social sciences cannot penetrate to what lies

behind social reality, they must work directly with man's definitions of reality and with the rules he devises for coping with it. While the social sciences do not reveal ultimate truth, they do help us to make sense of our world. What the social sciences offer is explanation, clarification and demystification of the social forms which man has created around himself" ⁽¹³⁾.

Anti-Positivists would also argue that experimental research is altogether inappropriate for the investigation of human experience and Kirkegaard held that the meaning of experience was "concrete and individual, unique and irreducible, not amenable to conceptualisation" ⁽¹⁴⁾. However, the body of art and storytelling that exists in every known culture attests to the communicable and often shared nature of meaning within human experience. Further, this rather extreme point of view is not particularly helpful to the educational researcher, who is of necessity committed to the notion of learning as in some sense a shared experience, however diversely perceived by individuals.

A more helpful Anti-Positivist view is held by Ions, whose objection is to quantification which is an end in itself; he sees the scientific approach as applied to the social sciences as: "a branch of mathematics rather than a humane study seeking to explore and elucidate the gritty circumstances of the human condition" ⁽¹⁵⁾. A further helpful criticism is that Positivism fails to take into account the unique human ability to interpret and communicate experience. Social scientists argue that their discipline stands in a "subject/subject" relation to the world unlike the "subject/object" relationship of the natural sciences. That is, the individual interpretations of the world made by human subjects play an important role in the discoveries made by the researcher and cannot be ignored. Further, "the causes of social phenomena are usually multiple ones and an experiment to study them requires large numbers of people often for lengthy periods. This requirement limits the usefulness of the experimental method" ⁽¹⁶⁾.

In this context, there would have been a major disadvantage in using an experimental approach to the study since human behaviour is not predictable in the way, for example, the reactions of two chemicals placed together in a test-

tube may be predicted and tested. In deciding where to place the research (e.g., LEA level, HE level, FE college level) there was a danger that the most significant explanatory variable in the style of individual workshops might have been eliminated. This proved to be at the level of the students themselves. The Positivist concept of parsimony would have overlooked what the Anti-Positivist view of inclusiveness was able to capture.

Pragmatically, experience has shown that the more rigorously objective the social scientist tries to render his research, the more trivial and the less useful it becomes to practitioners. This would seem to provide strong support for the view that the role played by human subjectivity is central, since the more this is filtered out the less of value there is to garner. David Holbrook puts it thus:

"Since ... the whole problem belongs to 'psychic reality', to man's inner world, to his moral being, and to the subjective life, there can be no debate unless we are prepared to recognise the bankruptcy of Positivism, and the failure of 'objectivity' to give an adequate account of experience, and are prepared to find new modes of inquiry" ⁽¹⁷⁾.

This objection would seem particularly relevant to an investigation of students' learning-experiences where there was a heavy emphasis upon the description of explanatory variables. These were then to be used to form a hypothesis, which might highlight suitable areas for future research by other methods.

Whilst ethnographic concepts have led to the use of research methods which are better suited to the investigation of common experience, there were also disadvantages to the exclusive use of these methods in this study. A major objection is that they are unstructured and can be responsible for the collection of a large body of unmanageable data. Further, it is difficult to see how there can be a guarantee that the results of uncontrolled interviews and participant observation studies can be sufficiently consistent or orderly to be useful as they stand.

There was therefore a perceived need to build structure into the work, which for this reason combined survey approaches with ethnological methods. A good example of this occurs in the construction of the interview schedules, which comprised a mixture of open-ended and pre-coded questions. This was done in order to manage effectively the large quantity of information the instruments were designed to collect. (See Appendices B, C and D, pages viii, lxxi and xc.) The emphasis upon structure is further exemplified in the decision to use instruments for classroom observation instead of participant observation and in the construction of a grid for the materials and room scrutinies. There were additional (more important) reasons for the use of all these measures and further discussion about them can be found below.

By these means the limiting effects of the experimental and survey approaches were avoided, since inclusiveness was a very strong feature of the work, whilst the provision of such a framework for the data helped to ameliorate what was seen to be a major disadvantage of ethnographic methods - unmanageability. This combination of approaches has been shown to be successful elsewhere ⁽¹⁸⁾.

This is distinctly different from the experimental approach, which sets out to eliminate or measure the effects of as many variables as possible in order to isolate and confirm the effect of those previously identified as in some way significant. In this approach researchers start out with a hypothesis which they then set out to prove. The strategy employed in this study, however, was to obtain a large quantity of data in order to draw from it appropriate information which would then generate a hypothesis. That is, ideas were sought which would contribute to the concept of a model workshop. A possible further stage of research might take the conclusions that were drawn and test these in a more experimental context. At this stage of the development of theory concerning learning in workshops, this approach would be inappropriate because so little is as yet known.

Indeed, much educational research is descriptive at present because the discipline is still new and has not yet built up the large quantity of data which allows a strong body of theory to develop:

"Much research in the field of education, especially at classroom and school level, is conducted [by means of], e.g., surveys and case studies" ⁽¹⁹⁾.

This is cited by Cohen and Manion as stage 2 in a list of six stages in the development of a science where stage 1 is "definition of a science and identification of the phenomena to be subsumed ..." and stage 6 is "The use of the established body of theory in the resolution of problems or as a source of further hypothesis." Stage 2 is "a relatively uncomplicated point at which the researcher is content to observe and record facts and possibly arrive at some system of classification. Stage 3 introduces a note of added sophistication as attempts are made to establish relationships between variables within a loose framework of inchoate theory" ⁽²⁰⁾.

Additional reasons for the combination of survey and ethnographic approaches were linked with the desire for holism, but also with the need for validity:

"And what of the insistence of interpretive methodologies on the use of verbal accounts to get at the meaning of events, rules and intentions? Are there not dangers? Subjective reports are sometimes incomplete and they are sometimes misleading" ⁽²¹⁾.

Use of a combination of techniques is particularly valuable when investigating the effectiveness of a classroom environment with its multiplicity of variables:

"So complex and involved is the teaching-learning process in the context of the school that the single-method approach yields only limited and misleading data" ⁽²²⁾.

Further justification appears in the following statement:

" ... triangular techniques in the social sciences attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint and, in so doing, by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data" ⁽²³⁾

and:

"Strict and rigid adherence to any method ... may ... become like a confinement in a cage. If he is lucky ... a fieldworker will ... find all the answers ... But if ... he is limited by a particular method ... he will do well to slip through the bars and try to find out what is really going on" ⁽²⁴⁾.

It was particularly valuable to use triangulation in the context of this research, since "This is at the heart of the intention of the case-worker to respond to the multiplicity of perspectives present in a social situation" ⁽²⁵⁾.

Clearly, the more there is a correspondence between various sets of data obtained in different ways, the more confident the researcher may feel in the reasonableness of her conclusions. This is especially true where a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data has been collected, since:

"The chief problem confronting the researcher using triangulation is that of validity. This is particularly the case where researchers use only qualitative techniques" ⁽²⁶⁾.

Greater validity is obtained where different kinds of triangulation occur ⁽²⁷⁾ ⁽²⁸⁾ and this study employed triangulation of three kinds. The first was in its combination of two levels of investigation ⁽²⁹⁾: in this it addressed the subject at an individual level (the student), the interactive level (groups students, workshop tutors, referral tutors) and at the level of collectivities. (This level is located in the questions put to workshop tutors concerning college management and political support (see pages ix and xxii in Appendix B) as well as in questions put to HE and LEAs (see pages clxiv, clxviii and clxix)).

The second kind of triangulation was methodological: a variety of instruments was employed, as well as different methods within the same instrument. For example, in the structured interview schedules questions eliciting both fact and opinion from each of the three categories of subject overlapped so that responses could be compared and checked against each other. Of particular advantage to

this activity was the inclusion of questions drawing out quantifiable data, which lent itself to comparison between subjects. (For fuller discussion of these details see page 64).

Space triangulation was the third kind employed. That is, a number of colleges across the country were investigated in order to increase ecological validity ⁽³⁰⁾.

Further checking was done by soliciting information from other sources. Two examples of this occur in the postal questionnaires sent to HE institutions and LEAs in order to check and explore more fully the responses of workshop tutors. (See pages 76 and 77.) Other examples are to be seen in the Materials Checklist and instruments for classroom observation which have already been mentioned. The latter were of additional advantage in their contrast with the interview schedules ⁽³¹⁾.

The scrutiny of workshop materials similarly sought to combine structure with open-endedness in that the samples taken from the different workshops included an example of everything that was available to students. The categories constituting the grid against which they were measured (see page cliv) were drawn from the statements made by tutors in response to the questions in Section 3 of the Workshop Tutors' Interview Schedule on page xvi (Appendix B) and were designed to check these.

Further, instruments for classroom observation were preferred to participant observation in order to take advantage of the strengths implicit in the collection of orderly and consistent data. The greater inclusiveness of participant observation was carefully considered and rejected for its lack of structure. (See Chapter Three, pages 59–60 for a fuller discussion). Two instruments were employed as a supplement to each other and direct observation was additionally employed in order to maximise inclusiveness. This was particularly important, since Flanders' categories for classroom interaction do not include opportunities to record non-verbal responses and some categories are particularly wide and therefore imprecise. (For example, category 10, silence or confusion, which

does not distinguish between unhelpful and constructive silence ⁽³²⁾.) The formation of categories is an intrinsic weakness of systematic observation ⁽³³⁾. Thus, the intent was to combine the strengths of the different approaches whilst eliminating as far as possible their major weaknesses.

The value of employing this approach was particularly demonstrated in the result obtained from classroom observation, which clearly showed a gap between what teachers thought and said they were doing and what was actually happening in the classroom. (See pages 124, 147 148 and 192 195 for discussion of this phenomenon):

"Naturally, ... , it is not to be expected that complete consensus among data can or should be achieved. Indeed, the very burden of the interpretive approach is that different actors in the situation will have different meanings, and that each meaning is equally valid. What is required, however, is that some attempt be made to relate incongruent data in some way or other. Accounting for differences would be one way; using them as a basis for further hypotheses another" ⁽³⁴⁾.

This gap was informative of staff development needs, both in relation to classroom interaction and to the effects of the predominant teaching-methods. Without ethnographic concepts of inclusiveness and the use of triangulation techniques these points would have been lost.

For the purposes of assessment, each set of data was taken on its own merits and what seemed to be strong indications were followed. Indications were considered strong when, in the structured interview schedules, the responses to any question were over 50%. Many of these indications were well supported by data obtained from the supplementary methods discussed above and conclusions were drawn upon the basis of cumulative effect.

The contribution of triangulation methods to the ethnological validity of this study is well illustrated in the full details of the basis upon which the conclusions were reached. These can be found in Chapter Six, pages 192 195.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RESEARCH.

In order to find a path through the thesis, discussion of the purpose of the study should be sought in Chapter 2 on page 46.

Theoretical discussion of the probable client group for workshops is also to be found in Chapter Two (see pages 28 and 29). Information on all the intended samples can be found in Chapter 3 on pages 65 (workshop managers), 69 (non-workshop tutors) and 71 (students). Details of the actual student sample are provided in Chapter 4 (pages 95, 110, 111) and Chapter 5 (pages 140 and 142) and Appendix B (page xxxii). Also in Chapter 4 appears information concerning the actual samples of workshop managers (page 92) and non-workshop tutors (page 106).

The research methodology is described in Chapter 3 and a summary of all the results appears in Chapter 4; discussion, interpretation and application of the results occurs in Chapter 5 and the overall conclusions are presented in Chapter 6.

The most appropriate way of following information through the thesis can be demonstrated by tracing one or two key issues.

In the case of negotiation with students about their learning-agenda, the reasons for including this topic are discussed on pages 43-46 of Chapter 2 and its place in the seven main points of theoretical interest indicated on page 46.

For a general description of the construction of the interview schedules see Chapter 3. (See page 64 for the Workshop Tutors' Interview Schedule and page 71 for the Students' Interview Schedule.) In order to assess the extent to which the learning-agenda was negotiated with students, tutors were asked to describe their methods of ascertaining the learning-programme (see Appendix B, pages ix, xiii and xiv). Additionally, students were asked for to describe their own learning-experiences (see Appendix D, questions 10 (e) and (f) (on page xcii) and (n) (on page xciii)).

Teaching-materials were also scrutinised: a description of the methodology employed appears on page 74 in Chapter 3; on page 75 the place of the negotiated agenda is shown in (a)(vii).

In a more general sense, classroom observation was also used to check the accuracy of the various subjects' responses. For a description of the methodology used see Chapter 3, page 72 and also Appendix E.

The results of questions put to teachers concerning their methods of deciding on the learning programme are summarised in Chapter 4 on pages 94 and 96 and can be found in detail in Appendix B on page xxx; the effect of these methods upon tutors' choice of appropriate teaching/learning-strategies for their students are to be found on pages xli and xlii.

For the results of the scrutiny of teaching-materials see page clviii. See page 127 in Chapter Four, no. (vii) for a discussion of these results. The written examples tutors were able to produce in evidence for the activity are to be found on pages clxxii ff in Appendix J.

Students' replies are summarised on page 114 and the full details can be found on pages cix, cx and cxviii.

The educational priorities delineated by the workshop tutors were checked against the priorities of the students. (See Appendix B, pages l and li and Appendix D page civ for the individual results.)

Students' preferred learning-experiences were also checked against the tutors' preferred teaching/learning strategies; see Appendix D pages cv to cxxviii and Appendix B page lviii for the individual results.

The results of the classroom observation can be seen on page cxxxiv of Appendix E.

For a discussion of negotiation (usually within the more general context of "student autonomy") see Chapter 5, pages 151, 153 155 and 178 181. For a summary of the conclusions, see Chapter 6, pages 193 and 198.

This demonstrates the kind of system the reader might use to follow any of the issues through the thesis.

An Unexpected Finding

A distinctive and unpredicted pattern that emerged was in the important differences between the ILEA Communications workshops and what became known in the study as the non-ILEA language-support workshops. These differences began to emerge during the initial survey and are highlighted in Chapter Four (See pages 83 85, 88 -89 and 91 - 92. See also page v in Appendix A. Further details emerged from the Workshop Tutors' Interview Schedule and are summarised in Chapter 4 on pages 94, (see pages xxix and xxx in Appendix B), 95 (pages xxxii ff), 99 and 106. Classroom observation elicited more relevant data, which is summarised on page 119 in Chapter 4 and page cxxix in Appendix E. Scrutiny of the materials further confirmed the pattern (see pages 127 in Chapter 4, (clv in Appendix F), 108 (cliv) and 129 (clvi)).

Discussion of these differences plays a prominent part in Chapter 5 and can be found on pages 140 - 141, 144 - 160, 176 and the conclusions can be found on pages 179 183. A summary of the conclusions appears on pages 192 195.

THE MAIN RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

A clear distinction emerged between ILEA Communications workshops and the language-support workshops in existence in colleges outside ILEA. The cause of some of these differences appeared to be that ILEA tutors in the sample had moved radically away from the then Authority's original vision. There was evidence to suggest that this tendency was more widespread than simply in the sample colleges. Ironically, workshops outside the Authority had taken on many of those principles and used them successfully. These differences are discussed fully in Chapter 5.

The expectation of drawing a model workshop from the study gave way to the recognition of a rich variety of solutions to a problem, exciting in their dynamism if limited individually in what they were achieving in relation to their potential. Workshops existed in a philosophy and a set of principles more than in any one clearly-defined approach since their conception lay in the response of individual teachers to the needs of individual students.

Whilst it was possible to discover a number of aspects of the work upon which to make recommendations for improvement, there was no doubt that the vast majority of students in the sample were enthusiasts for the workshop approach and believed that they were making better progress than they had achieved in their previous educational experience. Their very positive response to workshops was echoed by craft or other tutors who might refer them, where they were also on mainstream college courses.

It therefore became clear that, despite some weaknesses, workshops represented a significant solution to the problems faced by colleges in providing for the needs of their new clientele. Their potential would be enhanced by the provision of more staff development, particularly if this were to be targeted at areas of need highlighted by the research and detailed in Chapter 5.

A rationale for the use of the workshop approach and a theoretical definition of what the ideal learning-environment would be appears in Chapter 2.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. Burgess, R. G., *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*, Routledge, London, 1984, page 59.
2. Bell, J., *Doing your Research Project*, second edition, Open University Press, Buckingham, 1993, page 8.
3. (1) pages 16 ff.
4. Ibid page 3.
5. Ibid, pages 143 144.
6. Robson, E., citing Stubbs, M. and Delamont, S. (eds.), in *Explorations in Classroom Observation*, page 13, John Wiley and Sons 1984 in "Assignment no. 2: Compare and Contrast Systematic Observation and Ethnographic Observation", Curriculum Studies Dept., Research Principles and Practice.
7. (2) page 9.
8. Bassey M., "Pedagogic Research: on the relative merits of search for generalisation and study of single events", *Oxford Review of Education*, 7 (1), 73 93, cited in (2), page 9.
9. Open University Unit, Block 8, page 14.
10. Cohen L. and Manion L, *Research Methods in Education*, Routledge, London and New York, 3rd Ed 1992.
11. See (9) page 14.
12. See (10) page 12.

13. See (10) page 27, quoting Beck, R. N., *Handbook in Social Philosophy*, MacMillan, New York, 1979.
14. Kirkegaard, S., *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1974. Cited in (10).
15. Ions, E., *Against Behaviourism: A Critique of Behavioural Science*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1977. Cited in (10), page 25.
16. (2), page 12, citing Wilson, N.J., "The Ethnographic Style of Research, in Block 1, part 1 of Open University Course DE304, *Research Methods in Education and the Social Sciences*, Open University, 1979, Buckingham.
17. Holbrook, D., *Education, Nihilism and Survival*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1977. Cited in (10) page 26.
18. See O.U. Unit, Block 8, page 14 and (1) page 17.
19. O.U. Unit, Block 8, page 44.
20. See (10), pages 20 21.
21. Bernstein B., "Sociology and the Sociology of Education: a brief account", in Rex J., (ed.) *Approaches to Sociology: an Introduction to Major Trends in British Sociology*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1974, cited in (10), page 37.
22. See (10) page 275 and also (1) pages 143 ff.
23. See (10) page 269.
24. See (1) page 143.
25. See (10) page 277.

26. Ibid, page 278.

27. Hopkins D., *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research* Open University Press, Buckingham, 1985, page 112.

28. See (2) page 64.

29. See (1) page 15.

30. See (10) pages 272 ff.

31. Ibid, page 270.

32. See (27) page 100.

33. See (6).

34. See (10) page 281.

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

A Definition of the Term "Workshop"

Background

The Nature of the Clientele

WHY THE WORKSHOP APPROACH?

Reasons for the Failure of Traditional Teaching-methods

The Social Context for Effective Learning

Curriculum Development

Introduction

Small Group-work

The Students' Needs

The Ideology of the Learning-Context

Negotiation of the Learning-Agenda

Conclusion

THE STUDY

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

A Definition of the Term "Workshop"

A workshop provides a student-centred environment designed to enable learning to proceed as confidently and autonomously at an individual level as students' capacities allow. It also seeks to stretch those capacities to the full. Students experience a more egalitarian relationship with their teacher, whose role is to support, not to lead, and normally learn in a setting with a social dimension. They may encounter the opportunity to make choices concerning their own learning-strategies and to select their own materials. There is often the right to come and go, and move around at will. The curricular emphasis is upon the acquisition of skills. Some workshops provide individual help at any level of requirement.

This differs from traditional forms of teacher-led education where students are normally taught in a whole-class situation and respond to the authority and superior knowledge of their instructor. They lack many of the freedoms accorded to workshop students. Traditionally the emphasis has been upon the acquisition of a body of knowledge, but with the advent of GCSE this has been less the case.

Background

The introduction of workshops has been an important aspect of Further Education's response to the literacy needs of students, particularly because the demands upon their written skills have significantly increased over the last thirty years.

A new general awareness of the importance of literacy and also the fact that educational planning must take account of the way in which the criteria for such a definition constantly rise in standard is well illustrated by Alan Bullock's

comparison of the 1951 UNESCO definition of a literate person with that made ten years later⁽¹⁾:

"a person is literate who can, with understanding, both read and write a short statement on his everyday life;" (1951) and "... a person is literate when he has acquired the essential knowledge and skills which enable him to engage in all those activities in which literacy is required for effective functioning in his group and community." (1960s)^{(1)(a)}.

In 1975 The Bullock Report, specifically concerned with education and language and the British situation, estimated that there were at least one million people with a reading-age below 9.0. The government's response at this time was to establish ALRA (later the Adult Literacy and Basic Skills Unit, ALBSU) which has had the effect, through funding, of generating a great deal of important curriculum development outside the mainstream of education⁽²⁾.

A specific need for a continuing programme to improve the levels of literacy of many young adults was highlighted by the fact that approximately 9% of nine-year-olds sampled by the APU in 1980 "employed a written style which was barely responsive to the need for what was written to be interpreted by a reader"⁽³⁾.

Further supportive evidence of this need was provided by a survey carried out in 1981 by the National Children's bureau which revealed that 10% of a sample of 12,500 twenty-three year olds defined themselves as experiencing literacy problems of some kind. At this time, only 8% of those who had defined themselves as experiencing difficulties were receiving any remedial tuition⁽⁴⁾.

A further considerable factor which highlighted the importance of providing more literacy support for young people was the government's response to the high levels of youth unemployment in the 1980s. This was to develop a scheme to make new courses available to the young unemployed⁽⁵⁾.

Seventy-thousand school-leavers had been drawn into the scheme since it began and the government had anticipated that this figure would rise to over a million by 1986.

There had also been an increase in the number of school-leavers entering FE, for whom many of the traditional courses were not appropriate⁽⁷⁾.

The response of Further Education had so far been two-fold:

- (1) The provision of then new courses like BTEC and CPVE.
- (2) The development of new teaching-strategies like Communications and literacy workshops.

The development of Communications workshops, mentioned above, occurred early and particularly intensively in the then ILEA where *Appendix II of The Review of Further and Higher Education in London ILEA, 1981*, expressed "special concern for the needs of the younger, less able and less advanced students" and continues: "among these (operative, craft and technician) courses, and more especially at the lower levels, there are students who are in need of special attention to general education, particularly in the area of communication and literacy" . This work is seminal and is therefore central to much of the discussion in this chapter.

Simultaneously, ALRA/ALBSU was playing a fundamental role in raising national awareness concerning the need for literacy provision. In the 1974 "Right to Read" Charter they called upon the Government to eradicate illiteracy from Britain by 1985. (Their awareness-raising activities have since provided a model for campaigns in other countries.)⁽⁸⁾ It is a considerable success to have generated a national debate on such a potentially expensive issue during a period of economic recession. Indeed it is a tribute to their continuing success that passing attention was paid by all parties to the issue in the General Election of 1987:

"No less than one quarter of unemployed people have need of help with reading and writing and we have to put that right." Norman Tebbit, "World in Action Special", Channel Three 8.6.87.

"Seven million people have problems with literacy." David Owen, Speech in General Election campaign, June 1987. (Reported in a news bulletin.)

"The levels of competence in numeracy and literacy however measured, whether it be by the Assessment of Performance Unit or any other competent body, get better every year." Neil Kinnock "World in Action Special", Channel Three 8.6.87.

These comments were also, no doubt, a response to the link that was made by the then Manpower Services Commission between low levels of literacy and unemployment. This was a result of the discovery that "a quarter of the long-term unemployed, more than 300,000 adults, have literacy and numeracy problems" and that "over a quarter of a million adults may be, for all intents and purposes, almost total non-readers."

A sign of the significance placed upon this issue at this time by the government was the remit of the Working Group, which was "to put forward to the Secretary of State recommendations for a major new initiative in the field of literacy and numeracy provision across the full spectrum of MSC programmes and services"⁽⁹⁾.

The existence of wide-scale illiteracy in developed countries and its implications for the state of their economy is only slowly being acknowledged⁽¹⁰⁾, but now that a stronger link has been established in the political minds of Britain between a well-educated/trained work-force and economic health, there has been an increased awareness of the urgency of the need to upgrade our national training in order to become more competitive in the European Market⁽¹¹⁾. This has become all the more urgent because of the down-turn in demographic growth in the 16-19 age-group; the national failure to lure adequate numbers of young people into post-compulsory education was highlighted by a study of

almost 6,000 16-19 year-olds. Preliminary results of this showed that "about half the nation's school leavers shun further training, far more than in most industrialised countries"⁽¹²⁾.

Clearly there is an urgent need to render the prospect of further education or training more attractive than hitherto. While one answer may lie in offering more financial support⁽¹³⁾ the more pertinent issue, the importance of which is underlined by the demographic crisis, is the need to improve the retention rates of those who have actually entered the portals of FE, and a large part of the answer to this must surely lie in the provision of more learning-support for young people with limited language-skills. Evidence in reinforcement of this argument is provided by a study of the drop-out rate of low-level Craft apprentices in seven colleges situated in England, Scotland and Wales:

"It is estimated that around one half of the students who embark on the first year of CIGLI Craft level courses fail to complete their courses, or fail the final examination. The findings of this study suggest that these estimates are accurate.

In 91% of cases the main reason given by the course tutor for the withdrawal or failure of a student was the inability to cope with the demands made upon his English by his course. This, together with problems with numeracy, were said to constitute the main reasons for failure or withdrawal⁽¹⁴⁾.

In view of its relevance to economic health as well as its importance in fulfilling the needs of both mature and young people with literacy problems, those already within the FE system as well as for a new potential client group, literacy is a crucial issue. As will be demonstrated, communications and/or literacy workshops are an important answer to the problem.

The Nature of the Clientele

These arguments raise the question of the identity of the client-group and its wants and needs. One ILEA definition of its anticipated clients went thus:

"We could anticipate that the students may have some of the following
....

- a) They would have left school at the earliest opportunity and have some record of truancy.
- b) They would have learning-problems and a lack of basic skills.
- c) They would have some behavioural problems within the college situation.
- d) They would have a multiplicity of social and personal problems which could impede learning.
- e) They would be ill-prepared to start work."⁽¹⁵⁾

The accuracy of this formula is in itself questionable and additionally dubious as to how fully it describes the wider group in the population who have a literacy need, for tutors in the Charnley and Jones study⁽¹⁶⁾ expressed their surprise at the often sophisticated levels of skill other than literacy possessed by adult students in relation to both their working- and their leisure-activities. Further, they were successful in their working lives:

"it would be dangerous to assume that our students are seriously economically disadvantaged. Few, in fact, would appear to be any more disadvantaged than their reading counterparts in the working-class community"⁽¹⁷⁾ and a report on 88 students in Liverpool⁽¹⁸⁾ revealed that 12% were in skilled occupations and 20% in semi-skilled. Charnley and Jones also found that the bulk of students, in contrast with expectation, did not need help in matters requiring basic coping skills like dealing with applications for benefits, or information concerning citizens' rights.

Neither can adult literacy students be identified with the lowest educational achievement, since the UNESCO project of 1976 showed that two thirds of UK

students were spread over a range of ability "that reached high competence in reading and writing, but difficulty in spelling"⁽¹⁹⁾. Only the other third of the group had fundamental difficulties. Research carried out by the ILEA Research and Statistics Unit similarly revealed a very wide range of attainment in its "low-level" groups and the point is made that "Students' intellectual equipment is often regarded as synonymous with the level of written performance; there is a sizeable body of research which shows that this equation is very suspect"⁽²⁰⁾. Similar statements have been made more recently elsewhere⁽²¹⁾.

The particular relevance of these issues lies first in the question of how far ILEA is stereotyping its own existing low-level achievers and secondly in the implication that there exists a body of adults who may have been underestimated as well as undereducated as a result of the traditional classroom approach normally adopted by secondary schools. Further, the literature indicates the presence of a wide range of individual needs which could not easily be satisfied within a traditional classroom situation. *Transition and Access* assumes the existence of a homogenous group of students with similar problems and therefore common solutions.

It also becomes clear that, because they had been set up to solve a particular problem, ILEA's Communications workshops would be likely to focus upon a relatively small proportion of the total college population with a literacy need let alone the population at large if students' own self-definition is taken as the measure of this ⁽²²⁾.

WHY THE WORKSHOP APPROACH?

Reasons for The Failure of Traditional Teaching Methods

The potential client-group, then, would consist of students for whom the accepted teaching methods had failed. Certainly from secondary-school age, they would have been likely largely to have experienced whole-class teaching in which the teacher dispensed information and students had little control over their learning other than in their responses to the teacher's authority and superior knowledge⁽²³⁾.

Studies of the way language is used in the traditional classroom provide a helpful additional insight into why this approach has failed such students. Edwards and Giles⁽²⁴⁾ show how children from some cultural backgrounds may, on entering school, experience difficulties which amount to culture shock because they encounter a language so different from their own. For many pupils this becomes an insurmountable barrier to success during their whole school lives. For example, it has been demonstrated that the wording of a question in a GCSE History examination prevented 15% of students from answering it despite their possession of the necessary information⁽²⁵⁾. Another study has shown how the difficulty students found in the language of Craft manuals and examinations has been misunderstood by teachers and attributed to difficulty of content⁽²⁶⁾.

In his study of the experience of eleven-year-old children⁽²⁷⁾ Douglas Barnes describes this same phenomenon as "secondary school language" and shows how, in many classrooms, teachers were totally unaware of the linguistic gap between themselves and their pupils and how that gap was the more effectively hidden by the widespread failure to invite pupils either to explore their learning aloud or spontaneously to ask questions and raise new issues. This is potentially a serious hindrance to learning in general and particularly for those students with the least developed language skills.

It is likely that such students would be further alienated from their educational environment by the failure of many teachers to make clear the criteria by which their pupils' performances will be judged so that they have to learn these by trial and error.

Other studies have shown a tendency in teachers to stereotype their pupils on the basis of speech-type and to lower their expectations accordingly⁽²⁸⁾.

Recent evidence derived by the NFER from SATs piloted with seven-year-olds suggested that this is a general tendency in teachers and occurs in the case of a wide range of pupils. One of their assumptions appears to be, "If I haven't taught it, they won't know it"⁽²⁹⁾. The effect can be profound⁽³⁰⁾.

That these errors are not confined to the education of children has been demonstrated by the most up-to-date study of student- and volunteer-behaviour in the then new Adult Literacy Scheme where tutors were found to have been strongly stereotyping their expected clientele. They also held unrealistically high expectations of their adult students. The intensive nature of individualised teaching provided opportunity for corrective insights, but "... although the majority of tutors underwent a major educational experience, the students often paid a high price"^{(31),(32)}.

As yet, no parallel studies have been carried out in the Further Education sector.

These failures indicate the need for a learning-environment with the freedom to allow students to participate in communication on their own terms and give rise to the question of whether student experiences in colleges compound the problems they have so far encountered or whether at this (usually final) point in their formal learning there is at last an opportunity for these to be rectified. The ILEA view that the solution to the problems of low-achievers would be to enhance motivation by use of the work-context for literacy-teaching would therefore appear to be ignoring the root of the problem and seek to impose a curricular solution based on precisely the kind of stereotyping under attack in the literature. And, indeed, the next section illustrates how important a holistic approach to the student may be as well as the possibility that there is no short-term solution to the problem. Therefore the ILEA "emergent adult" requires a programme that has been set in a longer-term context. The separation of FE and Adult Education within the then Authority would seem to have militated against the development of a longer perspective in the educators and therefore, potentially, in the students.

The Social Context for Effective Learning

In recent years linguistic theory has moved towards a greater emphasis upon the social context of language. Joan Tough, for example, describes the different ways advantaged and disadvantaged children use language and concludes that those who assume linguistic deficiency in children displaying syntactic difference are wrong, and that the need is to develop the disadvantaged child's

potential for meaning by "teacher-pupil dialogues which extend, probe, and give a focus to the child's experience, imagination and communicative capacities"⁽³³⁾. This has been described as the "language-experience" approach⁽³⁴⁾. Geoff Peel shows how "The relationship between speech and writing had implications for the problems involved in teaching reading (and writing) skills. Some difficulties can be traced back to the inherent differences in these two methods for the transmission of language. Children have to make a conscious effort to adjust to written language, since its characteristics are different from those of speech and they present a very different experience. The greater the gap between the spoken language of the child's social environment and that of the written word, the more pronounced the effort required.

Nevertheless, as many teachers know, students who first have the opportunity to explore their ideas and experiences verbally will very often afterwards find it easier to express them in writing. Theories of reading have moved in a similar direction: Halliday, for example, asserts that reading-readiness may be associated with social and functional factors⁽³⁵⁾.

Conversation appears to be the ideal basis for all learning, but especially for the development of language. This stress on development of language skills in a social context again lends support to the view that an ideal learning environment would be one which facilitated social and communicative links between individuals.

The reorientation in the teacher/student relationship this implies would provide one means of creating such an environment. That it is successful in increasing confidence as well as developing in students the ability to take a greater part in the community is evidenced by the sample in the Charnley and Jones study. That this is a more general phenomenon is suggested by the outcome of an FEU experiment with learner-centredness, where teachers reported "increased learning-potential in their students"⁽³⁶⁾.

This issue will be discussed more fully in the next section.

Various studies have shown that although literacy is commonly viewed as neutral and the same thing for everyone, in reality it gains its definition from social class so that until a growth in self-confidence has taken place in students, significant development in literacy would be unlikely to occur⁽³⁷⁾. In the case of the ILEA target-group, representing "the emergent adult"⁽³⁸⁾, willingness to move into the adult world would be an additional factor.

The importance of a growth in self-confidence as a pre-requisite of learning was very evident in the mismatch revealed by the Charnley and Jones study between tutor expectations of student deficiency and the students' actual learning-behaviour. Student learning-behaviour demonstrated an important link between success in learning and self-image, as related to social class. A person who wanted to develop a full range of literacy skills was one who recognised his or her "marginality" in society and desired to move into a more central position, which required a change of social grouping. His or her learning was reflected in a gain in self-esteem, which led to improved social and personal relationships as well as an increased involvement in the community. This development was more marked than any gain made in literacy skills. This study investigated students after two years' tuition and it is possible that further research at a later date may reveal a greater learning-gain; however, it would seem unlikely that it would negate this fundamental point.

A potential result of this reorientation would be a closer and more democratic relationship between teacher and student, as well as between students themselves. Indeed, this may be the most fruitful aspect of the learning:

"It seems that the greatest gain comes from the act of sharing rather than the skill," and:

"Whether a student acquired confidence or not depended upon the warmth of the tutor's personality"⁽³⁹⁾.

One of the important factors was the recognition in teachers of their students as human beings with a range of problems, one of which happened to be literacy.

Another was the recognition of the social and psychological implications for adult literacy students of their desire to become literate. This represented a readiness to move from a safe, familiar culture into a new one which was not clearly perceived: "The delicacy and the paramount importance of the teacher-student relationship [in facilitating the crossing-over] is clear enough"⁽⁴⁰⁾. Group solidarity amongst the students was also observed to be important, both for morale and for the development of autonomy.

The high potential for educational growth through strong encouragement is suggested by evidence from the Kirkelees paired reading scheme, which was "designed to give parents things to do that are incompatible with being critical". The scheme, which also employed peer tutoring, highlighted the way these children displayed a strong grasp of the importance of praise in that they "enjoyed writing positive things on the report card". This heavy emphasis upon encouragement was regarded as one of the two major factors behind the scheme's "impressive results". (The other was fun⁽⁴¹⁾). So the power of suggestion and the implications for the use of praise and encouragement with students should not be underestimated.

It would also seem self-evident that language can only exist in the context of relationships, the negotiation of meaning forming the basis of these. The development of language within the context of a positive and growing relationship between tutor and student is therefore likely to result in an optimum growth in language skills. That is, the relationship itself may provide the learning-context and meaning, particularly for people whose sense of success may have traditionally centred heavily upon their interaction with others. (Eg women with families, students of both sexes from large families, working-class/black communities.) This might help to explain the Charnley and Jones data showing improved family relationships as well as an increased willingness to participate in the community. Investigation was not made of students' oral development, but it is interesting to speculate that an advance in spoken-language skills may have underlain these advances and that further research might reveal a follow-on growth in written skills. The increase of confidence

may have been both a cause and a result of heightened oral skills. If this is so, the interaction between teacher and student is of fundamental importance.

The probability that this is the case is further strengthened by Charnley and Jones' conclusion that "students sense the need for counselling as the most important ingredient in adjusting their self-image"⁽⁴²⁾.

Curriculum Development

Introduction

The challenge, then, is to provide an environment which frees students' linguistic potential in order to develop it⁽⁴³⁾.

James Brittain emphasises the educative value of informal, personal talk and shows how this can reinforce personal involvement in learning⁽⁴⁴⁾. In Douglas Barnes' view:

"It is when the pupil is required to use language to grapple with new experience or to order old experience in a new way that he is most likely to find it necessary to use language differently. And this will be very different from taking over someone else's language in external imitation of its forms: on the contrary, it is the first step towards new patterns of thinking and feeling, new ways of representing reality to himself."

He also shows how the teacher's own use of language can help to create a suitably encouraging environment. For disadvantaged students there is a vicious downward spiral: the slighter the linguistic skill the harder it is to acquire knowledge and the less the knowledge the less meaningful language will be.

A further development in linguistic theory⁽⁴⁵⁾ has brought to birth a new definition of language-acquisition as the achievement of an individual in performance. In clarifying a point over which there has been lengthy debate, this would seem to confirm the validity of the movement by language-teachers since the 1960s away from a subject-centred curriculum towards more learner-focused methodologies. This is known as the Communicative approach to language-teaching. The implication that language-learning occurs most

effectively by osmosis rather than through the development of an underlying theoretical framework⁽⁴⁶⁾ suggests the disadvantages under which students and more particularly those who learned slowly in any case may have been labouring in the past. It also supports many of the assumptions behind the design of the ILEA curriculum framework and its siblings in modern Communications teaching.

In recent years, in SLA, linguists have concentrated upon the design of syllabuses, neglecting to consider the role of methodology in learning⁽⁴⁷⁾. This has created inconsistencies in the classroom, since language-teachers have been increasingly moving towards Communicative approaches as a result of a concern with teaching-methods. The integrative effect of a student-centred curriculum would provide a solution to this disjointedness since it necessitates a consideration of method:

" all the elements are in interaction and each may influence the other. Objectives may be modified, altered or added to during the teaching-learning process."⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Recent formulations in linguistic theory focusing upon SLA have concerned "the importance of the negotiation of meaning as a stimulus to language development" and "the belief that language development can occur through means other than by sequential, step-by-step processing"⁽⁴⁹⁾. From this debate have sprung the notions of "comprehensible-input"⁽⁵⁰⁾ and "comprehensible output" and, whilst the relative importance of these two concepts is as yet unclear, it is also suggested that students need opportunities to negotiate meaning in order to render it fully comprehensible to themselves⁽⁵¹⁾.

Additional evidence of the growing recognition of the effectiveness of learner-centredness (as well as the importance of an approach to writing via oracy) appears in a new emphasis upon listening and speaking in the development of language in primary-age children: "Childrens' ideas, by implication, become central, as do their individual needs"⁽⁵²⁾. Even at the nursery level it has been shown that a learner-centred approach is essential if children are to develop socially as well as academically. With a teacher-directed style, "the children

learn that a large and powerful person tells them to do something, then they can stop"⁽⁵³⁾. The Cockcroft Report's recommendations on Mathematics teaching also called for pupils "to have more autonomy in directing their own enquiries, with the teacher managing and directing their learning":

" the subject can only be learned by involving students in experimenting, questioning, reflecting, intervening and discussing"⁽⁵⁴⁾.

The moral desirability of a learner-centred curriculum is also clear:

" one of the fundamental principles underlying the notion of permanent education is that education should develop in individuals the capacity to control their own destiny this means that programmes should be constructed around learners' needs and that learners should exercise their own responsibility in the choice of learning-objectives, content and methods as well as in determining the means used to assess their performance"⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Added to the educational and values-oriented arguments of a learner-centred curriculum is the practical recognition of the need to develop a flexible, thinking workforce to serve the economy of the 1990s. An EC conference dedicated to the question of vocational training asserted the need for young people to be "active agents" rather than "passive recipients" in the process of educational guidance with the implication that they needed counselling rather than advice and "self-assessment and the use of self-help techniques to encourage independence and initiative"⁽⁵⁶⁾.

The implications of this change are profound for both parties, and particularly since research suggests that "too little emphasis has been placed on the need to understand the highly individual ways in which people come to learn"⁽⁵⁷⁾. In this respect, the ILEA philosophy, successful in having introduced the important notion of student-autonomy, would severely limit students' ability to explore and negotiate their learning-agenda by placing emphasis upon a work-related curriculum. This point is more fully developed in the next section.

Additionally, it is not yet known how far further education in general has developed an awareness of these kinds of needs and set about maximising the relatively short time students spend in colleges by creating an optimum learning-environment to meet them.

Small-Group Work

For the purposes of developing in students some of the desired characteristics already mentioned, small-group work, it has been argued, provides important learning-experiences:

"Group work provides an environment in which learners can comprehend, it gives them opportunities for production and it provides contexts within which meaning can be negotiated"⁽⁵⁸⁾.

Research into second-language learner talk in pairs⁽⁵⁹⁾ established that they talked more in partnership with each other than with a native speaker and that linking learners with different proficiency levels resulted in an increased negotiation of meaning.

Group-work also increases motivation, creates a positive affective climate, allows more individual teaching and increases opportunities for using language⁽⁶⁰⁾.

These arguments would seem to have equal validity for students whose own native language as experienced in most educational institutions has more than a flavour of the foreign about it as far as they are concerned.

Further, Charnley and Jones found that implicit in intensive one-to-one teaching was the strong dependency it created in students, and: "perhaps the most important enactive achievement was to move from a solely student/tutor relationship to a group situation"⁽⁶¹⁾. And indeed it was only within the context of strong student relationships in addition to the tutor-student link that the major advances in confidence were made.

This particularly validates the ILEA emphasis upon the use of small group-work in Communications workshops, but also has implications for the overall staff-student ratio.

A sensible balance must nevertheless be maintained between private and collaborative thought, since it would be a mistake to neglect: "the silent, secret processes of comprehension, reasoning and creativity in all of us. Reflection and imagination, the real parents of creativity may sometimes prove more fertile in quiet, internal privacy"⁽⁶²⁾.

The Students' Needs

The Ideology of the Learning-Context

ILEA's conception of the four elements essential to drive students through the curriculum took into account the importance of self-image in creating motivation. The notions of "context, work, skill and autonomy" were to move the student towards greater maturity, work-readiness and "the ability consciously to control a situation without dependence upon an intermediary to perform for him". It was felt that the relevance of work as a goal would be readily apparent to the student:

"If all the activities on a course have a clear reference to the stated objectives of that course, then the individual parts derive their meaning and importance from the overall context"⁽⁶³⁾.

Thus, the base ingredient of work-experience in the then ILEA's plan would help to "create a context of common experience that [could] begin to produce at least proximate meanings for both the teacher and learner"⁽⁶⁴⁾ and thus narrow the gap between the linguistic and perceptual contexts in which each was operating. There are recorded examples of student-teacher interaction⁽⁶⁵⁾ which show how student language becomes richer in response to an opportunity to draw on their own background knowledge and this would seem additionally to testify to the validity of the ILEA approach.

The intent clearly delineated in *Transition and Access* was to place a heavy emphasis upon skills development using material related to citizenship or

vocational concerns. Although the language-skills necessary to their target-group were seen as those related to "the student as student, the student as worker, the student as citizen" which, it was thought, would provide the individual with "an education in the round", since "Priority was attached to survival on the course of a substantial number of students whose skills were inadequate, the curriculum development emphasis was upon the student as student." Noticeably missing from the definition of a "rounded education" for students is the student as person. The fact is justified thus:

"It must be stressed that this does not represent a reduction in the importance of personal development It does not aim to meet all learning needs, only those that are crucial at this particular stage of the young person's life"⁽⁶⁶⁾.

In a situation where, particularly without encouragement to develop a long-term perspective, the majority of the target-group would be unlikely to return to education at a later date, work-related development would represent the final educational experience of this group of students. This seems surprising in a context where they are described as:

" these young people, fluent indeed on matters of relatively small consequence, but even now after a period of further education often inarticulate, even incoherent, about their more private hopes and aspirations for themselves"⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Further, as has been noted, self-confidence was established by the Charnley and Jones study as the primary criterion of success, and as tutors in their sample understood this, "the 'training' as distinct from the 'education' element in the total process tended to diminish in importance and the skills occupied a place lower down the scale of criteria". These researchers also concluded that students came to literacy classes for much the same reasons they attended adult education classes a whole and that it was therefore necessary to view client need in this light. There is support for this view elsewhere:

"There is a risk that functional literacy will supply the economy with individuals tailor-made to fit specific job-requirements instead of enabling people to understand, control and dominate progress"⁽⁶⁸⁾.

Moreover, the gain in skills made by the adult literacy sample during their two-year period of study was too slight to improve significantly performance at work or an individual's job-prospects. There is also the danger that where there are work-practices which "in no way call for the critical use of literacy skills [and this may] result in whatever skills people once had being extinguished".⁽⁶⁹⁾ Indeed, this situation has proved strongly inhibiting in their initial acquisition⁽⁷⁰⁾ and

"A crucial lesson from EWLP seems to be the need to avoid viewing or designing literacy as an overwhelmingly technical solution to problems that are only partly technical"⁽⁷¹⁾.

This is because "The problems are human, cultural and moral as much as technical or economic." At the same time, the alternative approach, through General Purpose English courses which attempt to provide students with a general background from which to draw, are based upon a concept that has neither been clearly defined as yet nor researched for effectiveness⁽⁷²⁾.

For the time being at least, therefore, the context must not be predetermined but chosen by the learners themselves, who are in a unique position from an experiential point of view to postulate the conditions most helpful to their learning⁽⁷³⁾:

"In the interpretation of their perceptions as recorded by research the evaluation of success in the acquisition of literacy must begin with the objectives perceived and formulated by the students, and not with externally imposed standards and purposes." The exploration contingent upon this decision-making would be an important constituent in the process in its own right⁽⁷⁴⁾.

It therefore seems essential that students develop their linguistic skills within a broader context of need than simply the vocational, particularly since greater breadth would be likely to expose them to a richer experience of language used in a greater variety of ways.

In the light of these arguments, the then ILEA's decision to place a strong vocational element at the centre of its strategy poses questions which this study is in part designed to address. In drawing an evidently tenuous link between lack of literacy skills and young people's unreadiness for work, the rationale for Communications workshops may be confusing two separate problems with potentially different solutions.

This debate also gives rise to the wider question of whether the IIEA view, which lies at the heart of much communication teaching, has also informed the activities of workshops outside ILEA.

Negotiation of the Learning-Agenda

In designing a curriculum for the Australian Adult Migrant Education Programme, Ingram delineated his philosophy thus:

"Rather than being an arbitrary academic exercise, the course followed should be responsive to the learner's needs emanating from his stage of language-development and his personal interests and aspirations. Thence, it must capitalise on the learner's natural and acquired learning-strategies and ensure, through community involvement, that any bridge between the learner and the community is bridged and any sense of undesirable alienation is reduced"⁽⁷⁵⁾.

This justification for a student-centred approach is as relevant to the various kinds of literacy students in the UK in their sense of "marginality" and their need to move more fully into the community in their different ways⁽⁷⁶⁾. Also present is the notion that there is a learning-agenda within everyone and that encouragement is all that is required to activate it⁽⁷⁷⁾. The practical effectiveness of the approach has also been established in the evidence that learning must initially take place within a student's own subculture, and that his or her

demands may lie strictly within its limits. Progress would therefore not be even across the range of possible skills, but would reflect individual requirements⁽⁷⁸⁾.

The slow progress made by adult literacy students illustrates the additional realism of the argument that, "given the constraints of most learning-contexts, it is impossible to teach learners everything they need to know in class In consequence, other aims will relate to the teaching of learning-skills"⁽⁷⁹⁾. This would include establishing their own priorities. The need to optimise the use of limited time is an additional reason for concentrating on skills students themselves are most eager to acquire as is the likely enhancement of motivation.

Within the adult literacy schemes, negotiation was an informal, fairly intuitive activity. In the ILEA curriculum model, negotiation was regarded as a central means of motivating students, and more consciously present. It was also to take place within a strictly limited field:

"The overall context of the course has to be agreed with the learner and accepted by him"⁽⁸⁰⁾.

Its main function was to enable the evolution of autonomy which, in its implications for increased maturity, was to be the primary aim of the workshop approach.

This would require a relinquishing of power on the part of the teacher, whose role would be to support the student in becoming more proactive, and "to help the student to order his experiences".

"As progress is made, the agenda lengthens through collaborative activity with his teacher, he learns to establish his own priorities and modes of achieving them"⁽⁸¹⁾.

This change in orientation would place many new demands upon teachers who have previously taught in a traditional way, not the least in answer to the question:

"Where is the balance between the student-control and teaching to be struck? Where and how can the students' learning be more autonomous?"⁽⁸²⁾

Given the volunteer tutors' adaptability and evidence that, whatever the prevailing educational and curricular theories, teachers adopted a "commonsense" approach in the classroom⁽⁸³⁾, it would seem likely that where negotiation occurs, the teacher would go through as profound a learning-experience as that anticipated for students. Indeed, the organic nature of a curriculum with continuous evaluation, as against the 'ballistic' model with end-on evaluation, is one of the arguments presented by curriculum development theorists for its adoption⁽⁸⁴⁾. Negotiation also offers teachers an opportunity to introduce and accustom students to non-traditional methods of learning to which they may be resistant⁽⁸⁵⁾.

The sum total of these issues highlights negotiation as being of key importance in the hierarchy of learner-centred issues. However, there is evidence that students do not readily adapt to the notion of adopting a more proactive role in their learning and that in this there is a mismatch between student and teacher opinion as to its value. Teachers themselves are dubious as to students' potential for autonomy in some respects⁽⁸⁶⁾. Neither is a state of autonomy easy to achieve⁽⁸⁷⁾. The dangers have been clearly recognised:

"A learner who arrives too soon and unready at the stage of student-controlled learning may not perceive his own needs accurately, may make bad choices in selecting the sources of his learning, may have inadequate standards to monitor his own performance and end up disappointed by not achieving his objectives"⁽⁸⁸⁾.

For this reason, it would be necessary to adopt a curriculum model aiming to promote dual skills: those related to language and those associated with learning. In the development of both, negotiation would play a vital role.

Conclusion

The requirement is for "a flexible learning-environment within which the needs of students at various levels of attainment and ability might well be met"⁽⁸⁹⁾ and an ideal learning-environment would be likely to be one which:

- i) was physically organised so as to encourage communication⁽⁹⁰⁾;
- ii) encouraged the intimacy of small group work⁽⁹¹⁾;
- iii) fostered less formal relationships between students and teachers, facilitating conversation⁽⁹²⁾;
- iv) made provision for the learning-agenda to be negotiated with the student so that s/he was fully aware of the criteria for success, having been instrumental in deciding what they should be;
- v) allowed students periods of time without the teacher so they could establish their own group identity and interact with each other⁽⁹³⁾;
- vi) provided a wide range of linguistic tasks and experiences⁽⁹⁴⁾;
- vii) enabled language to be taught in the context of the whole educational experience.

THE STUDY

Recent theoretical debate clearly indicates the need for a learner-centred context in which to enhance students' language acquisition and refers to a variety of possible methods by which this might be achieved. Further, the Chandlers and Jones study of the early stages of ALBSU's adult literacy scheme provides an analysis of a particular way in which the problems were approached and the effects of that system upon the clientele. Moreover, a strong case has been made by the now abolished ILEA for the implementation of such methods in the learning of low-achieving students in Further Education. What is missing from the picture is information concerning the nature and effectiveness of the

response made by the Inner London Colleges to the ILEA initiative and, if at all, how far and how successfully the issues have been recognised and addressed in the wider context of further education as a whole. This study is designed to fill that information gap.

The ILEA development, based on a particular set of assumptions, and seen in the light of the findings concerning adult literacy students, gives rise to a range of specific questions which no study in Further Education has so far investigated. These are:

- 1 Who are the wider workshop clientele and how accurately does *Transition and Access* describe them and define their needs?
- 2 How do these students perceive their own needs?
- 3 How do their (various) teachers define their needs?
- 4 Are workshop goals truly relevant to these?
- 5 Are workshop methods effective?
- 6 How far have the ideas developed within ILEA been disseminated and put into practice more widely within Further Education?
- 7 What suitable staff development is available to promote the use and effectiveness of workshops?
- 8 What managerial and political support do workshops command?

The means of investigation are described in the next chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

- 1 Bullock A, *A Language for Life*, HMSO, London, 1975, ch.2, para.2.2.
- 1(a) A further illustration of this point appears in the ALRA/ALBSU estimate that in 1975 there were 2,000,000 people with self-defined literacy needs and by 1990 this estimate had risen to 7/9,000,000. Reported at a local conference in Tamworth, 16.3.91 by Mr Ivor Davies, Staffordshire Co-ordinator for Adult Basic Education.
- 2 See, for example, "Language and Literacy in a Clothing Skills Training Workshop", Tower Hamlets Training Forum, and "Basic Education in Further Education Craft Courses", Thames College of Technology, in *Special Development Projects Report*, ALBSU, London, November 1984. See also *Basic Skill and Unemployed Adults: a Report on ALBSU/MSD Demonstration Projects*, ALBSU, London, March 1987.
- 3 *Language Performance in Schools*, APU, HMSO, London, 1983.
- 4 Simonite, V., *Literacy, Numeracy and Adults, Evidence from The Child Development Study*, ALBSU, London, 1983.
- 5 *A New Training Initiative*, Government White Paper, HMSO, London, 1981.
- 6 *Education and Training for Young People*, Government White Paper, HMSO, London, April 1985.
- 7 See "Harrow and Barnet Top the GCE Table", *TES*, no. 3585, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 1st March 1985: 22% of school leavers from maintained schools pass 5 'O' levels or more.
- 8 Limage, L. J., "Adult Literacy Policy and Provision in an age of Austerity", *Education*, Vol 32, No 4, 1986.

- 9 *Identification and Assessment of Basic Skill Needs: Psychological Survey Report No 257/S*, MSC, 1987. Unpublished Manpower Services Commission evidence, and research carried out by Lancaster University, in a report for limited circulation only.
- 10 Vora, K., "Shame of Illiterate Millions", *European*, No. 0094, The European Ltd, London, February 27th March 24th, 1992, p.1.
This refers to the findings of an OECD report which states that "Several million people in the most advanced nations of Europe cannot read or write." It quotes the Head of the OECD Centre for Educational Research; "Unless more resources are devoted to the problem productivity increases that could be realised through technical advances will not be achieved."
- 11 *A million New Students. THE CHALLENGE FOR FE*, NATFHE, London, April 1990: "Commentators have made the link in recent years between our economic competitors' better performance and the continuance of their young people in education to 18."

See also, for example, "Shake-up for post-16 education", *The Independent*, 21.3.91.
- 12 Spencer, D., "Half UK's teenagers shun training", *TES* no. 3848, The Times Supplements Ltd., 30.3.90, p.A12.

NATFHE estimates that "at best 40% of 16 and 17 year-olds are now in full-time education and training." This compares with at least 80% for America, Japan and the Netherlands. See (11) para. 8, p.4.
- 13 See, for example, "Teenagers prepared to stay on for £3,000", *TES* no. 3855, The Times Supplements Ltd., 18.5.90, p.A2.
- 14 Austin-Ward, B., Portsmouth Polytechnic, *A Study of the Competence in Written English of 16 year old students in Further Education*, unpublished PH D thesis, University of London, 1980.

- 15 *Transition and Access: A Review of Further and Higher Education in London*, ILEA, FEU, London, 1981, p.8.
- 16 Charnley A. H. and Jones H. A., *The Concept of Success in Adult Literacy*, ALBSU, London, 1979.
- 17 Risman, A., "Adult Illiterate Students", 1975, in Jones, H.A. (Ed.), *Studies in Adult Education*, 7 (2), pp 142-149, quoted in (15) p.22. This refers to yet another group of students and not the Charnley and Jones sample.
- 18 Liverpool Project, 1976, Cited in (16), p.22.
- 19 UK part of the UNESCO Literacy Project, 1976, cited in (16), p.22.
- 20 See (15).
- 21 Brindley, G., *Needs Analysis And Objective Setting in the Adult Migrant Education Programme*, NSW Adult Migrant Education Service, Sydney, 1984, cited in Nunan, 1988, p.24.
- 22 See (14) p.22.
- 23 See Carroll, S., and McQuade, P., *The Voc. Prep. Manual*, Framework Press, Lancaster, 1984, pp 73-74, for a detailed analysis of the differences between traditional classroom teaching and the workshop approach.
- 24 Edwards and Giles, "Applications of the Social Psychology of Language: Sociolinguistics and Education". Ch. 6, in *Applied Sociolinguistics*, Ed. Trudgill, P., Academic Press, London, 1984.
- 25 Mobley, M., *Making Ourselves Clearer; readability in the GCSE*, SEC Working Paper 5, London, 1987.
- 26 Mahoney, M., *Student Achievement in Relation to Readability of Technical Examinations*, unpublished MSc, University of Surrey, 1977.

- 27 Barnes, D., "Talking to Learn" in *Language, the Learner and the School*, Barnes, D., Britten, J., and Rosen, H., and the L.A.T.E., Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969.
- 28 See (24).
- 29 "Pupils confound staff test forecasts", *TES* no. 3881, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16.11.90, p.6.
- 30 See (24).
- 31 See (16) p.66.
- 32 It should be added that a third of these volunteers were experienced teachers who were, presumably, perpetrating these errors in schoolrooms with no occasion for correction.
- 33 Hodge, B., (ed.) *Communication and the Teacher*, Longman, London, 1981.
- 34 Geoff Peel in *ibid.*
- 35 *Ibid.*
- 36 *Improving Teaching-Quality: A Learner-Led Approach*, FEU Bulletin, London, August 1987.
- 37 Lankshear, C., with Lawlor, M., *Literacy, Schooling and Revolution*, The Falmer Press, East Sussex, 1987.
- 38 See (15).
- 39 See (16).
- 40 *Ibid.*, p.26.

- 41 "More than a chit chat and a bun", *TES*, no. 3777, p.21, Times Newspapers Ltd., 18.11.88, p.21.
- 42 See (16), p.181.
- 43 "The teacher's task should not be to introduce a new set of linguistic forms, but to help his pupils to use language to organise experience in a new way." Barnes, D., in (27).
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Rae, P., "Language testing and the communicative language teaching curriculum," in Y.P. Lee, C.Y.Y. Fok, R. Lord and G. Low (eds), *New Directions in Language Testing*, Pergamon, Oxford, cited in (47).
Krashen 1978, cited in (47), p.33.
- 47 Nunan, D., *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988, p.17.
- 48 Nunan, D., *Language-Teaching Course Design: Trends and Issues*, National Curriculum Resource Centre, Adelaide, 1985, quoted in (47), p.17.
- 49 See (47), p.81.
- 50 Long, M., "Input, Interaction, and Second Language Acquisition in Winitz", H. (ed.), *New York Academy of Sciences*, New York, 1981, and Nicholas, H., "Interactive Strategies, "input" and "output"" *ATESOL 4th Summer School Proceedings: Volume 1, ATESOL*, Sidney, 1985, cited in (47), p.80.
- 51 Long, M.H., and Porter P., "Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition", *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 2, 1985 in *ibid*, p.83.
- 52 "Paying Attention", *TES* no 3824, Times Newspapers Ltd., 13.10.89, p.2.

- 53 Makins, V., "Good work, bad behaviour", *TES* no. 3643, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 25.4.86, p.13.
- 54 Nash, I., "LAMP shows up training needs", *TES* no. 3733, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 22.1.88.
- 55 Brindley, G. (1984) *Needs Analysis and Objective Setting in the Adult Migrant Education programme*, NSW Adult Migrant Education Service, Sydney. Cited in (47).
- 56 "Europe agrees to improve the route to work", *TES* no 3734, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 22.1.88.
- 57 *Improving Teaching-Quality: A Learner-Led Approach*, FEU Bulletin, London, August 1987. This refers to the work of Professor Hazel Francis, University of London Institute of Education.
- 58 See (51) p.83.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 See (16).
- 62 Ellwood, M., "Many hands can make heavy work", *TES* no. 3843, The Times Supplements Ltd., 23.2.90, p.31.
- 63 See (15).
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 See (47), p.107.
- 66 See (15), p.19.

- 67 Ibid, p.2.
- 69 Salame, N., *The Experimental World Literacy Programme*, UNESCO Paris and London, 1976, cited in (16).
- 70 See (16), p.15.
- 71 See (68).
- 72 See (47).
- 73 See (16).
- 75 Ingram, D. *Methodology*, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Canberra, 1981, quoted in (47).
- 76 See (16).
- 77 See (15).
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 See (15), p.18.
- 81 Ibid, p.23.
- 82 Ibid, p.24.
- 83 See (46).
- 84 Ibid.
- 85 Ibid.

86 Ibid.

87 See (16).

88 See (15), p.23.

89 Ibid.

90 See (33).

91 See (27).

92 See (33).

93 See (27).

94 See (33).

CHAPTER THREE

THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITY

The Initial Survey

Follow-up Activity

Pilot Interviews

DESIGN OF THE INTERVIEW-SCHEDULES

Introduction

The Workshop Tutors' Schedule

Introduction

Changes Made as a Result of the Trial Interviews

Supplementary Questions

Amendments to Questions

Means of Assessing the Results

Schedule for Non-Workshop Tutors

The Pilot Interviews

Schedule for Students

The Pilot Interviews

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Introduction

The Instruments

Changes Made as a Result of the Trials

ANALYSIS OF TEACHING MATERIALS

THE ROOM CHECKLIST

THE SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THE LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

CHAPTER THREE

THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

"Objectivity means that the conclusions arrived at as the result of inquiry and investigation are independent of the race, colour, creed, occupation, nationality, religion, moral preference and political predispositions of the investigator. If his research is truly objective, it is independent of any subjective elements, any personal desires, that he may have." (Robert Bierstedt.)

"An investigator's values influence not only the problems he selects for study but also his methods for studying them and the sources of data he uses." (Derek Phillips.)⁽¹⁾

These two statements sum up the basis of the current debate within sociology concerning fundamental principles associated with research and hence the essence of the difficulties facing any researcher into social or educational issues.

Whilst considering methodology it was therefore necessary to bear in mind the doubts of many sociologists concerning the possibility of collecting valid data at all, to attempt to avoid some of the more obvious traps associated with the different approaches and to perceive the resulting information in the light of the limitations associated with it.

Each method was carefully selected for its appropriateness to the kinds of data being sought. Structured interviews were used as a means of obtaining detailed information concerning the organisation of workshops, but were also a means of ascertaining opinion upon a range of related issues. The main reason for their selection was in the uniformity they imposed upon the information-gathering from a large number of subjects in several institutions. Interview schedules were also felt to be the most efficient way of organising a potentially very large and unmanageable body of information. The discipline imposed by a carefully devised set of questions was felt to be a further advantage, since

time-management would also be a significant issue when dealing with so many subjects spread over several institutions.

Surveys were felt to be the most appropriate way of establishing background information of a less detailed kind, where a large number of institutions were to be contacted and it was neither practicable nor necessary to interview individuals.

Two instruments were employed for the purpose of classroom observation. One was *Flanders' Interaction Analysis* which was used in order to gain a view of the degree of autonomy allowed to students by the teacher's verbal interactions. The other, *Categories for Student Observational Form: Individually prescribed Instruction* by C. M. Lindvall, J. L. Yeager, M. Wang and C. Wood, provided a set of categories into which individual student-activity falls, allowing the collection of data concerning the nature and range of the activities in which students were engaged. Direct observation was used to supplement this information. It was felt that these instruments were the most useful way of obtaining the facts of what actually occurred in the classroom since they provided a framework for the collection of information concerning two key areas relevant to this study. Their particular usefulness was in the way they supplemented and complemented each other.

A grid was devised for the scrutiny of teaching-materials. This was felt to be a suitable way of categorising the different kinds of written handouts given to students in order to establish the range of linguistic tasks and experiences they encountered and to compare those experiences across colleges. The aim was to minimise the degree of subjectivity involved in this activity by structuring it as much as possible.

A simple checklist was used to establish a tally of the equipment in each workshop as this was felt to be a suitable means of recording the necessary information in a consistent way. All these methods are discussed more fully later in the chapter.

The various research methods were selected for their appropriateness to the particular task in hand and also, since there is no one definitive method of collecting information, a mixture of approaches was employed in order to try to build a rounded picture and to try to overcome the limitations of each one as far as this was possible.

For example, teaching materials were scrutinised in their own right and in order to assess how far they bore out interview-data and to round out the view of the students' learning-experience.

In an attempt at objectivity, structured interviews were employed although the researcher was aware that the questions in each reflected previous experience of her own particular workshop and interaction with the various personnel associated in some way with it in her own college. Choice of one of the categories of interviewee was based on the view that student-centred education was likely to be the most effective kind and that student opinion should therefore have an important bearing on provision. Selection of a second came from the opinion of some colleagues that craft teachers were largely unsympathetic to what they were trying to achieve with students although they played an influential role in directing their educational processes and so it was felt appropriate to attempt to test this belief. Since it was felt that the nature of the problem under investigation justified a limitation of the study to those with direct and current experience of workshops, the final category of interviewee was to constitute the workshop manager and an assistant teacher.

In an effort to be thorough, since "taking this inside view makes it easier to avoid structuring the material in ways that might be alien to the material itself"⁽²⁾, the use of participatory observation was considered. It was felt that this approach would provide a useful check in the classroom upon assumptions made in selecting the questions as well as upon the responses to them. This would have closely involved the observer in the students' classroom activity, providing the opportunity for informal interaction with the subjects and a submersion in their learning-experiences. Indeed, the contribution of participatory observation might most valuably have been as a prelude to the

development of the interview-schedules, providing wider experience and broad data from which material for questions might have been drawn. According to M Haralambos⁽³⁾, the value of participatory observation

"is seen to lie in providing useful insights which can then be tested on larger samples using more rigorous and systematic methods."

However, the results of participatory observation are difficult to quantify and are, in the opinion of some sociologists, suspect for this reason. Therefore two observational instruments were chosen to counter this disadvantage. Unfortunately, the activity involved in their administration precluded the possibility of participation in the sessions being observed. So the conflicting requirements of systematically collected data and a totally receptive approach towards the object of research were resolved in favour of a systematic approach⁽⁴⁾.

Moreover, workshops selected for study were scattered over a considerable geographical distance which, although essential (the reasons for this are discussed under "Preliminary Investigation") made it impossible to visit often enough or long enough to employ such a thorough approach - and the researcher's intimate knowledge of one workshop was a great advantage, despite the latent dangers in the presence of preconceived ideas. So the use of the instruments mentioned above was supplemented by direct observation in order to include additional information and to provide a context for its interpretation.

Constraints of time, money and distance therefore had some influence upon research methods and the variety of approaches adopted attempted both to combine the advantages of each and to balance the ideal with practical necessity.

Debate amongst sociologists concerning the relationship of the researcher with his/her material also raises the question of the role he/she plays in obtaining the answers from respondents and it has been noted that this may be considerable. Haralambos refers to the example of studies upon young black people by Alan

Williams Junior in North Carolina in the 1960s, in which it was discovered that the greater the social difference between the researcher and the interviewee the less likely the latter was to give an honest response. This may have been further complicated by racial differences. A study carried out on alcoholics by Stuart Rice in 1914 highlighted the way in which interviewers may unintentionally "lead" the respondent by a display of opinion on their part.

The role the researcher adopted, particularly with students, would therefore be crucial. Careful attention was paid to the language of the student interview-schedule, although the researcher is very much without support in this respect. As Haralambos points out, "Little systematic research has been directed to the effects of the language in which questionnaires are phrased and interviews conducted." As far as possible the schedule was written in terms that were likely to be congenial to a wide ability- and age-range and to the need for an informal, non-threatening setting in which the presence of a tape-recorder would not present problems. Further, the researcher decided to introduce herself as a mature student carrying out a "project" and to dress accordingly, eradicating all conscious traces of her self as teacher. There would be small variations in the presentation of the questions in order to respond to the subjects as individuals and to retain a sense of spontaneity.

A detailed description of the research's design follows.

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITY

The Initial Survey

An initial survey of all colleges in England and Wales (a total of 304) was carried out during May and June 1985 to determine the extent of workshop development and to find suitable colleges for research.

This was followed up by a second letter in the Autumn of 1985 to those who did not initially respond. (See Appendix A).

Follow-up Activity

The Curriculum Development Base at Westminster College was afterwards visited in order to gain further information about the suitability of various ILEA colleges who had responded.

Extensive preparatory visits were then made to colleges thought to be appropriate for the purpose and tutors in charge of workshops informally interviewed in order to ascertain their willingness to help and to gain their cooperation. In the selection, consideration was given to the desirability of seeking out workshops with differing circumstances, notably in the size of the workshop and geographical region, as well as to the value of finding a college with a particularly innovative approach, to provide a means of comparison. Moreover, since ILEA Communications workshops are seminal, it was intended to select four ILEA and four non-ILEA colleges in order to compare their approaches.

Pilot Interviews

Interview- and information-seeking schedules having been drawn up as described below, timed trial interviews were then carried out and recorded in the researcher's own college and corrections and amendments made. The main purpose of the trials was to establish the effectiveness of the wording of questions in eliciting clear replies; the pilots were also timed. Because of its length and greater importance the Workshop Tutors' Interview Schedule was tested on three members of staff; the others were tested on one subject each.

In the trials of the Workshop Tutors' Schedule, the first led to fairly substantial amendments and a second to fine-tuning. Both the non-workshop tutors' and the students' schedules were also amended in order to improve the efficiency of some of the questions. The details appear in the account of the design-process, below.

Trial classroom observations were also carried out, in order to ensure familiarity and basic competence with the two instruments to be used.

DESIGN OF THE INTERVIEW-SCHEDULES

For copies of these, see Appendices B, C and D.

Introduction

The purpose of these interview schedules was to elicit information and opinion from the different perspectives of workshop tutors, tutors in other subjects who might refer students to the workshop and from students themselves.

They were designed to collect a mixture of fact and opinion and in order to attempt to overcome the problem of subjectivity in interpreting data, pre-coded questions were used and supplemented with some that were more open-ended, thus allowing the interviewee to develop a fuller response. There was also a final totally open question in each case to collect any possible information which might have been otherwise overlooked. In this way it was hoped to obtain a core of quantifiable data while also allowing for subtle differences in response, as well as for the unforeseen. It was hoped that this would combine the advantages of structure with those of flexibility ("The greater flexibility of unstructured interviews may strengthen the validity of the data"⁽⁵⁾).

This would also seem to cover the circumstances mentioned by William Ford Whyte⁽⁶⁾ in his argument for the superiority of participatory observation:

"As I sat and listened I learnt the answers to questions I would not have had the sense to ask if I had been getting my information solely on an interviewing basis."

It would also, it was felt, go some way to dealing with the requirement cited by Liebow⁽⁷⁾ who was also advocating direct observation:

" there were by design no firm presumptions of what was or was not relevant."

It was thought that this aim would also be furthered by a trial run of the schedules, creating the opportunity to amend questions in line with unforeseen responses. (See below).

Questions put to different categories of respondent were also overlapped, in order to try to assess the veracity of the replies. Bruce Dohrenwend's study⁽⁸⁾ of the relationship of mental health and ethnicity highlighted the problems associated with "the social desirability of items in a questionnaire" and suggests that the respondent's desire to appear in a favourable light may influence his or her replies.

For example, the Workshop Tutors' Schedule, qu. 4(a), Students' Schedule qu. 8 and 9 and Tutors in Other Subjects' Schedule, qu. 5, 6 and 8 were designed to assess attitudinal similarities and differences. The schedule for tutors in other subjects, qu. 9-14 and that for workshop tutors, qu. 3(d), (e), 4(b) (ix), (h) and (i) all overlap, partially in order to ascertain the degree of consensus over apparently factual information.

The questions were drawn up on the basis of the information-needs of the researcher arising from the different demands being made by the new kinds of clientele coming into Further Education. (See Chapter Two). For many of these questions authority was afterwards found in *Transition and Access*⁽⁹⁾ and the discussion in this document was subsequently used to improve and develop the original questions, particularly those put to the workshop tutors.

The schedules were devised so that answers could be directly recorded upon them.

The Workshop Tutors' Schedule

(See Appendix B)

Introduction

The purpose of the workshop tutors' interview schedule was to ascertain information concerning teachers' views and practices concerning issues related to recruitment, organisation, pastoral care, teaching materials and strategies, as well as curriculum and staff development. In particular it sought to elicit information concerning:

- (i) the extent to which tutors used small group-work,
- (ii) their view of its strengths and weaknesses,

- (iii) their strategies for creating informal relationships in the workshop and encouraging student interaction,
- (iv) the level of student autonomy and the means of creating it.

The issues of recruitment, organisation, pastoral care, teaching materials and teaching-strategies provided the six main categories into which the questions fell. Thoroughness was a major consideration in constructing the questions, which were devised to allow detailed probing of wide areas of interest. It was felt necessary to collect very full information in order to avoid the imposition of a strongly preconceived pattern upon the data. The intent was to draw out common themes, contrasts and items of particular interest afterwards.

The mixture of pre-coded and open-ended questions was devised in order to support the need for both precise, factual information and clear opinion on the one hand and as full an exploration of the issues as was practicable on the other. So Sections One (Recruitment), Three (Materials), Four (Teaching Strategies) and Seven (Staff Development) were largely devised to elicit factual information and generally comprise tight pre-coded questions with an invitation to expand a point where necessary. Two other sections, Two (Organisation) and Five (Curriculum Development) contain a higher number of open-ended questions which were devised to ascertain opinion on key issues and Section Six (Tutoring), although largely seeking factual data contained two important open-ended questions as well.

It was intended to interview the workshop manager in each college and one other teacher in order to obtain as balanced and consistent a sample as possible. It was also decided that the second interviewee in each case, if possible, would be someone who spent at least three-quarters of his/her teaching-time in the workshop and a full-time member of staff.

Changes Made as a Result of the Trial Interviews:

The categories into which the questions had been organised⁽¹⁰⁾ were rearranged in an order that was felt to be more logical⁽¹¹⁾ and might therefore facilitate the thinking of the interviewee.

Supplementary questions were added where the originals were shown to lack precision and new questions added in response to unforeseen statements made by interviewees. (See Introduction).

Supplementary Questions:

- (i) To: "Is attendance voluntary/compulsory?" was added: "If compulsory, do students resent this?" (Qu. 1(a)(iv)). The contradiction implicit in requiring attendance at a learner-centred event emerged during discussion concerning this question and was considered important enough to include in the research.
- (ii) To: "Is it timetabled to be (i) Open-access; (ii) A normal classroom; (iii) Other" was added a new category: "A drop-in Centre". (See qu. 2(d)). This was a type of workshop that had been overlooked in the initial construction of the schedule.
- (iii) To: "In what ways are the materials made relevant to the student; " was added a further category "linked to gender". (See qu. 3(d)(iv)). This was in response to one of the trial subjects, who considered this to be an important category in her own teaching materials.
- (iv) A response to qu. 3(d)(i): " are they (ie teaching materials) linked to vocational studies?" led to the addition of: "Do you seek help from teachers in vocational areas in order to devise vocationally relevant materials/tasks?" (See qu. 3(e)). This was a particularly relevant and constructive activity cited by one of the respondents and it was felt worthwhile to explore this further in the research.
- (v) To Section 4, concerning teaching strategies, was added a new question: "What do you consider to be your main priorities in developing your students' skills, eg (i) oracy; (ii) autonomy in learning; (iii) providing language-support; (iv) other? (See qu. 4(a)). This amendment came about as it became evident in the trial that there might be a mismatch between teachers' stated aims and their preferred teaching-methods.

- (vi) Following a response to "Are there opportunities for staff to go into non-workshop contexts to help students, eg " (4(h)) and "If Y was this done formally/informally" (4(i)) was added: "was it successful?" The initial omission of this was a simple oversight and the addition became part of qu. 4(i).

- (vii) To subquestion (iii) of qu. 6(b): "Do the workshop tutors take part in the personal counselling of the students Approximately what proportion of your time do you spend on it"; was added the choice of the categories: "More than you would in a normal classroom/less than/the same?" and (v), "Is the workshop an appropriate place for this work? If Y, why?" The first amendment was simply felt to improve the efficiency of the question. The second emerged as a result of an unforeseen response in the trial and was thought to be worth exploring further.

- (viii) To the section on staff development (Section 7) was added: "What resources are provided for the introduction of staff to the workshop policy?" (7(a)(iv)). A new qu. 7(e) was also added: "How would you like to see the provision improved?" Dissatisfactions were expressed by the trial respondents about the situation in their own college and it was felt appropriate to explore the possibility that others might hold similar views.

Amendments to Questions

- (i) The question: "Does the administrative and/or physical organisation of the college have any effect upon the ways in which the workshop operates?" became two questions, separating out the two elements and becoming 1(p) and (q). Qu. 1(p) "Does the administrative organisation of the College have any effect upon the ways in which the workshop operates?" then became qu. 2(q) (see above for the reorganisation of categories) and after a second trial was further amended to "Is the administrative organisation of the College sufficiently flexible to allow students to be referred from all areas?" This was in order to elicit a more efficient response.

- (ii) After the first trial the question: "Which of the following teaching-strategies do you regularly employ " became: "How often do you employ the following teaching-strategies" and a choice of categories added as follows: "Always/usually/often/sometimes/never." (See qu. 4(b)). This was intended to improve the efficiency of the question.
- (iii) Where these were shown not to allow an adequate range of responses, the categories for the closed questions were improved; for example, to question 1(h) (i): "What proportion of the students in the groups you teach could be said to fit into any of the following categories:(i) come from socially deprived areas and schools don't know/most/some few/none" was added "all".
- (iv) A degree of repetition was cut ie a reference to counselling in original qu. 3(e) (new 4(e): "Is a part of the workshop's role to be concerned with helping students with day-to-day problems, eg (ii) Counselling", which overlapped qu. 6(b)).

Following the second trial the categories used for closed questions throughout the interview-schedule were criticised by the interviewee, who felt that it was difficult to quantify responses in the way required and that they were an invitation to subjectivity.

This point was considered very carefully and it was decided that the encoding of this and other questions allowed for considerably less subjectivity than totally open-ended questions would have done and allowed comparisons to be made. It also imposed a control upon the interviewee, ensuring a degree of precision, relevance and succinctness that could not otherwise be guaranteed. It was felt that these categories would elicit the information required to provide the general picture that was being sought, particularly when checked against information gained through the other aspects of the research. Therefore this practice was retained, with minor amendments to categories where the trials showed this to be necessary. (See above).

In the trials, the workshop tutors' schedule proved to take a little over an hour to administer and this was seen to be a potential disadvantage, so the possibility of shortening it was considered. However, since there were also disadvantages in not retaining all the questions, it was decided to risk making a heavy demand upon the interviewees and, if necessary, make compromises in its use.

Means of Assessing the Results

In most cases, this was a simple matter of counting answers, but questions 4(a) and (b) required a different approach. In question 4(a) tutors were asked to mention a first, second and third priority and, in order to be able to quantify and so compare responses easily, a frequency chart was devised and the different priorities were given a mark of 1 to 3 according to where they rated in the teacher's list. Any that were rejected by the tutor rated a mark of 0. It was then possible to see, by observing which had the highest number of marks, which were the highest priorities overall. For obvious reasons, category (vi) "other" was not included in this.

A technique similar to that in 4(a) was employed in 4(b)⁽¹²⁾ in order to establish the teachers' ranking of the teaching-techniques mentioned. In this question each category of response denoting frequency of use was given a score as follows: "always": 5; "usually": 4; "often": 3; "sometimes": 2; "never": 1. A frequency-chart was then devised and the number of responses in each category multiplied by its allotted score.

In 4(c), ("Which do you feel to be the most useful strategies in fulfilling your priorities?") the number of times a priority was mentioned was simply counted up and the rank-order devised according to this.

Schedule for Non-Workshop Tutors

(See Appendix C)

Non-workshop tutors were to be selected for interview as far as possible in the following categories: those who taught students on Voc. Prep., YT, Craft, GCSE and "A" level courses. They were ideally to be staff who taught students

being interviewed in order to facilitate the cross-checking process that had been built into the research.

Questions put to such tutors sought to elicit their perceptions of the value of workshop teaching to their particular students and the extent to which they would support the work, either by referral or by active involvement. The questions were therefore largely opinion-seeking and several were completely open-ended. However, qu. 5, also opinion-seeking⁽¹³⁾, was carefully structured because its role in the interview schedule was fundamental and ability to make direct comparison of responses was considered to be essential.

The Pilot Interviews

After the trial interview, amendments were made as follows, in order to eliminate the need for repetition of questions and to make it easier for the interviewee to formulate a clear response:

- (i) With qu. 8, which read: "Which of the following aims do you think workshop staff should pursue?" (followed by 9 categories) was amalgamated the question "For which of those purposes would you be prepared to release students from your classes if this were necessary?: 1/3/4/5/6/7/8/9?" because the original format was cumbersome and involved a fairly lengthy reiteration of what had gone before.
- (ii) To qu. 9, which read: "Do you ever work closely with workshop staff or other English teachers for the following reasons (followed by 7 reasons) was added the categories: "usually/often/occasionally/never". This was intended to increase efficiency in the response.
- (iii) Following on from qu. 9 (as above) was added the question: "Is there any reason for cooperation that does not yet exist?" when the trial made it clear that the old qu. 10: "If not, would you be prepared to do so if asked?" made the possibly unjustifiable assumption that the respondent would not be likely to initiate such activity himself. Qu. 10 then became no. 11.

Schedule for Students

(See Appendix D)

In this, students were asked to explore their learning-experiences as they perceived them. They were also invited to compare and evaluate the teaching-strategies and quality of the learning-environment in relation to their other educational experiences, either past or current. Although this schedule had a far higher proportion of opinion-seeking questions than the two mentioned above, their structure was mostly formal in order to ensure relevance and clarity in the responses. This was done in order to allow for a potentially very wide ability-range in the respondents and to ensure comparability over a large number of subjects. The inherent danger of putting ideas into respondents' heads was recognised, but it was felt that in an interview situation it would be possible to observe this eventuality should it arise. Pragmatically, it seemed likely that a number of students would have failed to reflect in detail upon their educational experiences and that this kind of structure would provide a stimulus to do so and a framework for a response.

As with the tutors in other subjects, students were to be selected for interview as far as possible in the following way: those on craft courses like CIGLI Level One; those on CPVE, GCSE, "A" level and YTS. It was also felt desirable to select from a range of craft-courses and to select students who were taught by staff in the sample in order to facilitate the cross-checking process that has already been described.

The Pilot Interviews

- (i) In addition to some minor rewording, one of the changes made to this schedule was the addition of a new qu. 5 and 6: "Do you like the atmosphere in the workshop as much/more/less than the atmosphere in other kinds of lessons?" and "Do you feel you are getting on as well as/less well/better than in a normal classroom?" because it was felt that the students' responses to atmosphere were being inadequately explored. These questions were thought to provide a more appropriate emphasis upon two important possible reasons for employing the workshop approach.

- (ii) The other change made was the amalgamation of two questions, (Qu. 7 "What do you think are the main things you do in the workshop out of this list and qu. 8 "Which of these do you enjoy: A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L/M/N/O/P?") exactly as in the non-workshop tutors' schedule, (see (i)) for the sake of streamlining. These became new qu. 10, "What do you think are the main things you do in the workshop out of this list; which do you like and which dislike; why?"

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

(See Appendix E)

Introduction

The observations were carried out to obtain confirmation of the following:

- (i) Teachers' statements in the interview schedule concerning their strategies for creating an informal environment and their views concerning small group-work.
- (ii) Information provided by both teachers and students concerning the students' autonomy, ability to work unsupervised and group interaction.
- (iii) Information provided by teachers about the range of linguistic tasks and experiences offered to the students.

The methods used for this purpose were:

- (i) Direct observation.
- (ii) Categories for Student Observational Form: Individually Prescribed Instruction, by C M Lindvall, J L Yeager, M Wang, C Wood.
- (iii) Flanders' Interaction Analysis.

The Instruments

The characteristics of the instruments were as follows:

- (i) *Categories for student Observational Form: Individually prescribed Instruction by C. M. Lindvall, J. L. Yeager, M. Wang and C. Wood.*

This divided possible student activity in the classroom into five categories thus:

- (i) independent work,
- (ii) teacher-pupil work,
- (iii) non-instructional use of pupil time,
- (iv) pupil-pupil activity,
- (v) group activity.

Each of these was then further sub-divided. When a grid was drawn up against these categories to allow an analysis of a lesson it provided a convenient check-list by which to assess the level of student autonomy allowed by the teacher, the degree to which the students were able to respond to such an opportunity, their group interaction and the range of activities undertaken.

(ii) Flanders' Interaction Analysis

This allowed the observer to collect information concerning teachers' interaction with their students and was an aid in the assessment of the following:

- (i) the amount of talk in the lesson;
- (ii) the amount of teacher-talk;
- (iii) the amount of sustained pupil-talk;
- (iv) the amount of teacher-lecture;
- (v) the amount of pupil-initiated talk;
- (vi) the proportion of indirect to direct influence in the teaching.

Thus the instrument was valuable as a means of ascertaining the levels of informality and group interaction in the classroom, the degree to which student autonomy was encouraged in the teaching-style itself, and the extent to which

conversation was regarded as a means of developing students' linguistic skills. Its wide use in educational research and consequently its likely reliability was an added attraction.

Changes Made as a Result of the Trials

Experience gained from the trials confirmed the validity of the reasons for using these instruments in addition to the researcher's impressions (see above). A well-structured body of data was obtained from the trials which enabled easy comparison between colleges and the process also provided a helpful focus in a situation with potentially conflicting demands upon the researcher's attention.

The classroom trials also led to the decision that one minute was the most appropriate measure of classroom activity on the Lindvall grid.

The criterion for choosing classes for observation was that they should be those of staff taking part in interviews in order to facilitate the checking process that was built into the design of the research.

ANALYSIS OF TEACHING MATERIALS

(See Appendix F)

A framework based upon relevant parts of the interview schedules was devised for the scrutiny of the materials; this was intended as a means of verifying workshop tutors' statements concerning the following:

- (a) their teaching-methods, specifically their encouragement of student autonomy and the use of small-group-work;
- (b) their methods of assessment;
- (c) the range of linguistic tasks and experiences made available;
- (d) the ways they made the learning relevant;
- (e) their involvement in counselling.

It consisted of a list of categories drawn up in such a way that, by counting the number of handouts that fell into each, it would be possible to obtain a measure

by which comparisons might be made between workshop. The information was then presented in a table based on the categories that follow.

- (a) The number of materials displaying evidence of:
 - (i) a classification/grading/booking system;
 - (ii) having been designed for independent use;
 - (iii) having been designed for small-group work;
 - (iv) having been specifically designed for oral work/having been specifically designed for written work;
 - (v) a built-in self-assessment system;
 - (vi) integration with other basic skills;
 - (vii) a means of deciding upon the learning-agenda;
 - (viii) allowing students to study independently for one of a variety of syllabuses.

- (b) The number of materials displaying evidence of:
 - (i) being intended for testing/profiling/keeping student records.

- (c) Materials displaying evidence of being intended:
 - (i) to enhance everyday English;
 - (ii) to introduce new ideas;
 - (iii) to encourage students to use their imagination;
 - (iv) materials that were:
 - commercially devised;
 - teacher-devised;
 - teacher-devised for individuals;
 - for use with computers or other kinds of hardware;
 - (v) materials that were intended to help students learn how to use periods of leisure or unemployment fruitfully.

- (d) The number of materials displaying evidence of being:
 - (i) vocationally-related;

- (ii) related to work-experience, a project outside the college or other "real-life situations";
 - (iii) linked to social and environmental concerns;
 - (iv) designed to take account of the linguistic/cultural background of students;
 - (v) designed to take account of gender;
 - (vi) designed to help students deal with everyday concerns;
 - (vii) designed for relevance to students' interests.
- (e) Materials displaying evidence of being intended to raise pastoral concerns.

THE ROOM CHECKLIST

(See Appendix G)

In order to assess how far the environment of workshops conformed to the original notion devised by ILEA a check-list was drawn up on the basis of the physical description recorded in *Transition and Access*⁽¹⁴⁾, an extract of which follows:

"A Communications workshop is a large room and distinct from a classroom in that the furniture is arranged in such a way that it is mobile students can be working on their own in a booth with a tape-recorder or working in pairs or in small groups you need a filing system for student work bookshelves, magazine racks, places where you can put up posters and pictures a quiet reading-corner video equipment, typewriters an internal telephone system. A camera is useful"

This checklist also provided an objective means of comparison between the physical environments of the different workshops⁽¹⁵⁾.

SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(See Appendix H)

During interviews with workshop tutors there were indications that very little stimulus for their development came from the Higher Education sector. In view

of the implications of this for staff development and initial teacher-training, in February 1986 it was felt worthwhile to carry out a survey to test the accuracy of this impression.

In order to assess the extent of HE's concern to familiarise teachers with the philosophy and methods associated with workshops, a brief questionnaire was designed and 82 institutions contacted. Questions were intended to elicit information concerning their views as to the importance of the workshop philosophy in relation to other teaching-philosophies, the extent to which they encouraged the students to use the approach and their awareness of its use in local schools and institutions of adult or further education.

The underlying aim was to discover whether they were as familiar with the concept and means of implementation of English workshops as respondents in further education had shown themselves to be.

THE LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY

(See Appendix I)

Further information concerning the introduction and promotion of workshops was sought from LEAs in the form of a survey carried out in 1989. A brief questionnaire was constructed with the intention of eliciting information concerning awareness of the existence of workshops within the Authority, positive promotional and supportive activity and future intentions concerning their development. Possible links with ALBSU were also briefly explored, since it was felt that this would help to provide information concerning LEAs' general awareness of and involvement in the issue of literacy-levels in the population as a whole. This would provide a background against which to view information specific to workshops.

97 LEAs were contacted.

The results of the research are recorded in the next chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

- 1 Haralambos, M., *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, University Tutorial Press, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, 1981 (6th edition) pages 502-511.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 This issue is discussed more fully under "Classroom Observation."
- 5 See (1).
- 6 Foote Whyte, W., *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*, quoted in *ibid*, p.504.
- 7 See Liebow, E., "Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Street Corner Men", in *ibid*, p.504.
- 8 Cited in *ibid*.
- 9 *Transition and Access: a Review of Further and Higher Education in London, ILEA, Appendix II, FEU, London, 1981.*
- 10 1 Organisation; 2 Materials; 3 Teaching Strategies; 4 Curriculum Development; 5 Recruitment; 6 Staff Development; 7 Tutoring
- 11 1 Recruitment; 2 Organisation; 3 Materials; 4 Teaching Strategies; 5 Curriculum Development; 6 Tutoring; 7 Staff Development.
- 12 How often do you employ the following teaching strategies?
- 13 (a) If students are identified as being in need of extra help do you/would you encourage them to use the workshop. Y/N

(b) If Y, at what point do you think they should go for help: (followed by a choice from a variety of conditions).

14 See (9), p.34 for a fuller text.

15 Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESEARCH AND A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITY

The Initial Survey

Selection of Colleges

Backgrounds of the Colleges

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Introduction

The Workshop Tutors' Schedule

Introduction

Results

- a) Section One: Recruitment
- b) Section Two: Organisation
- c) Section Three: Materials
- d) Section Four: Teaching Strategies
- e) Section Five: Curriculum Development
- f) Section Six: Tutoring and Counselling
- g) Section Seven: Staff Development

The Non-Workshop Tutors' Schedule

Introduction

Results

The Workshop Students' Schedule

Introduction

Results

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Introduction

Lindvall

Flanders' Interaction Analysis

Introduction

Results

THE ANALYSIS OF TEACHING MATERIALS

Introduction

Results

- a) Teaching Methods
- b) Methods of Assessment
- c) Range of Linguistic Tasks and Experiences
- d) Relevance to the Students
- e) Counselling

THE ROOM CHECKLIST

SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Institutions Training Staff for The Further Education Sector

Institutions Training Staff for The Secondary Sector

Teacher-Trainers Outside ILEA

THE LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

CHAPTER FOUR

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESEARCH AND A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The possibility of eventual non-cooperation amongst a small proportion of the contacts had been anticipated in the selection of eight colleges rather than the six actually considered necessary. Since the varied research methods as described in Chapter Three placed heavy demands upon already busy workshop tutors, and some methods (like classroom observation) were susceptible to suspicion and hostility, this proved to be an advantage.

Reluctance was normally overcome by the rapid development of a trusting relationship with respondents as possible and in most cases a sense of empathy between professional colleagues developed out of the discussion associated with the workshop tutors' interview-schedule. Where further resistance occurred the solution normally proved to be a tactful and patient exertion of pressure.

Nevertheless, some tutors eventually were not able (or in one case willing) to fulfil in total their promise to help, and this served both to slow down the research significantly and to force one or two compromises.

Most of the interviews were tape-recorded as a back-up to the researcher's written records. Exceptions occurred where adapted interview schedules were sent (as mentioned above) and in the last stages of the research where interviews with a few students were still being conducted and it was felt to be neither practicable, nor necessary by now, to do this.

Data was then drawn from the interview-schedules and recorded as shown in Appendices B to D. The tape-recordings were used to check details where necessary.

Detailed results of the research appear in the appendices and a summary of the main points below.

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITY

The Initial Survey

Introduction

(See Appendix A.)

Of the 304 colleges contacted, few initially replied. Inopportune timing and the failure to request a "nil" return were considered probable causes, so a second letter was sent out. This was successful in raising the yield to 50%, which was felt to be a satisfactory return.

The Survey

The survey showed that 33 1/3% of the respondents were either already running a workshop (several having only just started to do so) or about to begin one. Responding colleges represented a wide geographical spread, as evidenced by the fact that there were replies from places as far afield as Cornwall, Cumbria, Wales, Peterborough, Birmingham, Inner and Outer London, Sussex and Liverpool. As these examples illustrate, the respondents also represented colleges with a good range of socio-economic environments. Since the intent had been to create a sample balance between ILEA and non-ILEA colleges, the fact that only seven (then) ILEA colleges replied was disappointing. (This presented 4.6% of the total sample).

Some rudimentary differences were apparent between ILEA and non-ILEA colleges at this stage. One was that all the ILEA colleges who replied said they had workshops, whilst this was true of only 19% of the non-ILEA colleges. A second difference was that 4/7 (57%) of the ILEA colleges had workshops with more than 100 students, whilst only two non-ILEA colleges (7%) possessed the facility to cater for this number. No ILEA workshop had fewer than 20 students, whereas 5/28 (17%) of the non-ILEA group possessed workshops as small as this. Further, 5/7 ILEA colleges (71%) involved five or more members of staff whereas 8/28 (27.5%) of non-ILEA colleges had this level of resourcing.

A further 7/28 (25%) of non-ILEA colleges had only one member of staff. This was untrue of any ILEA college.

A third difference was that ILEA colleges referred to Communications workshops, whereas all but two of the non-ILEA respondents referred to English, or literacy workshops.

The data seemed to suggest that there was a difference in either philosophy, or purpose, or resourcing that would require investigation.

The responses of teachers both inside and outside ILEA showed that the ILEA definition of the term workshop, or close variants of it, were understood and taken for granted:

- i) "It is difficult to answer your questions on an "English workshop" precisely. We have an embryo Communications workshop which we started to develop this year. The intention is to build up a bank of instructional and assignment material for student self-teaching, particularly for students doing City and Guilds 772 (now 362), BTEC General (now BTEC First) and National Diplomas, plus a range of practical equipment for them to use, such as tape-recorders, typewriters, cameras. The base room is virtually fully timetabled for 30 hours per week, being used by groups of 12 to 18 students. In time, the teaching-material will be supplemented by a selection of reference books for use in assignments"
- ii) "We are this year very much involved in establishing support classes aimed chiefly at the bilingual student population in our college.

We have not yet got any workshop as such, but that's what we're aiming at The only genuine workshop operating in the college on a drop-in basis is organised by [the] Senior Lecturer for Appendix II students in the college."

iii) "We have actually started an English workshop and we do have a Numeracy workshop. We wanted to join these two together and develop them as drop-in centres, but College politics have intervened we're using the room to talk to students with ESL problems and I have one student who has enrolled to improve her spelling"

((i) and (iii) were non-ILEA colleges, (ii) was in ILEA).

Selection of Colleges

The sample was carefully scrutinised in order to select a group of colleges which would be likely to provide variety in the socio-economic situation of the clientele, large city and small-town experience and an urban and rural contrast. An additional criterion was that there should be a mixture of colleges with large and small workshops.

In view of the limited number of ILEA colleges who replied to the survey, it proved impossible to find four ILEA colleges who were willing to participate. For this reason two ILEA and six non-ILEA colleges were finally selected.

Backgrounds of the Colleges

College One

This college was situated in a small market town south of Oxford. In the year 1984/5 about 39% of school-leavers in its catchment area went into 16+ education, responsibility for which was shared with the local schools. In 1990/91, this rose to 62%. Twelve percent of school-leavers went into employment, in contrast with a figure of 33% in 1990/91, 15% into YT (25% in 1990/1) and 0.6 were unemployed (2% in 1990/1). In 1985/6 there was a large proportion of students whose destinations were unknown (over 25%).

The workshop was situated in two rooms which were in different parts of the college and catered largely for the 16-19 age-group. The main workshop was well established in a large purpose-devised room containing spaces for independent working as well as opportunities for the occasional Adult Literacy

student to receive individual tuition from a volunteer. There was also accommodation at one end for group-work. Computers were available for individual use. Adult Literacy was a part of this college's work, but these sessions tended to occur in an ordinary classroom because the demand was greater than the specialist accommodation. The workshop also catered for Special Needs students.

During direct observation the tutor was seen to behave very much as an enabler and the model in operation to be of the open-learning variety. Teaching-input was observed to be minimal and the tutor spent a large proportion of the session acting as computer-technician and dealing with an enquiry from a member of staff who had called in.

The atmosphere was busy and friendly, but the learning appeared to have an impersonal flavour. The versatility of the room appeared to be an attraction to other members of staff and during the observed session two teachers were fully employed in setting up a slide show for a class that was to take place later.

The emphasis was upon literacy and the workshop had between 20 and 100 students. Three members of staff were substantially involved with the work.

College Two

College Two was the only college in a small industrial town in the Midlands. It had a high level of unemployment and the college had a specific policy for the provision of courses for unemployed adults; in the year 1984/5 a total of 300 adults took advantage of the wide range of courses on offer. Adult Basic Education was seen as a part of this overall provision. Three members of staff were substantially involved in the provision and there were between 20 and 100 students.

The accommodation was in a self-contained modern building shared with the Careers office. Whilst it was on the College campus, it was separate from the main building and its autonomy was further ensured by complete possession of the second floor. This space and privacy allowed for the development of a

large, attractively purpose-designed workshop with a quiet atmosphere. Students worked largely on their own, supported by individual tuition. A number were in the 16-19 age-group, but the majority were adults. They appeared to have more personal attention than students in College One. The emphasis was upon literacy and English up to (then) "O" level.

College Three

College Three was situated in the North, in a small industrial town.

This college provided all the 16+ education in its catchment area. It had about 1400 full-time and 6,000 part-time students. In 1985/6, approximately 42% of school-leaves attended college and this figure has remained constant to date. In 1984/5 19% of students went into employment, as against 14% in 1990/1, 34% went into YT as opposed to 20% today, and 3% were registered unemployed (4% today). The destinations of the remaining proportion of students were not known.

Examination success rates were high and about 90% of the college's full-time students went on to HE, more advanced FE or into full-time employment. The college had shown a long-term commitment to Adult Basic Education.

The accommodation was spacious, with a side door which allowed students privacy in coming and going, as some of them wished. There was a wide variety of activities in this workshop, including individual and group-learning of literacy, English, ESL, numeracy and (then) 'O' level Physics support. There were carrels at one end of the room for tape-recorders, tables for private study and grouped furniture. Parts of the room were screened off to provide privacy and in order to cut down on a fairly high noise-level.

There was a large number of students in this workshop at any one time attended by a group of teachers who would move freely from one to another giving help as needed. They had a particularly flexible view of their role.

The workshop catered for over 100 students and had five teachers with a substantial involvement in the work.

College Four

This college was situated in a small market town in the Midlands.

In the catchment area for this college, responsibility for 16+ education was divided between a Sixth Form Centre and the FE College and in 1985/6 approximately 40% of school-leavers in all took advantage of this provision. A further 31% went into YT, 22% obtained work and 5% were unemployed, 3% of destinations were unknown. During the year 1990/91, there was an increase in the number of students remaining in full-time education to nearly 60%.

The workshop was established in a hut on the main College campus and students were timetabled into a group, within which they would be given individual tuition. There was an atmosphere associated with a comfortable classroom situation; students were observed to be less autonomous than those in other non-ILEA workshops, but also less isolated. The accommodation did not provide any special sense of its being a workshop other than that the standard furniture had been organised in such a way as to increase communication.

About 30 students were making use of the facilities, which concentrated on literacy tuition. The clientele was mainly, but not exclusively, in the 16-19 age-group. Five members of staff taught in the workshop, not all with a substantial time-commitment.

College Five

This College was situated in Inner London and the immediate catchment provided only a proportion of the College's total intake. Others came from a wider geographical area.

Because there was only one sixth form, there was a high intake into FE. A high proportion of the education was provided by church schools, in which white

pupils predominated. These institutions tended to retain their pupils as they moved into the sixth form. For this reason, a high proportion of FE students from the catchment were black. These tended to concentrate themselves slightly more in the less high level courses. (For example, in 1990/92 43% of the students studying "A" levels in FE were white, 16.4% were Afro-Caribbean as opposed to Afro-Caribbeans representing 35% of GCSE retakes in comparison with 4% of white students.)

23 % of the 16-19 population stayed on for some form of education and this represented a considerable advance upon 1985/6 when the figures would have been considerably lower⁽¹⁾. The recession had caused a considerable increase in the staying-on rates and students tended to go to college rather than into YT. (For 1990/91, 34% stayed on in school or a college, whereas 4.6% entered a YT course; 10.1% remained unemployed.)

Because of the Adult Education Institutes in the ILEA, FE concentrated upon education and training for the 16-19 age-group.

College Five enrolled 3719 students in 1990-91, of which approximately 900 were full-time. The remainder were part-time day and/or evening, block release and links. Approximately 53% of students were white, 47% being black. In 1985/6, there were 3022 enrolments, 2261 of these on full-time courses.

The workshop was purpose-designed, with octagonal tables, filing-cabinets for the materials and suitable storage for hardware. Students were taught in classes and the teacher sat at the teacher's desk at the front. The emphasis was upon communications skills.

Well over 100 students had the experience of being taught in this situation. Three teachers were substantially involved with the work.

College Six

College six was situated on a steep hill outside a small rural town. Difficulty of access deterred adults from attending and it catered mainly for the 16-19 age-

group. The emphasis was upon literacy-teaching and students attended individually, or occasionally in pairs. The room was small and tables arranged in a square to allow for face-to-face communication. Materials were displayed attractively on bookshelves.

Students were more isolated from each other in their learning in this workshop than in any other and experienced very intensive one-to-one tuition. The workshop catered for about 15 students and two members of staff were substantially involved in the teaching.

College Seven

This college was one of several in a large town in the West country. It tended to specialise in low-level courses.

Literacy and numeracy provision were organised by the Adult Education Department who catered overall for 3,000 adults, 20% of whom came into the workshop. The workshop dealt with only 15% of full-time students in the 16-19 age-range, seeing its primary purpose as provision for adults. The population was almost totally white, the catchment being the second lowest for ethnic minorities in a league of 14 Adult Education areas in the county.

In this college's catchment, the percentage of students staying on in 16+ education in 1985/6 was 16%. This had risen to 28.5% by 1989/90.

The workshop was based in the Adult Education section of the college and the ethos reflected this separation from the mainstream in its more adult flavour. Study mainly took place in a large room organised at one end for working in groups and at the other end with easy chairs for reading or informal activity. Supplementary rooms were available for additional groupwork.

This workshop had moved from individualised tuition by volunteer tutors to individual learning in groups. They had found that volunteer tutoring created dependencies in students and did not necessarily promote effective learning. A new emphasis had therefore been placed upon the encouragement of student

self-reliance, mutual support and learning in an informal context. This was very evident in the purposeful, as well as social atmosphere.

Between 20 and 100 students used the workshop and two members of staff were substantially involved.

College Eight

This Inner London college was spread over several sites. For the lecturer in charge, obtaining an overview was impossible and consequently the coordination of Communications was a very difficult task and not very effective. A flavour of the problem was conveyed by interviews with two tutors working on different sites who were employing similar ideas in their work, but who thought they were unique and isolated in their activities. Each site had its own workshop and policy in each reflected the philosophy of the members of staff involved. An advantage of this arrangement was that it had been possible to set up workshops which specifically reflected the vocational bias of each annexe.

Generalisation about accommodation, ethos and teaching-styles is difficult, since a range of these was encountered. The consistent factor was the very large Afro-Caribbean intake which made the college "a black college in a white working-class area"⁽²⁾. The approach described by the lecturer in charge was concerned with the then ILEA's workshop philosophy, whereas strong deviations from this were discovered elsewhere in the college. Therefore, students who were apparently experiencing self-determination and individual learning-programmes were in reality working in a fairly traditional communications classroom situation. On the main site was a purpose-designed Communications workshop, but in the annexes the accommodation was more likely to be an ordinary classroom.

This college had well over 100 students in workshops and more than five members of staff involved.

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Introduction

The amendments mentioned in Chapter Three proved effective in either clarifying or amplifying the questions, and the interview schedules were successful in eliciting the desired information.

The Workshop Tutors' Schedule

(See Appendix B)

Introduction

It proved possible to interview eight workshop managers and seven assistant tutors. In one college no assistant member of staff was available for interview and, although in five colleges over 50% of the staffing was by full-timers, they did not meet the criterion laid down in Chapter Three that at least three-quarters of their time should be spent in the workshop. It was therefore possible to interview only two full-time staff, the other five being part-timers who did meet this requirement.

The difficulty concerning the categories for closed questions in the workshop tutors' schedule was not experienced by any of the other respondents.

One of the additions (See (ii) under "Supplementary Questions" above) was found to have been made in response to a preoccupation of the trial interviewee that was not shared in the same form by subsequent respondents.

The techniques employed in questions 4(a)⁽³⁾ and 4(b)⁽⁴⁾ were successful in providing a clear rank-order in each case; however, with hindsight, it would have been useful to ask a question concerning the number of students in each college who visited the workshop purely to collect tasks for study at home. The ranking of category (x) in last place (see also below) might be an indication that many workshop tutors place student autonomy in learning within strict limits, despite their high ranking of it as a priority (as in 4(a)). This would have provided a useful way of checking how strict the limits were. Two colleges mentioned that some students did prefer to work in this way and were allowed to do so.

In one or two other (minor) respects the schedules could have been further improved, notably where there was a residual degree of repetition. However, this was more a matter of style than an impediment to collecting the information.

Although the Workshop Tutors' Interview-schedule had originally been intended for both the person in charge of the workshop and a second tutor with a significant involvement, in practice the already lengthy interviews were frequently extended by initially over-detailed exposition on the part of some of the main interviewees. This led to a tailing off of enthusiasm afterwards. An attempted solution was to warn respondents of the length at the start, and a tactful pressure to move on. This was partially successful, but the researcher was dependent upon good will and did not wish to antagonise interviewees by seeming heavy-handed.

It having become clear that the tutors in charge of the workshop were more than willing to expound in detail upon its organisation, it was considered adequate to rely upon this level of collection of what was mainly factual information. Those aspects were therefore omitted from the interviews of the assistants, who could most usefully concentrate upon an exposition of their views upon teaching-priorities, teaching-techniques and tutoring.

The possibility that workshop tutors desired to present themselves in the best possible light in the interviews suggested itself in the discrepancies between what they said they did and what was observed to happen in the workshops. This bore out the value of the strategies described in Chapter Three for checking respondents' answers both against each other and against observable phenomena.

Results

a) Section One, Recruitment

Referral: The majority of the colleges (seven; 87%) had a tutor-referral system; six (75%) of these also worked on a self-referral, drop-in basis; tutors largely believed that attendance should be voluntary. In one college there was college-wide screening by means of a test, but others had strong objections to testing students for whom failure had been so large a part of educational experience in the past and preferred to rely on self-referral.

Testing: The college with institution-wide screening used a test. Their task was made more difficult by the absence of any commercially available test that was generally felt to be easy to administer and suitable for this ability- and age-level.

The two colleges with Communications workshops had a variety of entrance tests set in one by English staff and in the other by course tutors. The aim of these colleges was, however, principally to place students on appropriate courses and not to discover those with literacy needs.

Five colleges mentioned a dislike of tests insofar as they conflicted with the workshop ethos, which they felt should always be voluntary. They relied on course-tutors to encourage, where this was appropriate, but mainly waited for students to come forward of their own volition.

Cooperation of course tutors: In colleges where testing was carried out (see also below) support of course tutors ranged between identifying the role as exclusively their own, or giving considerable support, to taking no part at all. Only in one college was substantial support provided.

Negotiated agenda: Two (25%) colleges used tests to decide the students' learning-programme whilst in five others the agenda was negotiated with the student on the basis of information from a test or initial work or a combination of both.

One of the ILEA Communications workshops used a "diagnostic assignment" from which to draw out information⁽⁵⁾.

Advertising: Six colleges advertised the workshop and the methods that appeared to have been the most effective were television, a prominent spread in the local newspaper and knocking on doors. The two ILEA colleges did not advertise because course groups were timetabled into the workshop and outside recruitment was not a part of their brief.

Social background of student: A good number of students (in four colleges (50%) "most" and in four (50%) "some") came from socially deprived areas and schools. Some experienced unsupportive attitudes towards education (in four colleges, "most", in two "some", and some damaging tensions (in five "most", in two "some") at home. In five colleges (62%) "most" students had also suffered disruption through illness or other causes and in four "most" had left school at the earliest opportunity. In the other four "some" had done this. In one college "most" had a record of truancy and in another four "some" had this record. In one college "all" in one "most" and in five "some" of the students experienced difficulty with learning in general. The vast majority in the two ILEA colleges suffered educational disadvantage because of ethnic background and seven colleges were catering for a proportion of mature students. Tutors did not feel that pupils "exhibited behavioral problems within the college situation". (See *Transition and Access*, page 8, quoted in Chapter 2.) In four colleges "some" students had a mental or physical disability and in three "not many" did. In one college there were no such students in the workshop.

The majority were on either general education courses including 'O' level (now GCSE) or low-level vocational courses, (in each case three colleges said "most" and three said "some").

b) Section Two, Organisation

Resourcing: the amount of time students spent in workshops varied from one to eight hours per week; in one case the amount of time available to them was open-ended.

It was impossible to ascertain the actual levels of funding, but the number of teaching-hours devoted to it varied from 13½ to 70. In three colleges workshops were unable to meet the total demand for their services on the basis of their current hours.

Access: Arrangements for this varied considerably, on a scale ranging from the exclusively timetabled to the totally open, drop-in arrangement.

Monitoring: In six colleges (75%) student progress was monitored by means of a record of work, three supplementing this with profiling. In all these colleges the tutor kept a record of progress and in some the students did too.

Methods for responding to the information thus gained were various and had a different effect upon subsequent teaching strategies according to the degree to which negotiation was allowed to predominate over teacher-led learning.

Organisation of the learning: This varied widely between workshops. The common features were that they were all designed to create some degree of autonomy for the student and to make the maximum use of the study-time available. They also involved a negotiation in order to establish the student's individual needs.

Examples of the most significant variations follow:

- (i) Students were assigned to a tutor, who selected work on the basis of a negotiated agenda. Sometimes work would be added if a skills tutor considered that students needed to learn something in particular for their mainstream course. The work done would then be checked against the students' negotiated agenda by the tutor.

The work and the agenda were all kept in a filing cabinet in the workshop and tasks would be placed in the folder between sessions so the student was able to begin immediately upon arrival.

- (ii) The students kept diaries in which at the beginning they wrote down what they wanted to achieve on the course. These diaries were then used for a student-teacher dialogue throughout, in which students commented upon their own progress. They also kept a list of words they could not spell/understand and on the basis of this information the teacher would devise work-sheets, give praise and encouragement and respond to student comment.

These were private between the teacher and the pupil. As there was a summary sheet at the back students could also tick off their own achievements as they developed. This college used a mixture of negotiation and advice based on written work.

- (iii) The tutor kept a checklist of the skills the student wanted to acquire with any additional skills she had advised the student to learn. The student sometimes kept his/her own copy of this as well. Progress was checked against it.
- (iv) A mixture of negotiation, initial assessment and guidance would be based on information from the student's written work.

Siting/Accommodation: Six staff (75%) were satisfied with this although three (37%) were concerned at the marginalising effect of not being centrally located and references were made in more than one case to distracting problems with inadequate heating. Three liked the separation from the main building since it eased the task of creating a more adult environment. Five out of eight were also satisfied with the furnishings, but three felt these to be inadequate.

Reasons for satisfaction were: the room was large; furniture was easy to move, creating flexibility in the room layout; the room had easy-chairs; the room was modern, large and well-provided with screens and various nooks and crannies to allow flexibility in its use.

Criticisms were: insufficient storage; insufficient space to allow the addition of easy chairs; management attempts to make the room double-up as an office or store.

Six were satisfied with the arrangement of the room, when they had allowed for the constraints within which they had to work.

All the respondents considered that the workshop style of layout provided a superior teaching-environment to that of a traditional classroom.

Examples of their reasons were:

- (i) Students could drink tea and relax; the whole arrangement allowed for a great deal of flexibility, including the teaching of literacy and numeracy at the same time and the participation of several tutors at once.
- (ii) The environment was an aid to teacher-student and inter-student communication; students worked better in these conditions and also taught each other. There was "more informality and more laughter". Provided there was adequate time to deal with each individual, "they were probably getting a better deal than in a normal classroom."
- (iii) It was possible to create an adult atmosphere; the students could move around, find their own materials and be independent.
- (iv) It would be impossible to operate individual programmes in an ordinary classroom. There had to be adequate space in which to move around.
- (v) It was an environment that was less threatening to students.

Half had no facilities for people with a physical disability, with the exception in one of these of a lift, which allowed wheelchair access above ground-level; the others had some facilities.

The physical organisation of colleges: this had an effect upon the operation of all the workshops except for one of those in the then ILEA. Negative effects were mentioned more often than positive ones (five negative and three positive, one college mentioning both).

Examples mentioned were the existence of an outside door which enabled students to come and go discreetly and physical independence from the main building as against inadequate rooming which meant the classes had sometimes to be taught in non-specialist rooms and the difficulty of providing over multi-site colleges.

Staffing: this was felt to be adequate in colleges where there was a significant full-time teacher-input (three colleges), but in those colleges where much of the work was carried out by part-timers there was normally dissatisfaction.

Administrative organisation of colleges: six tutors (75%) considered this too inflexible to allow all students to take advantage of the literacy provision. The major criticisms were of rigid timetabling which did not allow students free time in which to attend and craft or other main-course tutors who were unwilling to release students from their classes.

Support of Management: five workshop-managers (62%) felt well-supported by their senior management in financial terms, although in three cases it was felt that only lip-service was being paid, or that (the then) MSC funding for courses run in the workshop was being diverted elsewhere in the college.

Six of the colleges were able to take advantage of some kind of LEA or government support for their work, but this was often felt to be patchy or badly advertised. Outside ILEA there was little evidence of consistent, structured support. Within ILEA there was more, in particular from the Curriculum Development Project.

c) Section Three, Materials

The most popular were teacher-devised, and commercially produced materials. Next came those designed for particular individuals. Computer-software and videos were used to a lesser extent. The main reason given for these preferences was that there was a need for a wide range of materials to suit individual needs and a mixture of teacher-devised handouts supplemented by commercial materials helped to fulfil this need in as time-efficient a way as possible.

All colleges set out to make materials relevant to students; the most usual way was that mentioned in qu. 3(d)(iii), in that they were "written with the linguistic background of students in mind." Seven linked them to "work-experience or other real-life situations." Six sought help from vocational teachers in devising materials and five linked the work to students' vocational studies. A minority were concerned with the other categories.

Four workshops classified their materials, usually under both subject- and skills-headings. Three said they had a formal booking-system, the rest an informal arrangement.

Only two colleges had a grading system and this depended upon individual teachers judging the level of difficulty of a worksheet they had devised and filing it accordingly. Tutors normally did not have time to grade materials and judgements were generally made informally⁽⁶⁾.

d) Section Four, Teaching Strategies

Teaching Priorities: the main teaching-priorities cited were to provide language-support (15 points) and to create autonomy in learning (15 points), followed by preparation for employment (13 points) and oracy (11 points). Preparation for leisure/unemployment was seen as a very low priority indeed (2 points).

Frequency of use of teaching-strategies; the most significant results were as follows:

One-to-one Teaching: All tutors used the one-to-one method. Of these, 8/15 used it always (53%); another five (62%) used it "usually" or "often". 13/15 of these (86%) did so within a group/class situation.

One college mentioned volunteer tutors, who were occasionally used to provide intensive tuition for students with grave problems. This college was highly sceptical about the quality of the teaching of most volunteer tutors and had recently adopted a policy of shedding all but the very best, especially out of concern that students became excessively dependent upon them.

The one or two good volunteers would be kept within the group situation where the teacher would be giving others individual help. In this college the social experience of students was considered a vital aid to learning, hence the emphasis upon group work.

Informal conversation: Tutors placed quite a strong emphasis upon this technique (it was ranked third out of twelve teaching-methods) and had various means of implementing it. The most common approach was to create an air of informality and to appear approachable and interested in students as people.

For example, one tutor's approach depended upon the different needs of each group, but she made a point of taking a personal interest in her students and chatting with them. If this did not succeed she played ice-breaker games with them. She would not put this pressure on a very timid group, however, but would set out by giving them work, bringing the group together to analyse it and "letting the chat slowly come out of this."

A teacher of a group of physically and mentally disabled students (MLD) said that if the students seemed subdued she would draw them out by a casual enquiry concerning their interests. She felt that, because her pupils were disadvantaged, it was important to make the sessions pleasant. It was an

occasion when they each mattered as an individual. This meant no tests, no school ethos and a need to know a great deal about them personally. She felt that the resulting relationships were an important aid to learning.

Two tutors set out to limit informal conversation so that it did not grow beyond its usefulness and interfere with the work; informal conversation would be allowed at the beginning and then tailed off. Sometimes conversation would be limited when there were more than one or two students in the workshop in order to ensure that the work was done.

Small group-work: two tutors had strong objections to the method. Both happened to be in the same ILEA college with Communications workshops. Three disadvantages were mentioned; first, while students preferred to work thus, the furniture in the room had to be arranged in a way that could be inhibiting to whole-class discussion. Secondly, there was always "the student who cops out" in a small group. Thirdly, school-leavers had little experience of this way of working and it was better for them to gain it in subjects like Drama, since it was not really appropriate to Communications teaching. Two tutors from non-ILEA colleges mentioned problems with noise-level in a large, open workshop and its "inconsistency with flexi-study".

Tutors saw several advantages in its use: 12/15 (80%) used it to some degree; although demanding, it was successful because students were able to share different ideas. It gave them social experience and practice in communicating. Further, it was possible to cater for every individual's needs more effectively this way as students could be grouped according to common needs. It was good for them socially: "It provides practice for students who find it difficult to function in a larger group." At the same time, it was 11th/12 in the rank-order.

Learning integrated with other basic skills: In seven colleges, students could take the written work from their vocational areas into the workshop for help if they wanted it. This happened more often in three colleges than in the rest, however.

Leaving students on their own: In five colleges (62%) this happened at some time, but more regularly in three of these than in the others. Responses to this question ranged from indignant denial to strongly positive statements as to the use that tutors could and had made of this technique. A tutor in one college used the method thus: sometimes there would be a group who would hardly talk in the teacher's presence and would not talk to her at all, asking each other if they needed help. So for a few weeks she would leave them for short periods of time at frequent intervals, monitoring their progress by means of reports from the secretary sitting out of sight in her office, which was built into the workshop. The result would be that the group would become more talkative, and very supportive of each other and the confidence gained would eventually persist even in the presence of the teacher. This tutor saw it also as a means of achieving student autonomy.

Few other strategies were mentioned. The most notable was the encouragement of students to organise trips, carrying out all the planning and administration themselves and making a book out of their accounts of their experiences afterwards.

Deadlines: Tutors in seven colleges (87%) were vehemently opposed to the notion of setting deadlines for written work because it ran counter to the workshop ethos and particularly the principle that students should work at their own pace. This did not preclude the possibility of insisting that work was actually done, where this was felt to be appropriate.

The most useful strategies in fulfilling teaching-priorities: these were felt to be students working at their own pace (72 points), one-to-one tuition (61 points), informal conversation (54 points) and emphasis on writing (53 points).

A minority of teachers had individual objections to some of the teaching-methods. For example, one or two doubted the value of one-to-one tuition with adults, since this could be an isolating experience and also discouraged

autonomy. The notion of leaving students on their own aroused the greatest controversy.

All 15 tutors considered it part of their role to help students deal with day-to-day problems like form-filling, although the degree of importance placed upon it varied considerably.

Tutors said that a wide range of syllabuses was taught, mainly by means of individual tuition and individualised study-packs.

It was very unusual for tutors to teach in craft-lessons, or work-environments. Although there could be advantages in creating such a link with their vocational work, it could deprive students of the privacy they often needed.

e) Section Five, Curriculum Development

7/15 interviewees (46%) thought that the workshop was a suitable place for curriculum developments like CPVE, but whilst one tutor felt particularly strongly that each element served individual needs, which would therefore provide a curriculum that was compatible with the teaching of literacy, another pointed out that integrated studies may preclude literacy teaching altogether. No other significant responses were obtained.

f) Section Six, Tutoring and Counselling

In 5/8 colleges (62%) there was no special tutoring system for workshop students, but all 15 tutors took part in counselling on an informal basis and 13 of these dealt with it as part of class discussion. 13/15 tutors (86%) spent more time on this than in a formal classroom because the nature of the clientele meant that there was a greater need and because the workshop ethos encouraged confidences. They said:

"The flexibility of the workshop allows for this; the normal classroom does not."

"Workshop students often have learning difficulties because they have psychological problems."

All respondents saw informal counselling as essential to students' educational development:

"Yes, if education is a preparation for new situations in life and learning to develop new strategies to cope."

"Yes: there is intimacy because students sit close together and have eye-contact; the teacher is not dominant and the set-up is flexible enough."

g) Section Seven, Staff Development:

In six workshops (75%), policy was a matter for individual teachers to decide; however, where there was a general policy it was formulated by the tutor in charge in discussion with the team. In one ILEA college, the SL in over-all charge of the workshops said, "I [make policy] and everyone ignores me." The reason for this was that the college was large and split over several sites; the resulting difficulties in communication obstructed the introduction of a whole-college policy.

No special facilities were available to introduce staff to the policy. Where newly trained teachers or student-teachers had been encountered by respondents, they did not usually show familiarity with workshop teaching-methods; where they did it was minimal.

Five workshop managers (62%) felt that staff were ill-equipped to deal with workshop teaching, largely because it placed so many new demands upon their role. The others were happy that teachers could cope with the different approach required. In six colleges staff development had been provided to help with this and most tutors in charge had received some form of extra resource for this purpose. Some LEAs provided help and ALBSU was another source of training. However, the tutors-in-charge reported that LEA and college senior management support were inadequate to carry out the task. For example, in six

colleges no funding was available to introduce staff to the workshop policy. The funds were spent on sending staff to training events outside the college.

There was unanimity amongst tutors in charge concerning the need for more time. The main improvements that tutors would like to see were better facilities for the reproduction and storage of materials, more in-service training, more money, payment for part-timers who were carrying out development work and attending meetings unpaid, more meetings, a larger room and more storage facilities.

One tutor summed up the needs thus: "We need a base plus time to develop it, plus more publicity amongst staff and students. Then with increased demand we'll need more time; staff; space ad infinitum."

In both the ILEA colleges the major concern was "for staff to use the workshop properly."

The Non-Workshop Tutors' Schedule:

(See Appendix C)

Introduction

This schedule was shorter and easier to administer than that designed for workshop tutors. However, since the referral policy of some colleges did not include the involvement of tutors in other subjects, it was not possible to interview four in each of these as originally planned. In two other colleges the contacts were prepared to arrange one interview only of this kind, for reasons of time, as previously mentioned.

This schedule was therefore amended so that it could be answered through the post and copies were sent to the two relevant contacts with a polite request for them to be passed on to additional tutors. In order to increase the likelihood of cooperation an explanatory note and stamped-addressed envelope were attached to each questionnaire, so eliminating effort on the part of the contact. This was followed by two reminders, to which one college responded. A not entirely satisfactory solution to the lack of response from the other was to send a

number of amended questionnaires to colleagues in the researcher's own college, which was one of eight, where a high level of cooperation was guaranteed. This, unfortunately, was less likely to result in the spread of opinion desired. Nevertheless by this means the number in the sample was raised to 26; this was felt to be acceptably close to the original target of 32.

Results

22/24 tutors in other subjects (91%) found the workshop useful to their students, particularly where their performance in their mainstream subjects was seen to have been enhanced⁽⁷⁾.

18 (75%) of those surveyed set out, in a variety of ways, to identify those students with a low level of literacy skills and usually referred to them for help.

Some tutors stressed the importance of counselling before referral and were conscious of fear on the part of many students of being "labelled". They felt the need to persuade, particularly in view of student reluctance to recognise their problem. They also emphasised that students should not be pressured into going for help and that it should not be just the teacher, but also the student who identified the need. Some stated that despite initial reluctance students who went enjoyed it because of the attitudes of the workshop staff.

21 (87%) said that it would be useful to test all students for literacy needs on entry, 20 (83%) said that they would be willing to help with it if asked.

There was commitment on the part of approximately 50% of tutors in each case to the notion of enhancing students' existing competence in general as well as in relation to their course and in terms of their developing maturity. (Committed to enhancing existing competence in general, 12/24 (25%), ability to cope with the adult world 10/24 (41%) and ability to cope with present course, 10/12, (83%)). Commitment to development for future benefit was almost non-existent. (Committed to enhancing ability to cope with a more advanced course, 2/24 (8%))⁽⁸⁾.

Some mentioned difficulties over releasing part-time students at all because of lack of time. 14/24 (58%) would release students from their own classes to allow them opportunities to enhance their performance on their present course. Support for release for the other categories was minimal (4/24, "enhance existing general competence", 2/24, "improve ability to cope with the adult world", 2/24 "improve ability future course".) 15/24 (62%) said that the timetable was organised to allow students to attend the workshop; half of those who said it was not would be willing to argue for this to be done.

23/24 (95%) thought that students should receive help in improving written work in order to perform better on their main course and there was substantial support for the idea of reading for pleasure: 17/24 (70%), competence with forms and business letters: 16/24 (66%), social skills: 15/24 (62%), enhancing leisure: 15/24 (62%), enhancing thinking in its own right 12/24 (50%) and to improve interview skills 10/24 (41%).

There was a very limited degree of active cooperation with workshop tutors on a regular basis except where practical necessity might seem to be dictating: 10 (41%) fairly regularly planned their materials together, 12 (50%) cooperated in deciding upon referrals, 11 (45%) provided help with discipline, 6 (24%) planned the language together on their own handouts, 1 (4%) the language in his/her own lesson and 1 the written work from his/her own classes. 10/24 tutors (41%) were prepared to cooperate more if asked, but many were satisfied with the present situation.

Individual tutors mentioned several matters over which they would like to cooperate more closely with workshop staff; they would like:

- (a) more written progress reports on their students; more information concerning the work students were doing;
- (b) a combined effort in creating a climate in which students realised that all staff were there to help them and to create a consciousness that the provision was across the college and not departmental;

- (c) work-sessions together to raise the consciousness of craft teachers about literacy and help them develop greater empathy with students' problems; literacy teachers to go into craft lessons to find out what students are learning.
- (d) more individualised programmes for students and liaison to produce suitable material for these;
- (e) more vocationally relevant materials and sessions for the production of these.

15/24 (62%) saw a value in working alongside a literacy teacher in the same session.

Only a few of these (5/25; 20%) saw any difficulty for the literacy tutor; the same proportion thought it would create difficulties for themselves.

14/24 (58%) thought that the service was well advertised, but there were also several constructive suggestions to make concerning ways of improving publicity.

Several suggestions were made as to possible other improvements:

- (a) Because this tended to be an area of work in which women were predominant it might be less intimidating to male students who were used to a more "macho" environment if there were also a male teacher involved.
- (b) There was a need for more facilities, especially for the service to be available for more hours of the week, in particular for twilight and evening sessions. Some wanted a drop-in facility.
- (c) There was also a need for a member of staff who could devote the whole of his/her time to the workshop.

- (d) There should be a club atmosphere, with a lounge-area to encourage students to go and to help them to feel less intimidated by the environment.
- (e) "They could be available more often for help with vocational teaching."
One said; "It's a great asset to the college to have something like this."

The Workshop Students' Schedule

(See Appendix D)

Introduction

Like the non-workshop tutors' schedule, the student schedule was considerably shorter than that designed for the workshop tutors and the administration was normally straightforward. The notion (see Chapter Three) that there would be a need for a particularly flexible approach to student interviews was borne out by experience. The range of ability levels and backgrounds ranged widely from, for example, the middle-class lady who worked at the Citizens' Advice Bureau and did not want anyone to see her enter the workshop, to an old weaver who wanted "to learn how to write funny stories" and the Special Needs student who complained, "Your questions are making my head hurt." The adoption of an open and accepting attitude towards whatever the interviewee chose to say and flexibility in the use of different registers and styles of language appeared to achieve the desired end. In her own college, one teacher inadvertently informed the interviewees of the researcher's true role, creating the necessity for a little more effort in creating a relaxed atmosphere, but the responses were not noticeably more restrained. An unforeseen constraint arose from the difficulty some students experienced in making an evaluation of a teaching-method of which they had no experience; questioning was nevertheless successful in evoking a useful response⁽⁹⁾.

The need to exert care in delivery to students of questions which might appear to be inviting criticism of their teachers' methods was highlighted by an air of defensiveness in some of the tutors-in-charge. Tact appeared to resolve this sense of discomfort in most cases. However, in the one college where there was

difficulty in gaining access to students, the cause was a hostile response to the interview schedule and questions 9 and 10 in particular.

During interviews with students the researcher did become aware of the difficulty presented by the need to avoid leading the respondent and had to come to terms with the effects of long identification with the role of teacher and her own attitude towards workshops. Dealing with teachers presented fewer problems in this respect since the need for tact and a neutral stance was more consciously present.

Circumstances did not allow for interviews with students in the categories originally intended (See Chapter One), but a sample consisting of students from a suitable range of courses was encountered and it was possible to interview 92% of the target total. However, in both the ILEA colleges students on only one course were available for interview.

One factor of particular interest was the positive attitude some of the younger students in one college expressed towards the workshop during interview, which formed a marked contrast to their need to be firmly driven to work during the observed session. These students were black and inner-city dwellers and their responses may possibly have been influenced by differences of social class and race between themselves and the interviewer as mentioned in Chapter Three.

Results

58/89 students (65%) were in the workshop because they had chosen to be there and had heard about the facilities in a wide variety of ways: no one particularly successful method of advertising was discernible. Students were frequently encouraged to make use of the facilities by tutors or employers (51 or 57% of students said they were thus encouraged). Most teachers of their mainstream subjects did not send students along for help with linguistic problems experienced in their classes (19, or 21% said they were sent "sometimes"); the majority of students in the sample did not know whether these tutors thought the workshop was useful or not (62 or 69% said this.)

A majority (73 or 82%) thought the atmosphere of their workshop good ("There's a greater emphasis on the student's own initiative and I have a feeling of greater maturity.") and 60 (67%) felt that the environment promoted concentration. ("There's plenty to do, I muck around in other classes because there's not so much to do.") It also made them feel at home, was different from school and better for this, was flexible enough to allow them to enjoy private reading if they wished. This was rarely done, except in the case of adult literacy students.

They were additionally permitted to work at their own pace (84, or 94%), work with friends (75 or 84%) and talk when they wanted to (78 or 87%). Respondents also said that the experience differed from that of other lessons (70, or 78%) and mentioned a large variety of ways in which this was so. One said:

"It's more casual. It feels maturer because there's a different teacher/pupil relationship; you're treated more as an equal and not made to feel stupid if you don't know something."

Criticisms were:

"Not everyone here is disabled; I find it easier to mix with people who're like me in my other classes."

"Because of the emphasis on independent learning, there's not enough social contact." Others were: the noise level was too high; there were too many people; the "coming and going is a distraction".

One student with a mild learning-disability said,

"I sometimes feel under more pressure to perform here than I do in my other lessons, where I'm working with people like me. It's OK when I'm left to work at my own pace."

53, or 59% of students preferred the atmosphere in the workshop to that in their other lessons, although they were in the main unable to explain why, and 71 or 79% considered that they were making better progress than they had in a conventional classroom.

67 students (75%) had no opinion as to the relative importance of the workshop in the eyes of college management, although one who did said,

"It's less important; although there are a lot of books, and tutors and students are involved, the room's on the top floor and is draughty; the windows are loose. It took six months to replace a filing-cabinet. To people like me the books and equipment in here are important and these were vulnerable to theft"

50 (56%) considered acquiring the ability "to write good English" a higher priority than success in their main courses, one commenting:

"English, if you write and speak well, reflects yourself."

Another said,

"Linguistic ability is the basis of all study."

All the interviewees found the workshop helpful and their highest priorities were learning how to fill in forms, write formal letters, apply for jobs (72; 80%) and improve employment prospects (71 or 79%); 62 (68%) also valued opportunities for oral work, 60 (67%) developing clarity of thought and 55 (61%) opportunities to use their imagination. 58 (65%) claimed to attend regularly. ("I wouldn't want to skive because it's voluntary and helping me.")

48 respondents (53%) had never experienced small-group work, but of those who had an opinion upon the subject, 40 or 44% liked the method or would like to try it. 56 (62%) regularly worked on their own.

38 Students (42%) regularly helped each other with their work, but a good number said that they did, or would, like this. ("You can talk to your friend, who understands your problem and so can explain it well." "Friends use the same language as I do, so they can sometimes explain it better than the teacher.")

16 (17%) regularly experienced the power of independent decision-making concerning the content of their course and 39 (43%) said that they were normally told by the teacher what to do. 43 (48%) seemed to have some involvement in the decision-making; in answer to question 10(e)⁽¹⁰⁾ 31 students (34%) said that they never did. In answer to question 10(n)⁽¹¹⁾ 37 (41%) said they never did.

Clearly, since they contradict each other, these results are not totally reliable. Additionally, the figures drawn from 10(e) and 10(f)⁽¹⁰⁾ do not add up to 100%. This suggests that some students contradicted themselves when asked the same question in two different ways. When asked in a third way, approximately half said that they "usually" negotiated and the other half said they "never" did (See qu. 10(n)).

Consistently over questions 10(e) and 10(n) approximately 50% of students said they would enjoy greater powers of self-determination (in 10(e) 45 (50%)); in 10(n) 43 (48%). One said of negotiation, "It makes me feel that my opinions are important; I never felt like this at school." In 10(f) 23 preferred decisions to come from the teacher on the grounds that "the teacher knows best." 37 (41%) could not form an opinion on this matter. (This was consistent over 10(e) and 10(n)). 29 (32%) did not know whether they liked the teacher to decide or not (qu. 10(f)).

A majority of students (62, or 69%) felt that conversation was about evenly shared between themselves and the teacher (ie, they said they "sometimes" listened to the teacher doing the talking. They were asked to elaborate and this elicited the information that it was "about 50:50"). Most showed a positive pleasure in being able to make their contribution ("I never said anything at

school; within this group, I can say what I like."; "I join in a lot. We're told to say what we think. I like that.") The figures indicated that some wished for the opportunity to make a greater one, since 44 or 49% said they disliked or would dislike listening to the teacher do all the talking and 21, or 23%, said they "usually" or "often" did this.

A majority of students (47 or 52%) never had group or class discussions (qu. 5 10(g) and 10(m)) or ever worked together as a class (qu. 10(l)), (39 or 43% never did this). 37 (41%) would like group discussions (qu. 10(g)); 46 (51%) did not know what they felt about this.

A large proportion, 64, or 71% had extensive experience of one-to-one teaching (qu. 10(o)) and the vast majority (73 or 82%) liked or would like this teaching-method, some to the exclusion of any other:

"No one feels categorised as you do in a normal lesson and there isn't the same problem with people who dominate and those who are quiet; you all get your share of the teacher's attention."

"Group-teaching can be time-wasting. One-to-one is a more efficient form of learning."

A minority of students selected their materials from a workshop stock (qu. 10(w)) (11, or 12%, usually did; 69 or 77% never did); with the exception of the occasional student who brought in his own, the teacher provided most of them; the majority of students preferred this, often in the belief, as above, that "the teacher knows best."

59 Students (66%) were able to sit with whom they chose; some preferred to work alone because they could concentrate better; some sat alone because they were taught separately, (q. 10(j)).

In qu. 10(p)), 35 students (39%) (ie, those who said they were "usually", "often" or "sometimes" left) were at some point left on their own to work while the

teacher was occupied elsewhere; approximately a third liked this, but more did not. One said: " in a normal class many students will talk and rely on those who are prepared to do the work to supply the answers. Here, if you don't work, it's your loss." Another, "There's not much time, so the teacher's presence is necessary and I like the company."

66 (74%) "usually" worked upon materials that helped them improve their everyday English; 61 (68%) liked this. 21 (23%) felt that they regularly encountered materials that introduced new topics or ideas to them, although 45 (50% of the sample) would like this; one said, "It opens up my thinking and makes me aware of words and how you use them. Now I know you have to read things more than once, I can see them differently." A similarly low number regularly experienced tasks which made demands upon their imagination (23, or 25%) although 53, or 59% would have liked to do so. It was very rare indeed for them to be engaged in work taking them outside the college (4 students "often" or "sometimes" did so) and few knew whether they would like this approach (74, or 83% did not know); a very few more (24, or 26%) undertook work-related or work-experience related tasks and few had views on its desirability; 62 (69%) did not know. (Qus. 10(q)-(u)).

A majority of students (78, 87%) "usually" worked at their own pace and 73 enjoyed this (82%); ("You have to rush in your other lessons, but not here."); it was not common, on the other hand, to assess their own or others' work (55, 61%, said "never") and they were not especially concerned to do so (61 or 68% did not know whether they would like this or not). A majority of those few who had had experience of using computers, and the even fewer who had had experience of video in the workshop had enjoyed this. ("It's great!") (21 "usually", "often" or "sometimes" used any kind of hardware; 31 or 34% would like this; 52 or 58% did not know).

The majority of students (43 or 48%) who had said that they were sometimes left alone in the workshop by the teacher claimed that they "worked normally" in these circumstances; a few confessed to talking or "messaging about". Not many were able to comment upon their topics of conversation.

A large majority (91%) regarded the teaching as helpful⁽¹²⁾.

"Normal life" was the area where most benefit was felt, but work in other lessons was also found to have been enhanced and, where this was applicable, students had also found it useful in their employment (see qu. 12). One said it aided her " especially in arguments with my Dad."

Since a minority of pupils (16, or 17% "usually", "often" or "sometimes") collected materials for themselves from a central store (qu. 10(n)) they were unable to comment upon their organisation; those who did generally found it satisfactory (14 or 15% said it was easy to find; 13, or 14% said there were always enough there and that it was easy to judge the suitability (qu. 13)). Opinions of the interest level varied considerably, but a majority of students responded positively (46 or 41% found it "always", "usually" or "often" interesting) and the majority also found the level of difficulty within the range of their abilities (53, 59% said it was "about right"). There was little response to a request for specific materials to be recommended. (Qu. 16).

Talking to the workshop tutor was easier than talking to a classroom teacher for a substantial number of students (57, 64%), a smaller group (27, 33%) finding it no different than for all teachers. A typical statement was:

"In some lessons the teachers don't listen and don't explain; in the workshop they do."

For 58 students (65%) the layout of the room was better than that of an ordinary classroom, for the following kinds of reasons:

"The arrangement of the furniture prevents the teacher from talking too much."

"The room seems set up to help you communicate."

"The teacher's standing by you rather than shouting at you from the front. At school it was a public performance every time you learnt something. Here there's less pressure, so I can learn better."

"A normal classroom is formal. It makes you feel trapped."

A small number were unable to make a judgement since they were taught in non-workshop rooms. It was not possible to ascertain opinion as to the facilities for students with a physical disability as there were none to interview.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Introduction

Teachers often did not like being observed and three refused. In each case but one it was possible to observe one teacher in the college, so all was not lost; however, it did mean that in some colleges two sessions were observed and in others only one.

In one case, observation was permitted, but avoidance techniques were then employed, e.g. engaging the observer in conversation for much of the session.

In the particular session where this occurred, several teachers were working simultaneously and, since they were moving from student to student, would disappear behind screens or into the coffee lounge, or would move into a seat where their backs were turned to the observer. It was therefore possible to record only short snatches of interaction between any one teacher and student. Since, in this workshop, students were taught by whichever teacher was available at the time of need, this may have in fact reflected a typical student's learning-experience.

Nevertheless, this particular set of data has been omitted on the grounds of inconsistency and unreliability.

Out of sixteen possible usable sets of data eleven were actually obtained by means of Flanders and twelve by means of Lindvall.

Lindvall

This was a very straight-forward instrument and few problems were encountered in administering it. However, it was sometimes difficult to be certain of the accuracy with which an activity was ascribed to a particular category since, without being unduly obtrusive, it was not always easy to ascertain the precise activity in which students were engaged. A notable example of this was the question of whether they were chatting together or whether they were actually helping each other with their work. In these cases the observer relied on the students' non-verbal behaviour to decide the matter. Results are out of a possible total of 360 minutes.

Independent Work/Teacher-Pupil Work:

The greatest amount of time was spent by students working individually upon a worksheet (270 minutes). Almost as much time was spent by students seeking and receiving the teacher's assistance (109 and 235 minutes respectively).

The amount of time spent on other activities was very much less, the next largest category being that of students using cassette tapes (47 minutes), and no time at all being spent on such activities as independent reading.

Group Activity

There was a heavy reliance in many workshops upon individual teaching; this precluded work in small groups and group interaction: the total amount of time spent upon group interaction (63 minutes) came from three teachers, two of whom were working within the ILEA concept of the Communications workshop rather than the notion of the language-support workshop.

No teacher was observed to use small group-work, although in three colleges students were taught solely in teacher-led groups.

Pupil-Pupil Activity

A total of 49 minutes was spent by pupils seeking and receiving assistance from each other.

Non-Instructional Use of Pupil Time

There was a high total of minutes spent by students in unproductive talk and sitting at the desk not working (124) (A+F). Students were directly observed to be devoting time allocated to category (g) ("leaving room to fetch material") to fetching coffee. The sum of the subsections in the "Non-Instructional Use of Pupil Time" category represents a high total of non-productive minutes (250).

Flanders' Interaction Analysis

Introduction

This instrument divided the various possible forms of interaction in the classroom into ten categories, seven of which described the characteristics of the teacher's exchanges, highlighting as the most prominent features the indirect or direct influence created by them. Two other categories divided student talk into that freely initiated and talk in response to the teacher. The final category concerned communication that could not be properly understood, silence or confusion.

The instrument was designed to record interaction in a traditionally organised lesson and it did not fit the more varied circumstances in the workshop environment as exactly, as will be seen in the following instances:

- (i) Where several interactions were occurring simultaneously it was impossible to record them.
- (ii) The interaction of the teacher might be with one person, or it might be with a group, or with the whole class.
- (iii) In a workshop situation, a far more varied range of demands was being made upon the teacher than in a normal classroom; for example, in one college, the teacher was observed to set up the session, advise a voluntary tutor, organise students' activities, deal with interruptions from

newcomers, repair a cassette-recorder and discuss a student with another teacher, as well as teach, all within the space of twenty minutes.

- (iv) The presence of voluntary tutors in some group-sessions complicated the interaction and this was difficult to record accurately.

The situation was further complicated in one college by the fact that in one session the teacher's role was totally that of advisor and administrator and the students were exclusively taught by volunteers.

- (v) Since workshops were devised in response to a wide range of student needs, it was impossible to standardise the nature of the sessions under observation and the kinds of students observed ranged from Special Needs to those taking 'O' level (now GCSE) and supplementing their regular teaching as well as Adult Literacy students. It was possible therefore that the teaching-styles under observation were affected by the kinds of students the teachers happened to be dealing with at the moment of observation.

The advantages mentioned earlier continued to make this instrument attractive despite its limited ability to cope with the circumstances in question. Apart from Lindvall, which recorded different aspects of classroom activity, there was nothing more appropriate to measure a widely varying set of circumstances to be found in comparatively few institutions. The following strategies were therefore adopted to deal with these limitations:

- (i) In most circumstances the interaction between the teacher and any student(s) only was recorded; since the existence of any other interaction, though not its nature, was recorded by means of the Lindvall method the fact of its presence was not lost. This decision was based upon the assumption that the classroom ethos was likely to be largely created by the teacher. This assumption was supported by direct observation.

- (ii) In view of the presence of voluntary tutors it was also noted that what was recorded would not represent a true experience for all the students, especially for those exclusively tutored by volunteers.

In the session referred to in (iv) above, the interaction of one volunteer with one student was recorded, since this represented the most typical experience of the students attending that workshop.

- (iii) Wherever a teacher was interacting with a student, even if in an administrative role, this was still recorded, on the grounds that its nature would still reveal the information sought concerning student autonomy, informality and direct/indirect influence. It was also likely to represent the student's typical experience in that particular workshop.

The method used was as follows:

The observer recorded each interaction every three seconds by means of the code-number (from 1 to 10) assigned to each category and thus, after twenty minutes' observation, was able to chart what had happened upon a ten-by-ten matrix.

Since Flanders drew conclusions upon the basis of twenty minutes' observation it was reasonable to use the instrument in the same way; however, it was practicable to observe only one lesson in each case, and there was no objective evidence as to the typicality of that lesson for the workshop as a whole (except insofar as it was taking place in the teacher's normal circumstances).

Moreover, this instrument was more difficult to administer than the Lindvall in that it was necessary to remember the codings for the different categories and to make a decision in assigning them in the space of three seconds. Observers are normally trained for this purpose until they show a high level of agreement with other observers and the researcher therefore carried out two practice observations, which facilitated the assigning of the category-codes at speed; however, the verification of the observer's accuracy as above was not possible.

It had additionally to be borne in mind that in the ILEA college which spread over several sites workshop-venues were many and various, so that observation taking place in one was not necessarily a guarantee of standard practice within the college. In two other colleges this was true to the extent that work went on in more than one room.

For all the reasons mentioned above, the results from this observation should be viewed in the light of interesting illustrations that, in different circumstances, might have led to further exploration and checking, rather than as hard-and-fast evidence in their own right. At the same time they were frequently consistent with the observer's own impressions.

A breakdown of both the totals and scores for individual teachers can be found in Appendix E.

Results

In the workshops studied there was generally an ethos in which students felt free to respond spontaneously, although not generally in a sustained form. This free response was often encouraged by teachers' questions, as evidenced by the extensive use of the question-and-answer approach by several teachers. However, some teachers tended to use a direct approach in a high level of lecture.

The percentage of talk in the lessons was very high, but because of the emphasis upon one-to-one tuition this did not necessarily represent a typical student experience. Of this talk a high proportion was the teacher's. This ranged from 58% to 77%. In 1912 Romiett Stevens found that teacher-talk tended to be around 64% and pupil-talk about 36%⁽¹³⁾.

The calculations indicating the proportion of indirect to direct influence showed an unusually high percentage of indirect influence, since the figures ranged from 39% to 83% and 50% is cited by Flanders as well above average for indirect influence. However, since Flanders provides no way of recording social chat independently and this is a far greater feature of workshops than in the

traditional classroom, it is possible that this may in some cases have represented a very high proportion of the category 9 interactions and distorted the impression gained of indirect approaches to teaching.

In the highest individual categories, 5 teachers out of 13 registered 9 and the rest showed figures establishing their heavy use of lecture and/or the question-and-answer technique. Figures in the highest individual cell suggested this even more strongly. At the same time, the amount of teacher-lecture calculated as a percentage showed that, whilst it varied considerably from individual to individual, in many cases it was very low. The general impression gained from a somewhat patchy pattern is that teachers use lecture and question-and-answer techniques quite widely and that this is mitigated by social chat, this last point having been derived from direct observation. Although this varies according to the tutor, in general students do not readily initiate discussion or make sustained comment.

In one college it was possible to record the teaching of a volunteer tutor on the Adult Literacy scheme and it became quickly clear that he used a very high level of direct teaching. In order to ascertain whether this was a purely individual characteristic Flanders was immediately applied to a second tutor nearby, who happened to be teaching numeracy. The result of this observation was a similarly high level of direct influence. Informal scrutiny of about another dozen tutors in the room afterwards suggested that this may have been a general characteristic. This was the only college where there was an opportunity to observe volunteer teachers at work, so there were no opportunities to examine this discovery further.

THE ANALYSIS OF TEACHING MATERIALS

Introduction

Allocating materials to a particular category was usually a straightforward matter, but certain decisions had to be made in particular cases, in the ways mentioned below.

- (i) In "Everyday English" was placed material designed for the development of students' functional English, although some was at a higher level of sophistication. It contained such items as exercises in basic grammar, handwriting, vocabulary and reading as well as comprehensions devoted solely to the development of vocabulary, and close exercises. Examples of materials that were omitted from this category were concerned with essay- or creative-writing, comprehensions requiring interpretation and/or evaluation and exercises involving identification of the parts of speech.
- (ii) Into the category of "materials likely to introduce new ideas" were placed any with a reading content (other than exercises) of more than about 100 words containing any information beyond the totally banal.
- (iii) "Materials requiring students to use their imagination" were those leading to creative writing and those requiring the interpretation of meaning beyond a basic vocabulary exercise. Not included were role-playing activities created to provide a setting for communications exercises.
- (iv) In order to assess the linguistic and cultural relevance of materials to students in relation to class, sex and race, they were scrutinised for their levels of vocabulary and general linguistic difficulty, their consciousness of both sexes as a part of their audience, their sources, where these were apparent, and the type of content. (E.g., an article on the history of Bath's spa waters was regarded as inappropriate for unemployed people in the Midlands.) In the case of materials specifically designed for ESL students their content was considered appropriate only if it clearly related to their minority interests.
- (vi) In contrast to materials concerned with "everyday English", materials relevant to everyday needs were those concerned with communication skills like filling in forms, writing cheques, letter-writing, etc. This excluded comprehension exercises.

There were one or two units containing multiple exercises (e.g. a series of 16 forms to fill in) and each of these was counted individually in order to assign it a value that would allow that workshop's emphasis to be compared with that producing a handout containing only one such exercise.

- (vii) Defining materials as relevant to student interests required value-judgements to be made and there was a danger of stereotyping students in this activity. This was equally true of the category dealing with relevance to students' linguistic/cultural backgrounds (see below); in order to ensure as accurate a judgement as possible, materials were compared with the background of the students in each workshop as described by the tutors in Interview schedule 3, page 2, qu. 1(g).

In this respect materials fell into three categories: the obviously trite and not to be included (e.g. "the cat is --- on my slippers"), that selected for its recognisable appeal to a particular age-group or set of students (e.g. an exercise concerning motor-bikes), and some more difficult to assess in that it may have reflected either the teacher's interests or the preoccupations of a specialist group of students (e.g. an article on autism from "The Guardian", May 1986; an article from the Observer ESL Service, December 1984 concerning the abolition of the GLC). Since their nature appeared to indicate the intent of relevance, they were included in this category.

Results

(See Appendix F).

(a) Teaching-methods:

- (i) There were no special packs to allow students to pursue different syllabuses, but in one college a range of commercially produced examination papers was available.
- (ii) A majority of the materials (239/297, or 83.5%) could have been used unaided by students and it was difficult to tell precisely which colleges

had designed theirs specifically for this purpose and which taught to them. For this reason the materials gave the impression that the workshop tutor's role was largely that of learning-guide and resource-manager, but it was necessary to refer to the results of the classroom observation for a confirmation of the accuracy of this impression.

- (iii) Only the communications workshop had samples which were designed for small group-work. There were three.
- (iv) In the whole sample there was only one handout relating to oral work, this from the communications workshop; the vast majority of tasks were concerned with the written word.
- (v) A minority of worksheets (three) provided the students with facilities enabling them to assess their own work, but in one college there was a small amount of material with substantial self-assessment features.
- (vi) Only three of the materials showed the integration of literacy with other basic skills and only one - from one of the ILEA colleges - sent students outside for information. The majority, that is those indicating the role of teacher as being that of learning-guide (170/297) and those with an emphasis upon writing, (290/297) revealed that by far the highest priority was to provide the students with traditionally-presented language-support tasks.
- (vii) There was one piece of evidence of a negotiated agenda: the form specially devised for this by one college had been filled in by the teacher, but the space allocated to student comments had been left blank (see Appendix J). Another college claimed to do this by means of a diary, but produced no evidence to support the claim. College six provided a set of forms which showed that students were invited to make an initial self-assessment and to state what they wanted to work on.

(b) Methods of assessment:

- (i) Only two colleges showed evidence of having tested students, one with one out of a choice of five college-devised tests.
- (ii) The other one tested on an impression-basis after scanning a short piece of the student's writing and it was not expected that there would be evidence of this in the materials.

(c) Range of linguistic tasks and experiences offered to students:

- (i) In all the language-support workshops the emphasis was very heavily upon "everyday English" (240/297:81% of the total sample).
- (ii) In the ILEA Communications workshop material with informative content was very much more the norm and this contributed considerably to the still moderate proportion of such material. (49/297:16% of the total sample).
- (iii) There was little evidence of attempts to stimulate students' imagination. (8/297:2% of the total sample).
- (iv) Two colleges made use of commercial materials, but there was a very much wider use of teacher-devised materials (236/297:83%). There was little evidence to suggest that any had been devised for the needs of specific individuals. None showed evidence of encouragement for students to use either videos or computers, but one set displayed considerable use of cassette-tapes for spelling and basic grammar exercises.

(d) Relevance to the students:

- (i) None showed evidence of vocational orientation, or of having been designed for use alongside a vocational teacher.

- (ii) There was no evidence of any attempt to encourage students to make use of work-experiences of any kind; nevertheless, materials were concerned with the skills required for job-applications: this was almost exclusively associated with the Communications workshop.
- (iii) There were 14 references to social or environmental concerns (4.7%), this emphasis appearing only in one language-support workshop and the ILEA Communications workshop.
- (iv) There was some evidence of a middle-class bias in content and language in all but two of the colleges' samples; 21/297 (7%) of the handouts did not have this characteristic. A few were specifically relevant to students of other races, the ILEA Communications workshop showing the highest occurrence, including a complete Afro-Caribbean Language Project.
- (v) 9 materials (3%) appeared to be designed to take account of gender, the ILEA workshop having the greatest number of these also.
- (vi) In all but one of the workshops there was some emphasis upon providing help with day-to-day problems like form-filling, and in one it was considerable (77, or 25% in total). The selection from the exceptional college suggested that the work was heavily oriented towards literacy teaching at a more basic level than in the others.
- (vii) Two workshops showed a high incidence of worksheets that seemed to have been devised for relevance to students' interests. One was the ILEA workshop mentioned in (iv); in the other there was a set of very sympathetic commercial materials, the teacher-devised ones generally not showing this characteristic, however.
- (viii) Only two handouts (0.6%) revealed any attempt whatsoever to engage with education for leisure or unemployment.

(ix) None of the material was classified and in only one sample was there evidence of grading. Here it was fairly substantial, although confined to a particular area of the work. There was no evidence of any kind of booking system.

(e) Counselling:

There was no emphasis upon pastoral concerns, but the Communications workshop had a considerable proportion of materials that dealt with issues of personal development and study-skills.

THE ROOM CHECKLIST

(See Appendix 6)

Generally, the physical environment of the workshops conformed to the description in *Transition and Access* quoted in Chapter Three in terms of room-size, furniture, storage facilities and wall-coverings. (See page 56.) Half possessed technological teaching aids.

However, the majority lacked opportunities for students to work with tape-recorders, cameras, a telephone or telephone directories and neither did they have a quiet reading-corner.

Facilities for people with a physical disability were non-existent in over half the colleges.

SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

82 institutions of Higher Education were contacted and of these, 51 replied. (See Appendix H.)

39/82 (47%) trained teachers for the sixteen-plus age-group, but of these only eight (0.9% of the total sample) trained any for FE; some of those who did were concerned only with In-Service Training.

Institutions Training Staff for Further Education

6/8 (75%) of those concerned with training staff for FE considered the approach a major teaching-method, and one thought that it was "a method to mention in passing". Six were aware of its use in some local educational institutions and two referred to the presence in their area of an LEA organisation set up to promote workshops.

Institutions Training Staff for The Secondary Sector

Of those respondents dealing with training for the secondary sector, 27 (87% of the secondary-trainers) said that they considered the workshop approach of major importance. An additional one said, "It is more than a method, but not yet major". 14 stated that they were unclear as to the definition of the term "workshop", or their comments revealed that the term was being used in a different way:

"It would have been helpful to have a definition of the term "workshop". Virtually all sessions have a major practical component. Students undertake writing assignments; marking, preparing schemes of work and lesson plans

In this college we use the kind of active learning methods which we hope our students will themselves use in the classrooms

The questionnaire overleaf has been completed on the assumption that this is what you refer to as "workshops"."

24 said that it was used in some institutions in their areas. One of the institutions in the sample ran its own small remedial workshop.

A total of eight were aware of whether there was an institution in their area which provided training in workshop styles of teaching.

In response to the last question, requesting documentation, some either sent material or wrote a note giving an outline of what they did. In no case did it conform to the ILEA definition of an English workshop and showed (as above)

that these particular tutors had interpreted the questionnaire as largely referring to a range of methods they used to teach their own students.

Teacher-Trainers Outside ILEA

Awareness of these details was greatest within ILEA. In Higher Education institutions outside ILEA, as above, some respondents said that they did not know the term "workshop"; some used the term in a different way; one or two suggested that the approach was implicit within their courses, but not explicitly presented:

- (i) "I have major difficulties with the words. I'm not sure what you mean our concerns are more with a range of practical and theoretical insights than with methods. We do not make any concentration on an "English workshop method", though many of the emphases of our work would focus on collaborative learning and a social and active account of language development."
- (ii) "I'm unsure how narrowly or otherwise you are intending us to understand "workshop". We certainly do some of our teaching through various activities in small groups and encourage our students to use similar approaches when they are working in schools."
- (iii) "I don't exactly know what you mean by an English Workshop, though I have my own definition of this vague term."

THE LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY

(See Appendix I.)

Over 50% of the sample replied and this was felt to be a satisfactory result.

Respondents identified workshops in 41% of the institutions in their care, by far the majority in those providing either further or adult education. Not many schools appeared to offer this facility.

24 LEAs out of the 97 who replied had formulated a policy specifically for the promotion of workshops. 33 provided staff development of some kind, but only 17 provided this on a regular basis. Even fewer were those actively encouraging the approach in other ways (15) or foreseeing this eventuality occurring in the future (12).

30 authorities had some involvement with ALBSU (e.g., with staff development), but few held a view on the relationship of this voluntary organisation's work with that carried out in mainstream education (11 had a policy on the interface between the two).

Interpretation and discussion of these results appears in the next chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

- (1) Unfortunately these were not available.
- (2) Interview with workshop tutor.
- (3) (a) What do you consider to be your main priorities in developing your students' skills, e.g.,
 - (i) oracy;
 - (ii) autonomy in learning;
 - (iii) providing language-support;
 - (iv) preparation for employment;
 - (v) education for leisure/unemployment
 - (vi) other.
- (4) (b) How often do you employ the following teaching strategies;
 - (i) emphasis upon class discussion led/directed by the teacher; always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (ii) one-to-one; always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (iii) directing the learning; always/usually/often/sometimes/never.
 - (iv) acting as learning-guide and resource-manager; always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (v) students learning from each other; always/usually/often/sometimes/never.
 - (vi) emphasis upon informal conversation; how do you set out to achieve this; always/usually/often/sometimes/never;

- (vii) small group-work; always/usually/often/sometimes/never; if Y what success have you had with this; does it have any disadvantages?
 - (viii) emphasis on writing; always/usually/often/sometimes/never.
 - (ix) learning integrated with other basic skills; always/usually/often/sometimes/never.
 - (x) leaving the students totally on their own for a specific purpose; always/usually/often/sometimes/never; if Y, for what purpose? Is it successful?
 - (xi) students setting their own pace; always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (xii) students assessing their own work; always/usually/often/sometimes/never; if N, what is your aim when you mark (e.g., success for the student). Do you insist that they do all the work and give it in on time?
 - (xiii) other.
- (5) Difficulties revealed by this could cause the teacher to slow down the pace of the work, but would not elicit any specific literacy support-teaching, except for students with ESL needs.
- (6) In one college the colour-coding system devised for this purpose had proved to be unhelpful. This was because the students, who chose their own materials, were preoccupied with gaining high marks at the expense of stretching themselves: they therefore chose the easiest tasks to work on, so the tutor had abandoned the system.

- (7) One item of particular interest was the use some Special Needs tutors had made of the facilities to broaden the educational and social experience of their students.
- (8) Qu. 5 (a) If students were/are identified in this way as being in need of extra help do you/would you encourage them to use the workshop? Y/N.
- (b) If Y, at which point do you think they should go for help:
 (i) when they can read and write fairly well, but would like some extra help, or the test indicates that this would be valuable to help their performance in general.
- (9) See question 10.
- (10) Qu. 10(e) [Do you] decide for yourself what you need to do?
 Qu. 10(f) [Do you] get told by the teacher what to do ?
- (11) [Do you] discuss with the teacher what you need to work at and decide together what you will do?
- (12) See Qu. 8(b)*: 8^(a) How important is it to you to be able to write good English: more important/as important as /less important than/ your other subjects. If Y^{(b)*} Do you find the workshop useful: Y/N
- (13) Wragg, E., Oates, J. and Gump, P., *Classroom Interaction, OU, Personality and Learning, Block II*, OU Press, Milton Keynes, 1976.

They add, "These findings are remarkably similar to a number of findings half a century later."

CHAPTER FIVE

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The Distinguishing Characteristics of Language-Support and Communications Workshops.

The Major Differences Between the then ILEA and the Non-ILEA Colleges in the Study.

THE NATURE OF THE CLIENTELE

STUDENTS' WANTS AND NEEDS

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WORKSHOPS IN FULFILLING STUDENTS' NEEDS

The Ethos of the Learning-Environment

Non-ILEA Workshops

ILEA Workshops

Oracy

Non-ILEA Workshops

ILEA Workshops

Conclusion

The Ideology of the Learning-Context

Effectiveness of Achieving Student Autonomy within the Learning-Context

Effectiveness of Achieving Student Autonomy by means of Specific Teaching-Techniques

Experimentation with Learning-contexts

THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHER-AUTONOMY

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND POLITICAL SUPPORT

Staff Support

Gaining Support through Curriculum Development

LEA Support

THE EFFECTS OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES

The Role of ALBSU and Other Providers

The Effects of ERA

EFFECTS OF THE NEW EDUCATION ACT: INCORPORATION

THE "IDEAL" WORKSHOP

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

CONCLUSIONS

Recruitment

Student Autonomy

The Development of Oracy

The Differences between ILEA and non-ILEA Workshops

Counselling

Political Support

Staff Development

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

CHAPTER FIVE

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The discussion in this chapter is of a slightly tentative nature, given the limited scope of the data. The tendency of both direct observation and information collected in a variety of other ways to bear each other out nevertheless encourages confidence in the reasonableness of the statements that follow.

Major differences between ILEA workshops and those outside the Authority have emerged from this study; they demonstrate that these are two different entities, the latter probably being an evolutionary branch of the former, although another possible derivation is mentioned below. As my study shows, these differences can be summed up in the notion that the development of non-ILEA workshops has been strongly influenced by considerations of teaching-methodology, whilst those within ILEA appear to have been driven by a concern for the quality of course-content.

The workshops studied in what was then the ILEA have also moved away from the original conception outlined in *Transition and Access*. These issues have major implications for the discussion that follows.

The Distinguishing Characteristics of Language-Support and Communications Workshops

A language-support workshop often provides linguistic help at the lowest level of need and the emphasis tends to be upon the functional aspects of language. One way in which it differs from a Communications workshop is in placing skills-acquisition in a broader context than simply the vocational. It may allow the student to negotiate his or her learning-context and may ignore the vocational entirely. It recruits at an individual level and the clientele may reflect a wide variety of needs and will usually represent a wide age-range. Students may be members of other courses, or simply enrolled in the workshop. The key principle is to employ flexibility in responding to student requirements and emphasis upon the teacher as enabler.

Such a workshop may be entitled "English workshop" in order to avoid the stigmatic use of the word "literacy". Alternatively, an English workshop may include the concept of GCSE, or even "A" level provision. This study began by using the term "English workshop", this being the starting-point of the researcher. In view of the wide variety of activities that were often found in this type of workshop, the term "language-support workshops" was afterwards used to indicate non-Communications workshops.

Such workshops appear to have developed as a result of enthusiasm on the part of individuals. There is little evidence of planned development on the part of LEAs outside ILEA.

Communications workshops appear to exist only in what was the ILEA. They normally have timetabled groups and provide for the 16-19 college population. Theoretically, students work at an individual level, but in reality they are often taught in groups; the key principle is the acquisition of communicative competence in a vocational context; others are emphasis upon the teacher as enabler and the development of learning-autonomy, maturity and work-readiness in students.

These descriptions of the different styles of workshop have been provided as a clarification for the reader. As will become clear from the more detailed discussion that follows, they are simplifications.

The Major Differences Between the then ILEA and the Non-ILEA Colleges in the Study.

One of the most significant differences between the ILEA and non-ILEA colleges in the study was in the clientele. In the ILEA the majority of students were of Afro-Caribbean origin; in no other college was this the case. This factor is further discussed below. A second factor was in the size of the colleges and their inner-city nature: uniquely amongst the sample colleges, in one of the ILEA colleges there was a need for members of staff to travel some distance by public transport from one site to another. Consequently there was a large staff all engaged on the same task but unable to communicate with each other.

Additionally, in no college other than those in the ILEA was there at that time the need for a security guard, or the need to lock public places like toilets to prevent theft or vandalism. This added to a general air of impersonality in the two large colleges and may have had some effect upon the nature of the workshops operating in this climate, since intimacy, a sense of informal communication and personal commitment were all characteristics of the other workshops to a greater or lesser extent.

Probably the difference that had the most influence on the development of the divergent workshop styles lay in the way in which the ILEA at that time organised both its educational provision and its curriculum development. Because there were Adult Education Institutes in the Authority, Communications workshop provision was directed almost exclusively at the 16-19 age-group. In no other college was this the case and the ethos in ILEA workshops was different as a result. The Authority's influence on curriculum through the Curriculum Development Project (now abolished), although diminishing, was clearly present in the Communications bias of workshops as well as in the provision of "Appendix Two" posts set up to initiate and develop the workshop approach in the colleges. Additionally, the existence was noted during the research period of a variety of In-service training events, practically based and oriented specifically upon the running of workshops. In-service training provided by other LEAs was normally likely to be devoted to techniques of literacy teaching.

Whilst language-support was present in the ILEA colleges in the form of ESOL, this was run on traditional lines: the Adult Education Institutes, on the other hand, were providing language-support in a workshop set-up that would have been more like the non-ILEA colleges' approach. It seems a reasonable speculation that the non-ILEA colleges' approach to workshops may have grown out of Adult Basic Education.

The effects of these differences, and their implications, are discussed in detail in the following pages.

THE NATURE OF THE CLIENTELE

Since the social background of the client group as a whole (reflecting the experiences reported in the Charnley and Jones study, but with a somewhat lower average age) conformed broadly to the expectations delineated in *Transition and Access*, it is legitimate to consider their needs and ways of providing for these in the light of that document's discussion. The ages and variety of the non-ILEA students paralleled the Charnley and Jones experience whilst, as mentioned above, ILEA provision was confined to a more homogeneous group: "the emergent adult". (See *Transition and Access*). This factor was linked with some of the differences between the two types of workshop.

The major difference, apart from age-range, between the client groups was that of race, a vast proportion of the students in one ILEA college in particular being of Afro-Caribbean origin. One workshop tutor described the other ILEA college as a "black college in a white working-class area", although the students actually interviewed were largely white Caucasian. However, since the social backgrounds and courses of all the students were broadly similar, comparison of the provision made for them in the different workshops is felt to be appropriate.

A new factor for consideration in curriculum- and staff-development was a category of student neither anticipated by ILEA nor apparently found in the Charnley and Jones sample. This comprised Special Needs students, some of whose tutors thought the workshop an ideal environment in which to take the first step towards greater social and educational independence.

The frequently half-hearted and sometimes non-existent facilities for access were unfortunate for physically handicapped students with literacy needs. Viewed from the Charnley and Jones definition of a literacy student as "an adult who thinks he has a literacy need" most colleges were failing to reach out to the full range of potential clients.

STUDENTS' WANTS AND NEEDS

Given students' statements that they were most highly motivated by the development of skills relating to job-getting, the arguments for ILEA's chosen

learning-context appear to have been vindicated. Students' second priority, oracy, no doubt reflects a recognition of the realities of daily existence and represents a useful overlap with the learning-theory which states that the development of written language arises out of growth in the spoken.

The next two items on their list, clear-thinking and use of the imagination, were particularly interesting for (in this context) their more esoteric nature. More importantly, they were an indication of the need for variety in the learning-context and a suggestion that students were more imaginative in this respect than either their tutors or the curriculum developers. Their views are also in line with Charnley and Jones' discovery of the need for a holistic approach to literacy teaching.

As will be seen, the wide disparity between tutor and student aims has implications for the negotiated agenda in particular and the attainment of student autonomy in general.

Other wants, needs and preferences of students that emerged were relevant to a particular context and are discussed where they most appropriately belong.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WORKSHOPS IN FULFILLING STUDENTS' NEEDS

The Ethos of the Learning-Environment

The ethos seems to be the single most important factor in the success of non-ILEA workshops and student opinion justifies the emphasis that tutors have placed upon this aspect of their work. Indeed, it is tempting to speculate that given a reasonable environment, a small group of students and a sympathetic teacher, much successful workshop teaching would take place. Important as other factors are, they serve to enhance and sophisticate the process.

The key to success is undoubtedly the committed and non-threatening persona of the tutor who, conscious of the need to provide students with an experience at odds with the sense of failure associated with school, often creates an "alternative" atmosphere which has a particular appeal to students. It is also

reassuring to them in the absence of authority-figures and its implication of greater student control. (A precise contextual definition of this appears below).

Non-ILEA Workshops

Perhaps partly as a result of the policy of voluntary attendance in the non-ILEA workshops in the study, the atmosphere was enhanced by the presence of many highly motivated students, (although all were not) and this appeared to intensify their determination to succeed. In a roll-on, roll-off situation the poorly motivated could absent themselves to the advantage of all concerned.

Motivation appeared to be further heightened by the fact that, for many, the improvement of literacy skills was more important than learning their mainstream subject(s) and the perception that they were experiencing better teaching than in some of their other classes. They also found the work interesting and felt that their chances of success had been enhanced.

The knowledge that the environment had been arranged specifically for them, and teaching orientated upon their particular needs, was often a new experience which underlay the dynamism of their learning. The following represent typical statements from students in the sample:

"The workshop is communal homely - and the teachers are very good; they're prepared to work hard for you and are very patient with people who are struggling."

"The atmosphere is 95% the teacher. There is a caring atmosphere; she's approachable and makes me feel that my point of view's worth considering"

That this success was not so apparent in the written environment provided for students was evidenced by the fact that, despite what tutors had said about students' social backgrounds, materials revealed a good sprinkling of matter influenced by middle-class language-patterns and cultural interest. This varied between workshops, however, and did not predominate in any. Since student opinion as to the interest-level of materials was almost evenly balanced between

fairly-to-very positive and fairly-to-very negative, it is unclear whether this represents a response to this particular factor. It is, in any case, evidence of the need to employ more effective vehicles for learning.

It should be added that there is a gap between what teachers said (and no doubt believed they did) and what actually emerged from student interviews and the materials scrutiny, and attempts to stimulate change would have to take this into account⁽¹⁾.

From the evidence, it is by no means clear how students respond to work- and real-life-related teaching⁽²⁾, since they had almost no experience of this approach to learning and felt themselves largely unable to comment upon it. The fact that many would like more opportunities to explore the imagination might suggest that, on its own, vocationally-related study would represent an arid experience for them and the heavy emphasis upon functionalism, reflected in the lack of materials dealing with social/environmental issues, leisure or the effective use of time during unemployment was too narrow. Happily, at the most vital level of their task, teachers were succeeding for the vast majority of students, who found the difficulty level of the materials they encountered to be "about right".

The fact, acknowledged by many non-ILEA tutors, that the atmosphere drew from students personal information requiring a counselling response is further evidence of the strongly student-centred nature of this style of workshop. The sense of security it implies would seem to be an additional comment on the skill with which the atmosphere was created. For example, the strong objections of several tutors to the practice of testing were related to the need to maintain a non-judgemental role that could induce trust.

These teachers have made strong links between providing support at a personal level and students' educational development. The nature of their clientele and the special ethos of the workshop places informal counselling high upon the hidden agenda. This reflects the experience of the Charnley and Jones volunteers. The challenge for teachers is that it is not normally recognised in the allocation of resources and makes additional demands upon an already very stretched bag of

teaching-skills. The requirement is that they divide time and attention constructively in an unsentimental, yet empathic balance between personal and educational development. That this activity has not attained the status it deserves, even in the consciousness of teachers, let alone at an official level, is apparent in the total lack of teaching-materials related to personal or social needs in all but the ILEA workshops. This suggests that teachers are purely reactive, as yet, and have not reached the stage where a consideration of these needs has become a part of the system driving students forward.

ILEA Workshops

Unlike the non-ILEA egalitarian atmosphere with implications of rudimentary student-control over learning, the ILEA students in the study were in the midst of standard classroom dynamics. This situation appears to be rooted in the different function of the ILEA workshop, whose role was to accommodate discrete groups for whom sessions were a timetabled part of the course. The evident effect upon motivation forced the staff-student relationship into a mode embracing the need for discipline. Teachers in one college were, for example, observed to sit at a teacher's desk set apart from the grouped octagonal tables or, alternatively, nearer to students but maintaining an authoritarian distance at a level above them. One tutor in particular was seen to employ very successfully a selection of stares and smiles that seized control without disturbing the flow of the lesson. The whole was a struggle, recognisable to any experienced teacher, between reluctant learners and a teacher determined to carry out an effective lesson.

A likely further result of compulsory attendance was that the goals of a non-ILEA student would probably be more clearly defined than those of students within ILEA. This would in turn have its effect upon motivation.

Another factor that may have influenced the climate is the almost unmitigated adolescent flavour of the group. In most of the other workshops, the presence of adult learners made a positive contribution to the atmosphere and was clearly, at times, having a powerful effect upon the young. This was especially true where

a cohesive social group had formed which extended its activities beyond the classroom.

It should be added that not all workshops in the then ILEA would have conformed to this pattern: evening literacy provision and work done in the Adult Education Institutes would have been more likely to mirror the activities described in the workshops outside ILEA. The study reflects the experiences of craft-students who were in College during the day and largely on full-time courses, that is, the clientele identified in *Transition and Access*.

Oracy

Non-ILEA Workshops

It would have been interesting to conduct an investigation into the consideration given to students' linguistic backgrounds in teachers' spoken language, particularly in view of the importance highlighted by the study of teacher-student exchanges. Some non-ILEA tutors' heavy emphasis upon student-centred, informal talk as illustrated below suggests a sensitivity towards their social needs and could also represent a recognition of linguistic needs. This was, to an extent, also suggested by the evidence from the materials survey. This particular task was outside the scope of the investigation, which must confine itself to pointing out the significance of the issue and reintroducing it briefly as a factor to be considered in Chapter Six.

A flavour of tutors' methods of creating informality is represented in the two examples that follow; the first is a teacher-student exchange accidentally recorded during interview:

- Tutor: Hi ya!
- Student: Hello. Busy?
- Tutor: No If you want to go into the office, I'll be in in a minute.
We'll put the kettle on, dears.
- Student: It doesn't fit.
- Tutor: What doesn't fit?
- Student: The kettle bit slow, aren't you! (Laughter).
- Tutor: Right, make me one as well please.

The second example sums up the attitude frequently shown to students, this, however, varying in its expression according to the individual tutor and type of clientele. This teacher created a supportive yet unpatronising climate by often addressing her students as "Love".

These are illustrations of non-ILEA teachers' success in creating a relaxed social climate and thus providing for students' linguistic needs in precisely the ways indicated by theorists like James Brittain and Harold Rosen. This is in contrast with the rather less sympathetic context created by some of the written materials. The limits of tutors' achievement in enabling students actively to develop conversation were, however, very apparent.

In non-ILEA workshops, the very limited opportunities for students to contribute in any sustained way to discussion was a feature of the situation thus (fairly) described by an ILEA advisory tutor⁽³⁾:

"What I've seen a lot of is too much "back to paper" work individually The most usual pattern is everybody having the worksheet and the teacher going round which is, I suppose, one remove from the classroom situation at least they are working at their own pace. But I think it falls short of what a workshop should be about because The group interaction is much more educative than dependence upon the teacher."

This may seem surprising in an environment where students make many spontaneous remarks and it is certainly the case that the increased closeness of teacher and student encouraged brief, relaxed social noises in students. At the same time, the teaching-methods employed mainly encouraged a high level of teacher-talk and not sustained comment from students. This would seem to have been the result of the teachers' assumption in most cases that their function was to move the lesson forward in a business-like way. This normally precluded the possibility of lengthy discussion.

This was linked with the tendency of many workshops to concentrate upon individualised teaching at the expense of group-work of all kinds and where

students and teacher did work together in groups a different picture emerged. The lack of any serious use of small-group work in most workshops highlights students' power to chat at will as of especial importance in providing opportunities for oral development. The approach in the majority of cases could be summed up by the following quotation from *Transition and Access*:

" some systems of individualised learning, while offering lip-service to the concept of assisting the student to become autonomous, in fact reassert the teacher's control over the student by isolating him with his task"

It is ironic that a good number of students who had an opinion on this would respond positively to learning in groups, which allows recognition of their own potential for making a positive contribution to both their own and others' learning, if only by confirming each others' identities within the group. This has been confirmed by evidence from the Charnley and Jones sample:

"In particular, the advantages of group-tuition emerged strongly, as mirrors by which individual students were able to reassess their self-image, and the limitations of one-to-one tuition in achieving the objectives of adult education became clearer."

The students' thinking is more intuitively a reflection of current theory and discovery than that of their teachers.

A possible explanation for tutors' lack of emphasis upon formal oral work appears in the statement of the advisory teacher quoted in *Transition and Access*:

"Doing the oral work is more difficult. It demands a lot more control over your hardware setting up is more difficult, and it's much easier to have people sitting down working through worksheets quietly" (p34).

However, the notion of learner-centredness at the heart of the kind of individualised tuition mentioned above clearly embraces the concept of a concentration upon individual written needs at the expense of all else. In that the

ILEA workshop with the least emphasis upon written development was that with the most highly sustained student comment and the non-ILEA workshop with the heaviest concentration upon individualised written work was that with the least, this narrow interpretation needs to be challenged in its failure to recognise the fundamental importance of oral development to language-learning.

This now clearly underlies the thinking in other areas of English and Communications teaching, as exhibited by its inclusion in the National Curriculum and the commitment shown in GCSE, as well as in BTEC and other recently devised courses. Indeed, there is a strong argument for ensuring that teachers are not isolated in workshops, but are also actively involved in a broader area of work so that they are in touch with the evolution of English and Communications teaching in general.

ILEA Workshops

At the same time, the stronger emphasis in ILEA upon oracy was reflected in the higher levels of student-initiated comment recorded during observed sessions and appeared to be solely developed by means of teacher-led, whole-class discussion. This was different from the informal conversation recorded above, which was often personalised, humorous chat which might focus upon specific individuals, or become serious and purposeful at need. ILEA teachers were able to create a suitable forum for the free exchange of opinion by the choice of sympathetic subject-matter and the use of the popular question-and answer technique. One of these tutors was shown by Flanders to be particularly receptive to student suggestion and neither of them was as inclined to lecture as some non-ILEA tutors. Nevertheless, the discussion's parameters were teacher-defined and students who made personal or incidental comment, particularly during the accompanying writing-session, were clearly working against the ethos with the intention of being uncooperative. The difference in student experience can be summed up as being similar to that between a domestic and public situation. In that they made different demands upon their oral skills, students were encountering vastly different learning-situations.

Conclusion

A synthesis of the different approaches to oral work discovered in each kind of workshop as well as a more careful balance in non-ILEA workshops between written and spoken language would help to provide students with the wider variety of learning-experiences they need in order to develop confidence and stretch the range of their linguistic skills.

This situation is part of a more general narrowness of learning-experiences offered to students. That it is also as closely related to the growth of learner-independence as other facets of the work already discussed will become apparent later.

The Ideology of the Learning-Context

That ILEA workshops have moved away from their founding principles is exemplified in the differing tutor-responses in one of the colleges in the study. Here the "old guard" Appendix II lecturer's statements reflected *Transition and Access* policy whilst a next generation lecturer outlined his concern to elicit "personal revelation" from his students in what he saw as his role to develop their understanding of their own emotional and sexual natures. This tendency was not confined to this lecturer and displayed itself in the emphasis of the other next-generation ILEA tutors, although in their cases it was considerably broader.

There were other differences, too, in the learning-experience on offer. ILEA tutors largely held the view that their role was in no way related to literacy teaching, separate provision being made for this. The point was summed up by one, who said: "I support their existing language rather than developing it. I work on the premise that they are writers and speakers of English." In contrast, the "old-guard" Senior Lecturer emphasised the importance of negotiation, writing, integrating and teaching of literacy skills with other basic skills, student-controlled pace and individualised learning, which seemed to be far closer to the theoretical ILEA view of the workshop's function. It seems ironic that extra-ILEA workshops carried out many, although not all, of these practices.

The fact that ILEA students found the teaching-materials generally engaging is significant in a context where they made the least enthusiastic responses about many other aspects of the workshop experience. In the other college, mentioned in the previous paragraph, there appeared to be "alternative" materials in use (but unavailable for scrutiny) in the sense that there was a set of official vocationally-oriented materials in the workshop library, which would have been irrelevant to the teaching-style in use. This was a clear illustration of the dichotomies of outlook and policy already noted.

The total impression gained by these contrasts with non-ILEA colleges and with original ILEA intentions for workshops is that at least some tutors in ILEA have either revolted against or retreated from the functionalism of the methods advocated in *Transition and Access* and largely pursued in workshops outside. It was as if they were responding to what they felt to be students' underlying emotional needs in the spirit of pre-BTEC Liberal Studies teachers. Certainly, in each of the colleges studied, at least one tutor was pursuing his own view of his students' Communications needs in a very substantial way, as a long Afro-Caribbean project in one and a thick document outlining a new direction in the other very clearly demonstrated. This situation would seem to reflect in teachers the concern, already noted, of various theorists at the limiting effect of language-study in a strictly vocational context and to demonstrate that in practice, they were attempting to find concerns that appeared to lie more closely at students' hearts than the world of work. This was in conflict with the evidence students gave of their wants, however, and it is not possible to ascertain whether this move represents the result of an implicit negotiation with the student group in the broadest and most general sense of the word (taking into account that students are sometimes inclined to say one thing and do another) or an aspect of the reversion to traditional teaching-methods.

Linked with this debate is the failure of the workshop tutors studied to make use of the possibilities for the development of a whole range of skills implicit in sending students outside the institution or even within and around it - to gather material which may be presented in a variety of modes. This reflects the very limited ways in which students were engaged with any kind of hardware and the

fact that, on the occasions when they were, it was within a passive relationship. The many ways in which tape-recorders and video-cameras as well as computers and word-processors can be actively used for the purposes mentioned, as well as to stimulate enthusiasm, have hardly been exploited. This, despite the normally adequate equipment provided.

The whole can be summed up as a move away from the intended emphasis upon the development of skills towards a heavy concentration upon content.

That, in itself, this is not an unreasonable move from the students' point of view is suggested by their previously mentioned desire to encounter materials with a variety of types of content, including some that would engage the imagination. ILEA workshops appeared to embrace most closely the Charnley and Jones notion of literacy in the context of general education and in this respect reflected ILEA policy in a somewhat distorted form, but neither in these nor outside the Authority was to be found an appropriate mix of all the necessary ingredients. It seems additionally regrettable that in no workshop did there appear to be any serious attempt to stimulate in students either creativity or pleasure in reading.

Effectiveness in Achieving Student Autonomy within the Learning Context

Since they were usually the recipients of traditional teaching, ILEA workshop students might be regarded as a rough-and-ready control group by which to gauge the effectiveness of student-centred learning in the promotion of learning-autonomy. On any scale measuring this, ILEA workshop students would appear at the lowest end. It would seem that only a total reorientation employing the teaching-methods recommended in *Transition and Access* would bring them closer in maturity to student-behaviour in the non-ILEA colleges. ILEA teachers displayed a greater tendency to use direct influence in staff-student interactions than the other tutors in the sample and this would be an important matter for consideration under staff development concerns.

In no college in the sample outside ILEA was there this same traditional interpretation of the teacher's role. The more student-centred approach of these colleges is further borne out by the fact that, in several, students' learning-

experiences could be very different within the same workshop as well as between one workshop and another in the same college. Although this was not normally the outcome of formal attempts at negotiation, it reflects a greater individual teacher-student interchange with the implication of ongoing, informal and implicit negotiation.

For this reason, the greater flexibility shown by teachers in the non-ILEA element of the sample might be considered to be a result of an implicit, continuous form of curriculum evaluation, and comparable to the attitude-changes brought about by means of the learning-processes experienced by the Charnley and Jones voluntary tutors. This does not imply that the non-ILEA sample of students had achieved a high level of independence in their learning, for example in monitoring their own progress or employing responsible choice in selecting their own learning-materials: in conformity with the evidence of Charnley and Jones' literacy students, as well as from elsewhere⁽⁴⁾ it is clear that particular attention is required in this area if staff and students are to learn how to achieve such a desirable end.

These implications for negotiation as well as the mismatch the research has highlighted between teacher- and student-priorities underline it as a key issue for further exploration in Chapter Six.

From the evidence of the research it seems reasonable to suggest that there is a link between the use by teachers of directive interaction with students and the adoption of intensively directive teaching-techniques. In the one college where students were taught in a group and provided with individual teaching as necessary, there was more indirect influence in the interaction and students were able to make more sustained spontaneous contributions to the discussion as well as to help each other with their work. The importance for autonomy of learning in small groups, both with and without the teacher would seem therefore to have been clearly established. The relevance to staff development lies in the implication of the need for a total reorientation in the practices of some workshop teachers, and a piecemeal approach to this would probably be inadequate.

Since, in other respects, the students being taught in a group context were no more noticeably autonomous than the others, attention must also be paid to encouragement in the use of other devices for promoting this.

Effectiveness in Promoting Autonomy by Means of Specific Teaching Techniques

Students' responses also indicated teacher-dependency both in classroom practice and in their psychology. In ILEA colleges this was related to the use of whole-class teaching. The most significant indicator and probable cause of this outside ILEA was the heavy use of one-to-one teaching. Charnley and Jones have shown the effect this has upon adult literacy students; "Quite often the paired system of tuition created conditions inimical to student independence"⁽⁵⁾.

The preference of the vast majority of students for this method and its wide use by teachers appears to be related to an anxiety to concentrate heavily upon the improvement of written skills: both are seduced by its apparent efficiency, however narrow. There is, therefore, a need to evoke in teachers a recognition of the more intangible benefits to students of a wider range of approaches. Both staff and curriculum development are required here, since students have a tendency to resist independence, as one of the colleges in the study discovered when abandoning individual tuition in favour of group-teaching.⁽⁶⁾

As demonstrated in Chapter Four, by contrast with the majority, one teacher used the expediency of leaving a group of students on its own in order to encourage independent social interaction and group solidarity. This exception serves to emphasise the conservative approach of most teachers, who felt that it was a vital part of their role to be present at all times. Students often expressed the same notion in the words, "The teacher knows best". Few teachers (perhaps behaving like over-conscientious parents) apparently know when to go away and many students do not feel capable of coping adequately without them.

The very way in which learning was organised in an administrative sense was revealing of the particular expectation within any one workshop of the student's relationship with his/her studies. The greater efficiency associated with

relinquishing more power to students has not been perceived by many teachers. In this, the prognosis for students' independent development beyond the classroom is poor.

At the same time, some student control was evident in that universally they set their own working-pace; they enjoyed this practice and teachers saw it as a key aspect of workshops. Related was the refusal of most to set deadlines of any kind for the production of work. The existence of informal peer-group teaching reinforced the notion that there were rudimentary attempts to encourage autonomy. That students did benefit from this was clear in their references to a sense of satisfaction and increased confidence. Feelings of group solidarity were strengthened, tempered only by a view of their own independence within its embrace.

Additional to its implications for autonomy and oral development, cooperative learning had a further, alleviating role in workshops where arrangements fell short of the ideal. This was to diminish isolation and possible monotony for students in a system which over-emphasised individual study.

Experimentation with Learning-Contexts

The restrictive approach towards teaching methods highlighted by this study is further evident in tutors' vision of the learning-contexts in which students may fruitfully operate. A sole Communications teacher has shown how the successful exploitation of a Craft class's different ethos may bring a sense of variety and realism to learning:

She said: " it's the way into teaching communications if you can't answer the question "What are we doing this for?" then you're nowhere

I stood in the workshops for hours watching what was going on and trying some of the things myself it then puts you on a common footing (with the students), because they can't do it and neither can you.

.... I was actually team-teaching with the supervisors eventually it was a coequal situation I was teaching some of the skills you could pick out. For example, one of the supervisors would come in with different types of brick and I would be writing the names of the bricks on the board while he showed the bricks.

.... You can't do it cold there was a good deal of negotiation to start with. In the end you got a rhythm to some extent I could play the non-specialist who could ask questions. Eventually the supervisors would bring in trade-related printed matter, which gave you a wealth of material to work on with the students.

The students responded very well and reacted in a more adult way than YTS students normally do: it dignified what they were doing."

It is felt, however, that the reservations expressed by some workshop tutors would require careful attention if students are not to be embarrassed by the more public domain in which their weaknesses were being addressed and supplementary workshop teaching would be necessary to provide the more private support required.

Because workshop tutors are constantly responding to new demands being made upon them individually by students, the teaching-situation is "organic". This means that new thinking is always required to meet a need. For this reason, it might be expected that there would be considerable experimentation taking place. In contrast with the somewhat disappointing scenario already described, some of the sample colleges were at least exemplifying this in the breadth of skills being taught.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHER-AUTONOMY

Whilst they had well-equipped rooms and extensive back-up for the production and storage of written materials, as well as specialist posts, ILEA tutors in the workshops in this study had no control over the selection of their clientele, group size or timetabling and students were not given the option of attending. This lack of power had a fundamental effect upon the relationships between tutor and pupil

and, by implication, appeared to contradict some of the principles upon which workshops are based, in particular, autonomy and negotiation. The packaging of students in groups also appeared to undermine tutors' perceptions of their pupils as individuals with varying needs. Further, involvement with pupils appeared, as in a traditional classroom, to operate at the level of the group rather than of the individual.

Both tutors and pupils can be thoroughly confined by a completed system, however good the intentions behind it, when its designers have tried to do too much of the thinking for them. Tutors who are not engaged in an evolutionary sense in the system in which they find themselves may experience their own problems of motivation in working within it. Additionally, if they feel powerless at a fundamental level, then it is likely that in turn they will feel unable to empower their students. This would particularly be the case in a situation in which they felt that unmotivated students would respond unconstructively to increased freedom. The point has been made thus in relation to the effect of the National Curriculum upon teachers:

"What the Department did to the teacher, it compelled him to do to the child. The teacher who is the slave of another's will cannot carry out his instructions except by making the pupil a slave of his own will. The teacher who has been deprived by his superiors of freedom, initiative and responsibility cannot carry out his instructions except by depriving his pupils of their own vital qualities."⁽⁷⁾

This point is driven home by evidence from Holland that children are making better progress as a result of a more democratic management style where heads taught and thus had to share their responsibility with staff; the corollary was a more democratic teaching-mode, since "children were being encouraged to sit in a circle where they were encouraged to listen and speak with confidence."⁽⁸⁾

Despite the limits of student-independence and control of the learning in the sample colleges outside ILEA, it was greater than within and the power-relationships between teacher and pupil vastly different. That there were exceptions even here became clear during informal observation of a (non-sample)

non-ILEA college into which mathematics materials had been imported wholesale from another college. Some hundred students sat together in one large room, programmed material before them. Four or five teachers stood talking to each other, waiting to be asked for help. There seemed to be a lack of involvement, perhaps because neither the course nor any of the material was their own and the size of the "class" and the herding together of students in a room lacking private nooks and crannies inhibited any social talk or formation of relationships with individuals. Judging by student interview-statements concerning the need for privacy in which to confront and express feelings of inadequacy, it seemed unlikely that help would often have been requested in that environment.⁽⁹⁾

These examples would seem to suggest that a system cannot be successfully imposed upon teachers, since energy and commitment arise from the fact that they have initiated even pioneered it themselves.

An aspect of this appears in the way in which many of the non-ILEA tutors-in-charge saw themselves as needing to fight the system hard for support of various kinds. This included battles for recognition. One tutor said, "There is a need for an identity for the workshop. I have been fighting a political battle with the Special Needs Coordinator, who wants to absorb us. We're not on the Special Needs Team and we're not a part of the English Team. I want a team of my own that runs across the College."

The difference was in the sense they had of involvement in an important purpose, which would drive them through difficulties. Teachers who had made unusually strenuous efforts to gain what they needed showed that this could be successfully done. This point is well illustrated by the ILEA veteran who said,

"If you want to set up a workshop from scratch, you have to sell the idea first. I begged and borrowed from everywhere used an old banda machine that nobody else wanted You can manage, if you absolutely have to, on second-hand things. I've always found that the money comes after that"⁽¹⁰⁾

Finding ways of motivating teachers in an appropriate direction would therefore seem to be as important as motivating students and difficult in a situation where those higher in the educational hierarchy do not seem to be particularly motivated themselves. The answer would seem to lie somewhere in the presence of a good number of workshops outside ILEA that appear to have sprung up largely from teacher-initiative, since institutions of Higher Education and LEAs do not seem to have been a major influence in their development. In any case, where teachers are not motivated, the imposition of a workshop approach will not succeed.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND POLITICAL SUPPORT

Staff Support

The particularly strong support won from craft tutors by some workshop managers was a reflection of their hard work and commitment, mentioned above, since it partially came out of carefully built up personal relationships. Their relationships with students played an even more important role in this. One example was of a Head of Department who might not normally rate literacy as a high priority who said:

"My students are often reluctant to go and I don't pressure them they're not always keen to accept help from people they don't know it's a very male-oriented department and in the literacy unit the teachers are all female but having said that, once you've persuaded them to go because of the sort of people we've got over there they take to it very quickly because of the environment and the reaction they get they realise it's very different and the atmosphere is very different and then they persuade other people to go whom I might not be able to persuade"

This success had been dependent upon the enthusiasm of a young part-time teacher who, amongst other activities, had given up weekends to go on motor-bike rallies with her students.

A technique employed by one workshop manager was to employ craft tutors in the workshop to teach literacy. Potentially an imaginative way of gaining

increased commitment from staff, this approach has its dangers. One Craft tutor said:

"In order to assess which of my students need extra help, I ask them to read aloud and if they have difficulty with a good number of words, I ask them to read aloud as often as possible."

ALBSU found it necessary to publish a document⁽¹¹⁾ outlining for Craft tutors ways of identifying and overcoming obstacles placed in the way of learning by literacy problems. This is further indication of the need to exercise caution in employing Craft tutors directly in literacy teaching. It is also an indicator of further staff development needs, particularly given the statements of some students concerning the relative poverty of the teaching they sometimes encounter in these classes. (For example, "You can explore things in the workshop. In other subjects, writing means dictation or copying notes.") That this is sometimes still the case, despite an improved situation since this study was begun, is borne out by recent evidence from HMI⁽¹²⁾.

Interestingly, many students' view of the tasks workshop tutors should be pursuing were of a fairly liberal nature which suggested a wider conception of student need than that reflected in workshop practices. Nevertheless, non-workshop tutors' responses suggested that practical support (ie, student release from their own classes) could be most strongly gained by emphasis upon work directed towards the students' need to enhance performance in their craft courses and by drawing craft teachers into this activity, particularly in devising craft-oriented handouts and tasks. Herein lies much normally unexplored territory the possibilities of which workshop tutors have yet to exploit.

Gaining support Through Curriculum Development

The principles elucidated in the TVEI scheme have much in common with those underlying workshop teaching and through it notions of student-centred learning are now being more widely disseminated. Since teachers' problems appear to lie in the marginality of workshops, it would seem logical to suppose that taking part

in raising the profile of their approach to teaching by means of involvement in TVEI and any other schemes promoting it would be an appropriate tactic.

Thus, they would be promoting their philosophy as an important contribution to mainstream education.

LEA Support

That the workshop approach may be more widely declining in ILEA was suggested by the initial difficulties in finding colleges for research. In only one non-ILEA college initially approached was there the same sense of reluctance as that experienced within the Authority. In two cases, it was admitted that this was linked with a decline in workshop provision. There was also the strong reluctance on the part of the second-generation tutor in one ILEA college to allow observation of his classes and, at first, the student interviews to be finished. A tutor in another ILEA college remarked that "workshops were passé" and a workshop librarian said:

"Workshops have largely become resource-bases. As the first-generation tutors have moved on, the young ones coming in have not felt confident of the approach, so have reverted to more traditional teaching."

The two tutors-in-charge in the sample ILEA colleges, when asked for suggestions concerning the improvement of their provision, said their main concern was: "For people to use the workshop properly."

Other evidence of this decline was obtained from the two colleges studied. In both the Appendix II tutors (mentioned above) felt that these posts had been subverted in the sense that principals "had jumped on the workshop bandwagon, gained the extra posts available and then broadened their remit to the extent that it was not possible to devote the time required to the development and enhancement of workshops". This is not evidence that no workshops still exist in the old ILEA area, but of a decline in their number.

There was also a feeling that the Curriculum Development Project (now abolished with the abolition of ILEA) was no longer providing the impetus described in *Transition and Access*:

"We want something that actually works; it's just theory I think they're into curriculum, not into teaching-materials they do have materials but they are just taken from other colleges. Most of the advisory teachers are into developing the curriculum, new initiatives, the implications of them; they're not actually into teaching materials and strategies that meet needs. They're really into CPVE and the problems with that and strategies for getting it off the ground"⁽¹³⁾

From a national perspective, the picture is even grimmer: whilst some authorities are energetically promoting and supporting literacy teaching in one guise or another, others have no commitment to it in any shape or form. Additionally, because of the variety of forms the provision takes in different authorities, its availability may be limited to only a small section of the client potential in any one area.

The matter of the precise approach taken to curriculum delivery pales into insignificance beside the question as to what proportion of those who need literacy teaching actually receive it.

In very many cases developments are by no means LEA-led, and are left to chance:

"I have just conducted a Borough review in the light of the Educational Reform Act and it may be that we put a policy to committee for "Essential Adult Learning" (and plan for implementation). I would expect the College workshop provision to expand, but as the result of TVEI and general changes in FE and not as the product of policy statements It is not likely that any Borough policy will refer specifically to workshop provision in the future.

"As you will see this Authority has a very disjointed attitude towards the provision The initiatives come from within the colleges rather than from the LEA."

(This reply came from a HOD on secondment to his LEA).

These issues are bound to become increasingly vital in an era when Performance Indicators will decide the capitation colleges receive from the LEAs: since one of these is staff-student ratios, there may be increasing pressure to fund only large groups of students; outside ILEA workshop teaching is very staff-intensive, so a high level of political activity may be the only way to ensure continuation.

There is likely to be a growing need for staff to be aware of possible alternative sources of funding and how to tap these. The wide variety of LEA practices fully illustrate these concerns:

"There is an independent Adult Basic Education Service, funded from the FE budget, which is the LEA's principal response to literacy[the LEA is] continuing to fund literacy provision relatively generously."

"Literacy and Basic Skills provision have been maintained primarily through funds made available from the Training Commission Since the disappearance of such programmes the Authority do not see the provision of Literacy and Basic Skills as an area of priority."

"There is very little literacy provision undertaken outside ALBSU."

Half of the sample colleges were running their own ALBSU scheme. In the others, there was no evidence of liaison or cooperation. What will happen to those now in existence under Incorporation has yet to be seen.

THE EFFECTS OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES

The Role of ALBSU and Other Providers

The result of government schemes for unemployed people, where these have gone to private agencies, have been to place a good proportion of potential literacy students in the hands of trainers who may either not see literacy as a priority or who may decide upon an in-house solution. Such schemes have tended to be short-term in any one particular manifestation and it would seem that long-term curriculum planning and careful consideration of the development of appropriate methodologies would be unlikely to take place in the midst of the kinds of disruption created by frequent changes of direction. It is certainly true that in some cases such work has been undertaken by people who are not in any sense teachers of literacy.

Where funding has gone to colleges, its short-term nature renders it inadequate unless senior managers have been prepared to absorb the costs subsequently. As a result of this, some workshop managers have adopted an entrepreneurial approach, but since money thus obtained comes with strings attached, this normally has a significant effect upon the type of provision made as well as upon its delivery.

It should be said, however, that it is likely that more people have been exposed to some sort of literacy tuition as a result of government schemes than would otherwise have been the case. What effect this has had is at present unknown, but the limited length of stay of any one individual would seem to suggest the likelihood of minimal influence.

Similarly, in a consideration of the contribution made by ALBSU, the question of quality is a matter of concern in a situation where in some authorities sole responsibility for literacy provision appears to be left to this voluntary organisation. Indeed, research⁽¹⁴⁾ has revealed that very little progress was made by adult literacy students after two years' tuition. The reason for this is by no means clear since, hardly surprisingly, the study did not address itself to the question of the competence of volunteers to teach. Given the gaps in the perceptions and practices of forward-thinking and experienced teachers, it would

seem reasonable to assume considerably greater problems amongst volunteer tutors, even taking into account the fact that 30% of them were trained teachers.

It would seem to be self-evident that there is a need for cooperation between workshop managers in FE and other local providers if students are to be offered a coherent approach within the community. This need is the greater since the organisation of the Adult Literacy scheme militated against the success of students who required more intensive teaching than volunteers could provide, since they were not referred on to Further Education⁹¹⁵. Moreover, a view of literacy teaching in the context of Adult Education¹⁶ implies a potentially continuous ladder of learning which could eventually bring many adult literacy students within the doors of Further Education colleges. In any case, they should be given this opportunity. Further, adult education is under attack in some LEAs as a result of financial pressures and in London additionally because of the break-up of ILEA⁽¹⁷⁾⁽¹⁸⁾.

There is evidence that ALBSU now recognises the need for many of its students to move on into Further Education⁽¹⁹⁾. That there is still much work to do in this respect is borne out by the recent findings of HMI⁽²⁰⁾.

The Effects of ERA

The abolition of ILEA under ERA and with it the Curriculum Development Project can only hasten the decline of ILEA workshops mentioned above. In view of its evidently originating role in workshop-development nationally, and the consistency with which the Authority took up the leading role in curriculum development generally, abolition represents a considerable loss to the British educational world as a whole:

".... in many ways the ILEA has led local authorities generally in activities which have been of exemplary value to the country as a whole the ILEA has consistently played a central, pioneering and innovatory role in the past and continues to do so today."

Despite the way in which workshops appear to be declining within what was the ILEA, they were begun here and their influence clearly has spread throughout the country, albeit in a different form.

As to the more general, long-term effects, the transfer of responsibility for education to the Inner-London boroughs has, it is felt, been underfunded: "What makes the present situation so frightening is that the Government is trying to force through radical changes on reduced budgets"⁽²¹⁾ and this is going to have a particularly debilitating effect upon the schools for which the poorer authorities are responsible. Indeed, it has been predicted that the government will try to force through spending-cuts of nearly fourteen percent in Inner London over the next four years⁽²²⁾. Other aspects of ERA are likely to have an equally long-term influence upon the need for workshops. The widespread concern amongst educators over the results both of allowing schools to opt out of local authority control and of Local Financial Management are mainly related to fears for pupils who are the least rewarding to teach. The policy "might damage the most vulnerable children and leave them in sink schools"⁽²³⁾.

The potential effect upon class sizes and the likely recruitment of cheaper, less experienced teachers as well as upon staff morale⁽²⁴⁾ will be felt by all pupils, but the most vulnerable will be the least resilient and particularly if "The introduction of local management is being used as a cloak to disguise a significant reduction in spending"⁽²⁵⁾. Further, the introduction of local management of schools has been "seriously jeopardised by under-funding and compounded by poll-tax capping in many local authorities" so that all schools were likely to be losers and not only the most disadvantaged ones⁽²⁶⁾. Concern at this is increased by the fact that school book purchases fell by £20 million in 1987/8, compared with 1986/7 and there was a further drop of about £2.5 million in 1988⁽²⁷⁾. The HMI Report of 1988 concluded that many primary schools could not afford the resources required by new curricular initiatives, that secondary schools did not have sufficient funding to improve their book stocks and that "many school libraries have been neglected for years"⁽²⁸⁾. That "schools could no longer separate financial viability from educational decision making"⁽²⁹⁾ is an addition to a growing picture that augurs particularly badly for students whose needs are for

a commitment to an enriched experience aided by a concentration of resources as a means of remedying their disadvantages, since "less able pupils are much more likely to experience the poor and the shoddy than the more able: a worryingly persistent feature of English education at all levels"⁽³⁰⁾. A good example of the accuracy of this statement appears in the results of a survey which has established that under LMS funding for special needs students was already being swallowed up in general school budgets. This was "disturbing evidence that LMS is hitting the least fortunate pupils the hardest"⁽³¹⁾. Moreover, the recent cut in TVEI funding will do nothing to increase the momentum for learner-centredness in education⁽³²⁾.

A further concern is a possible intensifying of social divisions by a more widespread development of City Technology colleges⁽³³⁾. This might have the result, observed in America, of creating "zoned" schools [which] now serve "very deprived areas, largely populated by an 'underclass' with few opportunities to get on"⁽³⁴⁾. Evidence that some CTCs are taking more than their share of the most intelligent pupils in a catchment area is already emerging⁽³⁵⁾.

The sum total of these possibilities is that a considerable part of the inheritance for Further Education is likely to be a generation of demoralised students. These will have come straight from the hands of over-stretched school-teachers trying to eke out meagre resources over a curriculum designed to meet tests as a result of which their pupils are doomed to see themselves as failures. In some areas, teacher-shortages may well exacerbate the situation⁽³⁶⁾. There was a drop of 7% in graduate recruitment into teacher-training between 1985 and 1989⁽³⁷⁾. The ill-effects of testing under the National Curriculum are unlikely to be avoided even under the best possible outcomes of ERA. A corollary of this is that "... there are clear indications that remedial classes are being sacrificed when reductions are to be made"⁽³⁸⁾. Further, the imposition of the National Curriculum may actually destroy the good practice of learner-centred study that already exists in schools, particularly in the primary sector⁽³⁹⁾.

So the challenge to Further Education is likely to be even greater in the future and colleges may be increasingly likely to turn to workshops for the support they

can provide for such clients. At the same time, since pupils are to be tested in core subjects from the age of 7⁽⁴⁰⁾ eventually there will be a body of high-profile data available upon which arguments for more funding and better facilities could be based. It will also provide colleges with ready-made information about the literacy needs of all their entrants. These are useful political weapons.

In the immediate future, in the context of the falling 16-19 roll, further resources may be freed to provide for such students, since it is likely to have the effect of keeping many students seeking more academic courses within the school system. College managements eager to maintain their enrolments may be in future more inclined to provide for a client group that has not hitherto normally been a high priority. Indeed, there is evidence that this is now happening⁽⁴¹⁾. In inner-city areas with significant black populations this may be particularly important in the event of the diminution and even disappearance of Section 11 funding⁽⁴²⁾.

The limit to what can be achieved on a political front at this time has, perhaps, been indicated by the failure of the Government to commit itself sufficiently firmly to the provision of Adult Basic Education by ensuring that the provision of "basic skills is made an unequivocal duty of each local education authority"⁽⁴³⁾. Further, after over 15 years of temporary funding, there is still no long-term mandate for ALBSU itself. Indeed, "There is no foreseeable increase in national commitment to eliminating adult illiteracy. The emphasis in the debate-created education's 'crisis' is on prodding schools to encourage better pupil performance"⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Meanwhile, ERA makes no provision for the inclusion of a discrete budget for Basic Education in FE colleges, with the result that workshop managers will have to compete for the sparse funds available. One result of such limited funding is that the most disadvantaged will not be reached⁽⁴⁵⁾.

ALBSU has responded by recommending to LEAs that they should make such arrangements. They have also pointed out the opportunities the Act provides to strengthen the coherence of Basic Skills provision and is offering individual guidance to LEAs on the most effective way of developing this in the light of

ERA. They are also planning by a series of discussion documents to draw LEAs' attention to the issues related to good practice and most immediately to ways of evaluating the effectiveness of LEA provision⁽⁴⁶⁾. It is to be hoped that these very positive actions will help to increase awareness and commitment.

The specific value of this for the FE workshop is the support ALBSU provides in its insistence that the need for Basic Skills provision should be taken into account in the strategic plan for Further Education now required of LEAs under ERA and its guidelines in resourcing requirements. The increasing attention ALBSU appears to be paying to the FE sector is a healthy sign in itself for the future of unified provision. It brings the additional advantage of a high political profile to an area of work which needs and deserves more support.

An example of the success of this approach appears in the Basic Skills Initiative announced by Timothy Eggar in January, 1990 "to assist the development of partnerships between LEAs and TECs for unemployed adults and those in employment but unable to progress at work because of basic skills difficulties". This was to be coordinated by ALBSU with a grant of almost £3,000,000 to fund approximately 30 development projects⁽⁴⁷⁾.

A very visible effect of the Education Reform Act has been a fundamental change in the approach of college managers, who have been forced to become more entrepreneurial if their institutions are to survive⁽⁴⁸⁾.

This has accelerated the general effect of Government policy upon education, which has been to encourage business-style attitudes and practices. Indeed, "the question arises [in schools as to] whether the budget is the means whereby the National Curriculum will be delivered or is the national curriculum the means whereby the budget will be balanced?"⁽⁴⁹⁾. The same concerns must apply in the FE sector. The effect of the new TECs has yet to be seen, but a pilot scheme for the use of vouchers for part-time education and training funded in part out of the FE budget and administered by the TECs points to the probability of further industrial and commercial influence in this area and further struggles to maintain levels of funding⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Fears that "unprofitable" students would fare badly in the scramble for a share of a limited budget were already being expressed in 1985:

"College Management doesn't realise the demand. The Head of Department doesn't think literacy students are worth spending money or resources on because this isn't the role of the College. (Students only pay £1 per year for literacy.)"⁽⁵¹⁾.

However, some colleges may find themselves under pressure from their new governing bodies to make themselves accountable to the Community as well as to Industry. Accountability to the Community was, after all, a major part of the rationale for the introduction of the Community Charge. Additionally, it is now suggested that "Brain is replacing brawn as a condition of employment" and 70% of the work-force "are only equipped to be coolies"⁽⁵²⁾ and literacy tends to be perceived as an important component in the general upgrading of workers' skills even if not always effectively dealt with, as can be seen above in the discussion concerning government schemes. It should be added that despite these optimistic signs, the proportion of the population with the greatest difficulties has so far remained untouched and may well continue thus⁽⁵³⁾.

In Further Education, a positive effect of the new proposals for the inclusion of core skills into the 16-19 curriculum, for the development of which there is "overwhelming consensus"⁽⁵⁴⁾, is the support it would provide for broadening the offer of workshop tuition to a wider clientele.

Equally significant, however, is the response of the LEAs who, if they are unable any longer fully to manage resources, will be in some difficulty in controlling the curriculum. Schools and colleges might simply opt for providing well-motivated students with high-profile courses. This would run counter to the policies of many authorities,, who have "tended towards positive discrimination in order to take account of social needs"⁽⁵⁵⁾. However, their vestigial power, to monitor the development and implementation of colleges' strategic plans, provides the opportunity to insist on the maintenance of a proper educational balance, if they so choose. With the advent of incorporation, however, the LEAs' power to influence will disappear.

Furthermore "Seminal events in the 1980s which have dramatically changed perceptions amongst staff have been the increasing involvement of the Department of Employment, the publication of "Managing Colleges Efficiently" and the impact of the Education Reform Act"⁽⁵⁶⁾. The major effect of these factors was thought to be a new recognition that "resource management is only the outcome of the need to manage the process of learning" and that this has led to a moving of emphasis away from control of inputs to a scrutiny of outputs in a growing need "to satisfy the funders"⁽⁵⁷⁾. The consequence, has been the adoption by LEAs of a system for quality assurance in Further Education.

This rapidly growing practice amongst LEAs will, at its best, have the effect of placing the customer at the top of the hierarchy and lead to resourcing more effectively based on need demonstrated by verifiable data. The overwhelming evidence of national need for literacy teaching, not therefore difficult to establish at college-level, and the quality of provision evidenced by the very enthusiastic customer-response discovered by this study indicate two very powerful tools close to the workshop manager's hand.

Further, the large number of changes at high speed demanded by the Government in recent years has resulted in a growing number of colleges that have been reorganised along more flexible matrix or semi-matrix lines. There have been two major effects. One, it has brought movement where there had often been stasis for some years. Secondly, the financial considerations arising out of ERA have led to the displacement of senior staff by younger, cheaper managers. An inbuilt increase in democracy, however limited, is an added reason why colleges are now likely to be more open to new approaches towards management.

That new ideas are beginning to manifest themselves is evidenced by the changes that have occurred at East Birmingham College. Management strategies resemble in principle the Total Quality Management approach employed by Jaguar Cars⁽⁵⁸⁾. The question of whether this remains an anomaly in education or whether it will prove a forerunner of general change is at present in the sphere of the clairvoyant. That these ideas are closely related to Quality issues does suggest

that, albeit in dilute form, they will become more generally influential and thus are worthy of discussion⁽⁵⁹⁾.

A client-led institution "goes back to basics":

"The management systems promoted during the last quarter century have added up to distractions from the main ideas We got so tied up in our techniques that we forgot about people - the people who produce the service and the people who consume it."⁽⁶⁰⁾

It substitutes the notion of leadership for that of management, creating a flatter hierarchy with implications of greater equality and its aim is to release the creativity of its employees. It involves adopting a "bottom up" approach and listening to employees, as well as to customers. This is a set of ideas that would seem to be particularly appropriate for education:

"The best bosses are tough on the values, tender in support of people who would dare to take a risk and try something new in support of those values. They speak constantly of vision, of values, of integrity; they harbour the most soaring, lofty and abstract notions. At the same time they pay obsessive attention to detail."

Peters and Austin argue that, far from being incompatible with financial viability (as educators often imagine) this approach has been adopted by the most successful American companies. "Where quality goes up costs go down"⁽⁶¹⁾. It was also responsible for Jaguar's then return to profitability.

Defining quality, vision and integrity in an educational context is a more complex business. It would seem, however, that colleges may have to do something more than simply appeal to industry if they are to project an image that will bring success. After all a shrinking, but highly significant, proportion of funding still comes from the LEAs and a further consideration must be recent indications that the policies of this particular government may not "go on and on" forever.

Because of the high degree of teacher-initiative and creativity in the development of workshops, and their emphasis upon striving "to delight the customer"⁽⁶²⁾ they would have the potential to become important role-models in an institution under the influence of such ideas. Workshop managers should be ready for any such opportunity.

Those in this study were already in 1986, in their different ways, exemplifying the "Onion Patch" strategy, which allows an individual or small-team approach to quality⁽⁶³⁾.

This is achieved by a series of tactics, but mainly by means of protecting staff from counter-pressures from above and aiming at achieving results which will gain respect, thus building "a network of believers and supporters" whilst making "real improvements in the system". The additional need to find ways of involving and educating top management is one which, in most of the colleges studied, had yet to be addressed. Nevertheless, there are now signs that at least some aspects of quality assurance are beginning to become an important issue in colleges⁽⁶⁴⁾.

This body of ideas, potentially highly supportive of student-centred education as well as of creative approaches to teaching in general, should not be omitted from a staff development programme.

EFFECTS OF THE NEW EDUCATION ACT: INCORPORATION

The aim of the Government further to increase participation in education and training by the 16-19 age-range, linked with the underlying theme in the White Paper of increased competition between sixth forms and FE, will be likely to place pressure on these institutions to attract an increasing number of students with lower-level attainments. The acceleration of the development of NVQs, the introduction of a new general NVQ and a stronger emphasis upon the value of vocational qualifications as a whole is likely to accentuate this trend.

Since also explicit in the document is the intention that this expansion will take place in a context of increased efficiency rather than increased resourcing, any kind of activity which requires a comparatively high staff-student ratio will be placed under strong pressure and this could spell doom for workshops which operate in this way.

At the same time Government policy refers to the use of flexible learning, which it specifically links with open-learning. This would seem to refer to a package-based approach to study which minimises teacher-input, an implicit suggestion as to how expansion will be effected in a climate of greater efficiency.

How successful this approach will be may well depend on how far colleges are able and willing to support students' independent learning with tutorial back-up. It will not be appropriate for students with literacy and numeracy problems and may indeed demand a fairly high level of linguistic skill of the learner. This provides workshop managers with a very relevant argument for the continuation of the facilities they have developed, and one which may have more effect if they emphasise the potential contribution to student retention-rates⁽⁶⁵⁾.

An encouraging sign is the reference to provision for adult education through FE and a specific reference to the importance of basic skills. ALBSU is clearly determined to capitalise on this and has already approached FE principals with an offer of advice on how to make such provision⁽⁶⁶⁾.

THE "IDEAL" WORKSHOP

In the workshops' egalitarian atmosphere, movement towards independence and maturity and the free exchange of opinion, outside what was ILEA the mood expressed through workshops is anarchic (in the best sense of the word). Although the sample colleges fall short of achieving these ideals, the spirit is implicit in the high value they placed upon individuals, their adult treatment of the young and the ethos as a whole. This spirit is further present in the individual nature of the models encountered, arising from differences in staff and their response to students as well as from local conditions⁽⁶⁷⁾.

For this reason, it is not possible to delineate a model workshop by which individual success or failure could be measured. Workshops exist in a philosophy. The differences between them occur as a result of the varying emphases placed upon those principles, as well as external constraints. The yardstick of success would be the degree to which they have been able to create an effective balance between the sometimes conflicting needs of their pupil⁽⁶⁸⁾.

The way in which this has been done would be a matter of personality and circumstance⁽⁶⁹⁾.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

In 1985 about 40% of the FE colleges who responded to the initial survey were using the workshop method, or were about to use it. Many were totally uninformed and asked for more information, which suggested a potential for wider dissemination. Those who were informed took the ILEA definition, or a close variant, for granted.

Lack of such awareness in teacher-training institutions of Higher Education represents a marked contrast to the level of interest in FE. Because of the uncertainty in HE over the definition, even the positive responses to the survey in some cases may be unreliable, where there was no clear evidence as to the precise definition attached to the word "workshop" by the respondent. This, however, does not invalidate the evidence it has evinced of their general lack of involvement in the specific promotion and development of English workshops. This implies a sector which is disappointingly out of touch with current thinking and developments in FE. There is an issue here for HE to address.

Apart from in the now defunct ILEA, the initiative apparently comes from staff themselves, and not even from management level, and this has strong implications for workshop tutors (see below). Respondents' general inability to cite supporting institutions outside the ILEA may reflect ignorance on the part of the HE sector rather than their total absence, but it does seem to tie in with evidence derived from workshop-tutor interviews and the LEA survey indicating generally small-scale and piecemeal provision by local authorities. Many of them saw this as a

college-role. ALBSU appears to be the only body outside the ILEA consistently attempting to give help. This is particularly important in view of the large number of tutors who felt that staff were ill-equipped to deal with the considerable demands made by such a teaching-method, and that the needs of part-timers were a particular source of concern. However, since the Curriculum Development Project at Westminster College in the ILEA provided support for staff and yet the workshop method appeared to be almost defunct there, staff development is not, on its own, an adequate motivating factor. Nothing can compensate for the appointment and continued support of enthusiastic and suitable staff. A then ILEA advisory teacher expressed the point thus:

"What you're up against is the teachers' own attitudes you can't push people. I don't think you can impose the kind of teaching people can do. We've had people in the workshop, for instance, who actually couldn't take it, and they've had to be taken out again. If they weren't standing in front of a blackboard in front of everybody they were totally unhappy and the only thing you can do is put them back in a classroom"

However, assuming good and well-motivated teachers, there is much that can be done to improve workshop provision through staff development.

CONCLUSIONS

Recruitment

By far the most effective way of recruiting and retaining students was by "seduction" and, where administrative arrangements allowed this approach, the study revealed that teachers were very successful in using it. Where administrative procedures did not allow this, tutors had less well-motivated students to deal with.

Tutors need to be aware of the implications for recruitment and motivation of the siting of their workshops.

Student Autonomy

A rudimentary form of autonomy is implicit within the ethos as well as in students' enthusiastic responses to the workshop approach. It also exists in teacher-intention⁽⁷⁰⁾.

There is a strong need to devise methods by which students may be gradually eased into a new role in relation to their learning. This would require a diminution of the present strong attention paid to the direct development of written skills and more time to be spent upon the acquisition of learning-skills. This would be related to a more central role for negotiation, seen and used as an educational tool, and the more positive and general use of a wider range of teaching-strategies which developed confidence and encouraged independence. The teacher's role would be increasingly to take on an enabling role as the student's competence to direct his own learning grew.

Whilst students often find it difficult to formulate a response to teaching-methods they have not actually encountered, it is clear that the seeds of negotiation already exist within their own view of the educational priorities they should be pursuing and in their sometimes strongly expressed views upon the learning-experiences they are being offered. Their conservatism comes from lack of confidence, and that they could benefit from an intensification of their new experiences is abundantly clear in the enthusiasm with which they almost unanimously prefer the workshop approach to that of school.

A refinement of (in some cases, an introduction to) the previously discussed methods would be necessary for this to evolve more fully. That this is a gradual process⁽⁷¹⁾ has not been fully understood by those few tutors who have made a serious attempt to organise a system from which it may arise. A more supportive approach than at present exists, as well as a better understanding of the true nature of autonomous learning are urgent requirements. The danger for those promoting this concept is in its potential for misuse as "cost-effective" partially or even totally unsupported learning.

However, there is a need to develop a framework within which individuals may become autonomous at their own pace: the flexibility of the workshop provides a fertile environment in which such growth may occur. The basic tools are the negotiated agenda and joint profiling of student progress. The fact that this is less obviously efficient in the short-term and even apparently time-wasting for students who lack self-discipline may be a factor to be endured in the interests of long-term maturity, providing the system is driving students inexorably in that direction⁽⁷²⁾.

For true autonomy, flexibility would have to be used in the case of students with limited, short-term aims. (E.g., an adult requesting a few brief weeks' tuition in order to pass an entrance exam into one of the public services has already established his learning-parameters and may have a precise view of the help he requires. His autonomy may well then lie in responding to his requirements.)

The Development of Oracy

This requires more time and attention than it is at present receiving in most workshops, based upon a clearer recognition of its contribution to linguistic development. Currently, teachers are extremely sensitive to the need for a sympathetic environment and are very successful in creating this. They have not, in general, exploited the advantage to its fullest in order to develop students' powers of oracy.

There may be a strong argument for ensuring that teachers are not isolated in workshops, but are also actively involved in a broader area of teaching so that they are constantly stimulated by new thinking concerning English/Communications teaching in general and are in particular updated on the new emphasis being placed upon oracy within the mainstream curriculum.

The Differences between ILEA and Non-ILEA Workshops

There was an undesirable division in the colleges between literacy and Communications teaching and the two different approaches seemed to be reflected in the two different styles of workshop. These are not fundamentally different, but exist in a continuum along which students should be encouraged to progress

at their own pace. Each style had much good practice to offer the other, yet there was no cross-pollination.

Counselling

There was an interesting dichotomy in non-ILEA workshops between the student-centred, sensitive ethos in which personal counselling is carried out and the narrow functionalism of the teaching. In ILEA the more sensitive materials, but less student-centred ethos, was a reverse image of this. It was almost as if tutors felt they had to limit their responses to the personal aspects of their students in order to ensure that teaching took place.

Political Support

Workshop tutors, especially in one ILEA college, have demonstrated ways in which the teaching may flow out of its base and return carrying craft students and tutors with it. In contrast, a non-ILEA college has shown how, after the initial Big Bang, the curriculum can continuously expand, providing support for an increasing number of requirements and in this way drawing into itself support from Craft tutors as well as a wider range of clients.

The answer to the survival of the workshop method may well lie in this willingness to move outside its original environment, creating a further dynamic by presenting it as an example of good practice which can be adapted to other classroom environments. Evidence that this development may be slowly occurring has recently been produced by HMI⁽⁷³⁾. In general, given a probable future of strict spending limits, workshop staff will have to address themselves more fully to the question of self-advertisement, particularly in view of the apparently low profile of workshops in HE and LEAs (already mentioned), since they will have to promote the work themselves within their own institutions and authorities.

Staff Development

The need would be to support and stimulate teachers' own abundant creativity largely by sharing knowledge and experience. The approach would have to

follow that involved in workshop teaching, first, so teachers can have experience of the consumer view and secondly because they are good principles with a universal application.

This would begin a continuous highlighting of the principles with the intent of alerting tutors to the possibilities they may at present be overlooking with the additional aim of raising awareness of their own classroom behaviour. Tutors could observe each other in the classroom for this purpose.

Negotiation would require particular attention, not least because it could have an enlightening effect concerning students' own broader view of their needs. An exchange of views with Craft tutors would enhance this effect. The study revealed that many of the tutors in the sample were prepared to take part in such activities and especially in the development of materials. That they are at least sometimes in dire need of staff development in their own right has already been suggested, so that a further advantage gained from this activity could be an improvement in their own teaching.

An additional, effective means of transferring expertise is by team-teaching, which many of the Craft tutors studied were also willing to try.

A dialogue between ILEA and non-ILEA workshop tutors would be valuable for both and closer links between Communications and literacy in colleges would be beneficial both for students and for the teaching.

The nature of the clientele would particularly suggest the need for a basic level of counselling skills and, in particular, an understanding of when to refer students on⁽⁷⁴⁾ in order to preserve the prime purpose of the workshop. This it is felt would encourage a sense of security in tackling a wider range of pertinent issues within the teaching. Acquisition of such skills would have the additional effect, by their nature, of encouraging a student-centred, non-directive approach to the teaching:

"The teacher may no longer stand at the blackboard and talk to the whole group, set them identical exercises, and correct them in the large group, but his lower profile does not mean the abandonment of his leadership role. He now has to exercise it more effectively from among the group rather than from the dais"⁽⁷⁵⁾

The preponderance of part-time staff teaching in workshops and their reliance upon the strong commitment that many display makes it particularly important to find ways of supporting these.

Much of this would have to be in- or inter-house, and there is a need for a mutually supportive national organisation ("The Association of Literacy, Numeracy and Communications Workshop Teachers") to help organise it. This would have the effect of raising the profile of workshops and giving them more prestige, which might also attract more funding for the work. It might, ultimately, carry sufficient political clout to gain more involvement from HE and LEAs, who need to take a positive role in ensuring wider dissemination of the workshop philosophy.

Its most important effect would be to end the isolation in which teachers sometimes work, often battling against the odds on their own. They need to share knowledge of political tactics, too, in order to discover how to gain management support without being stifled by it. Their student-centric nature means that they are constantly defining student needs that may have implications for the college as a whole, as well as their own developmental requirements. They need a forum for this.

At the primary level, such political action is beginning to develop in the form of The 99 by 99 Association which plans to launch its campaign in the autumn. It aims to make in-service training for literacy a national priority, "develop a model programme of action for children who are failing to acquire literacy skills" and to "promote good practice and influence government policy."⁽⁷⁶⁾

There is a wider sense in which staff development should be considered: workshops could be considered centres of excellence in teaching and could act as an example and stimulant of change within their colleges.

A summary of the main recommendations appears in the next chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

- (1) See Nunan, D, *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*, CUP, Cambridge, 1988 for evidence that this is a general phenomenon.
- (2) See *Transition and Access: a review of low-level FE courses in the ILEA: Appendix II*, FEU, London, 1981, Page 18.
- (3) Ibid, page 34.
- (4) See (1).
- (5) Charnley and Jones, *The Concept of Success in Adult Literacy*, ALBSU, London, 1979.
- (6) See also (1).
- (7) "Elementary my dear Holmes", *TES*, no. 3727, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 5.12.87, p.6.
- (8) "HMIs praise Dutch "basics"", *TES*, no. 3728, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 11.12.87, p.9.
- (9) These statements concerning the need for privacy were not made by students in this college, but during student interviews.
- (10) Interview, 21.1.86.
- (11) See "*Teaching Literacy to Craft Students*", ALBSU, London, July 1983.
- (12) *Aspects of Further Education, A Report by HMI*, DES, January 1988 - May 1989, which revealed that 10% of lessons were still poor: " the teacher talked at the students too much, sometimes dictating notes at length and

gave them insufficient opportunity to ask questions, engage in discussion or exercise initiative."

- (13) Interview, 1985.
- (14) See (5).
- (15) Ibid.
- (16) Ibid.
- (17) See "Lambeth braced for brutal cut", *TES*, no. 3895, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 22.2.91, p.2.
- (18) See "Cash runs out in shire and city", *TES*, no. 3890, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 18.1.91, p.4. (This refers to Northamptonshire and Haringey. There is some evidence that such cooperation has already begun in Haringey.)
- (19) *After the Act, Developing Basic Skills Work in the 1990s*, ALBSU, London 1990.
- (20) See (12).
- (21) Mrs Sofer, responsible for organising the transfer of services in Tower Hamlets, quoted in "Worried soothsayers see a future that does not work", Report on NAHT Conference, *TES* no. 3847, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23.3.90, p.A5.
- (22) "Destined to have a very lean and hungry look", *TES*, no. 3843, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23.2.90, p.13.
- (23) "The Financial Times", Sept. 1987, quoted in Simon, B., *Bending the Rules: the Baker 'reform' of Education*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1988.

- (24) Hofkins, D., "Cut to the heart by loss of morale and manpower". *TES*, no. 3852, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 27.4.90, p.A6.
- (25) Lodge, B., "Chirpy, despite heads' mutiny", *TES*, no. 3852, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 27.4.90, p.A13. This quotes Mervyn Flecknoe, Chair of Bradford SHA.
- (26) "Roars of dismay echo around the economic jungle", Conference Report, *TES*, no. 3850, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 13.4.90, p.6. This quotes Mr John Horn, President of SHA.
- (27) Davies, J., Director of the Educational Publishers Council, "Erratic market", *TES*, no. 3798, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 14.4.89, p.B5.
- (28) Ibid.
- (29) Mr Roy Pryke, Director of Education, Kent, quoted in report on NAHT Conference. See (21).
- (30) "Less able most likely to be the have-nots", *TES*, no. 3841, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 9.2.90, p.A8. This quotes Eric Bolton, Senior Chief Inspector, annual report on the state of England's education service.
- (31) Williams, C., "Special needs face LMS crisis says union", *TES*, no. 3855, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 18.5.90, p.A10. This quotes Nigel de Gruchy, general secretary to NAS/UWT.
- (32) Jackson, M., "Inflation Squeezes TVEI funding". *TES*, no. 3881, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16.11.90, p.4.
- (33) Hackett, G., "A CTC 'for every local authority'", *TES*, no. 3881, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16.11.90, p.4.

- (34) "Where magnets push pupils poles apart", *TES*, no 3843, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23.2.90, p.10, refers to an HMI report on a study visit to New York.
- (35) Dean, C., "CTC Selectors face an 'impossible task'", *TES*, no 3873, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 21.9.90, p.1.
- (36) O'Shea, L., "Numbers of graduate entrants plummet again", *TES*, no. 3871, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 7.9.90, p.7.
- (37) See also "More staff exit early", *TES* no. 3871, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16.11.90, for news of a rapid increase in staff seeking early retirement between 1987 and 1990.
- (38) Limage, L. J., "Adult Literacy in an Age of Austerity", *Education*, Vol. 32, no. 4, 1986.
- (39) See, for example, Jamieson I. and Watts, T., "Squeezing out Enterprise", *TES*, no. 3729, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 18.12.87 and Bayliss, S., "Dissent grows as testing time approaches", *TES* no. 2733, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 15.1.88.
- (40) Hofkins, D., "SATs to emphasise literacy and numeracy", *TES*, no. 3874, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 28.9.90, p.15.
- (41) See (12).
- (42) Rogers, R., "Jobs threatened as Home Office alters the rules", *TES*, no. 3873, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 21.9.90, p.14.
- (43) ALBSU, 1983, quoted in (38).
- (44) *Ibid.*

- (45) See (38). It should be noted that under Incorporation, there now may be protection for Adult Basic Education, which is to be brought into FE (24.4.92).
- (46) See (19).
- (47) Letter from ALBSU to providers, 19.2.91.
- (48) See Bowe, R., McBride R., and Wallace, G., "Uncovering the ERA of tension", *TES*, no. 3844, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 2.3.90, p.21, for a description of the effect of LMS on school managers.
- (49) Ibid.
- (50) "CBI's credit vouchers idea to get a test drive", *TES*, no. 3848, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 30.3.90, p.A3.
- (51) Workshop Manager, College no 1.
- (52) Taylor, C., (adviser to Kenneth Baker), "Climbing towards a skilful revolution", *TES*, no. 3734, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 22.1.88, p.4.
- (53) See (12).
- (54) "Hacking a way to the core", *TES*, no. 3850, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 13.4.90, p.3.
- (55) See (23).
- (56) Pardy, D., *Monitoring, evaluation and Review: an Overview*. The Further Education Staff College, FEU, London, September 1989.
- (57) Ibid.

- (58) Both reported at "Quality in the Curriculum", a Conference for Staffordshire colleges held at Telford, 27.2.90 1.3.90.
- (59) See, for example, Staffordshire County Council's Training-Agency funded total quality Management Project for 1990/91.
- (60) All the following quotations are from *A Passion for Excellence, The Leadership Difference*, T. Peters and N. Austin, Fontana/Collins, Glasgow, 1990.
- (61) "Quality in the Curriculum", Staffordshire County Council, February 1990; this notion, it is felt, would be likely to sell the approach to every college manager in the country.
- (62) Joiner: *A Practical Approach to Quality*, P. Scholtes and Heero Hacquebord, Joiner Associates Inc. Madison, WI USA, 1987.
- (63) Ibid: "A corollary to the top leadership guideline: The "Onion Patch" strategy. What can be done when your company's top managers are not quality leaders and champions?"
- (64) See HMI Report, *Course Monitoring and Review in Further Education*, May-HMSO, London, June 1990.
- (65) DES, *Education and Training for the 21st century*, HMSO, London, May 1991.
- (66) Letter from Alan Wells to college principals, 22nd May 1991.
- (67) In this, there is a level of negotiation which may go unrecognised, but which has resulted in some of the differences between workshops and traditional classrooms.

- (68) I.e., The desire to make rapid progress in basic written skills at the expense of oracy and autonomy.
- (69) In this respect, workshops resemble BTEC and Access courses where the curriculum may be devised around a set of pre-established principles by the validating body, as well as TVEI.
- (70) See Chapter Four under Workshop Tutors' Schedule, response to room-layout.
- (71) "As progress is made the agenda lengthens but with the growth of skill and understanding the learner becomes progressively responsible for its management." See (2), page 23.
- (72) "It [the curriculum] does not aim to meet all learning-needs, only those that are crucial at this particular stage of the young person's life." See (2), p.64.
- (73) See (12).
- (74) This presupposes that colleges have the necessary support systems, described in (2), p.38.
- (75) See (2), p.34.
- (76) "New drive to improve literacy rates", *TES*, no. 3893, Times Supplements Ltd., London, 8.2.91, p.15.

CHAPTER SIX

A SUMMARY OF THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

THE EXTENT AND SUCCESS OF THE PROVISION

A SUMMARY OF THE GENERAL POINTS THAT EMERGED FROM THE STUDY

- (i) Communications and Relationships**
- (ii) Small Group Work**
- (iii) Negotiation**
- (iv) Student Autonomy**
- (v) Range and Context of Learning experiences**

THE MAIN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ILEA AND NON-ILEA WORKSHOPS

Non-ILEA Workshops

ILEA Workshops

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

FINAL CONCLUSION

CHAPTER SIX

A SUMMARY OF THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The outcomes of part of the original purpose of the study are summarised below. The chief purpose was to establish the extent to which learner-centred methods were used in FE to aid students' language-acquisition and the degree of success achieved in their implementation.

It became clear during the study that to elaborate a model workshop would be neither possible nor appropriate since workshops are necessarily very individual. This is because their development occurs in response to local student demand and preference.

It was possible, however, to establish how effectively workshop practices conformed to the seven theoretical points delineated in the Conclusion of Chapter Two. This is summarised below.

THE EXTENT AND SUCCESS OF THE PROVISION

Workshops had developed over a wide geographical area outside ILEA and appeared to be growing. Within ILEA, in terms of their original definition, they seemed to be on the decline. Non-ILEA workshops provided for a wider range of needs and a greater variety of students. Workshops were nevertheless not always providing what students wanted. Details are below.

A SUMMARY OF THE GENERAL POINTS THAT EMERGED FROM THE STUDY

The seven theoretical principles delineated at the end of Chapter Two were found to be operating with a mixed degree of success, as follows:

These general points were reflected in ILEA and non-ILEA colleges in different ways. The details were as follows.

(i) Communications and relationships (see points (i) and (iii)).

Where informality existed in staff-student relationships and in the learning-environment students found this helpful. (See Appendix D pages xcvi and xcvi where more than 50% of students demonstrated this over four questions (questions 4, 4 (a), (b), (c)) and page cii where over 50% of students responded in favour of workshops over two more questions (questions 5 and 6).

There was generally a need for more student-sensitive written material (See Appendix D page cxxii, question (r) with approximately a 50% response and page cxxiii question (s) with well over 50% as well as page cxxxi where approximately 50% of students said that the material was "sometimes", "not very often" or "never" interesting or even felt unable to comment.

Motivation was enhanced by strong personal commitment from the teacher and voluntary attendance for students. This was observed directly by the researcher.

(ii) Small Group-work (see point (ii)).

It was better for students to learn in groups than to experience one-to-one tuition, as well as to experience a mixture of formal and informal approaches to oral work.

It is possible to see on page cxli in Appendix E the results for College 6, which demonstrate the highest level of teacher-talk, one of the lowest results for sustained pupil talk and, by a very considerable amount, the lowest pupil-initiation ratio as a percentage of the total talk. (That is, a pupil-initiation ratio of 7% of the total talk in a situation where the next lowest was 25% and the highest was 78%). It should also be noted that the lack of sustained talk occurs in a context where the predominant communication pattern is of question and answer. This was the college which used almost exclusively one-to-one tuition with individual pupils on their own in the workshop. The conclusion concerning the need for a mixture of formal and informal oral work was based upon the direct observation of the researcher.

(iii) Negotiation (see point (iv)).

There was a need for a more energetic attempt at implementing a negotiated learning-agenda in order to narrow the gap between student- and teacher-perceptions of what was a desirable learning-experience.

See Appendix B, page xxx where 5 tutors out of 8 said they negotiated the learning-agenda with students, page xlii where 4 tutors said that choice of teaching-strategies was based upon negotiation and Appendix J, which demonstrates the scant evidence they were able to provide for the activity. See also Appendix D, page cix, where over a third of the students said that they never negotiated; see also page cx where 80 students (ie nearly the whole sample) said that the teacher mainly decided the learning-programme and cxviii where over a third said that they never negotiated the programme. (For a full presentation of these results, see page 94 in Chapter 4). The evidence would suggest that a large number of students rarely, if ever, experienced self-determination in their learning. The evidence in these same questions indicates that many students would enjoy the activity. (On pages cix and cxviii in Appendix D approximately 50% of students said that they did or would like to negotiate; on page cx under 50% said that they would like the teacher to decide for them.

There is a contrast between the educational priorities held by workshop tutors and those held by students: Appendix B, page li shows that teachers are most concerned with autonomy, language support and preparation for work, oracy coming lower down the list and education for leisure a very low priority indeed; Appendix D, page civ, which shows students' priorities, demonstrates that preparation for work is important to well over 50% of students, but that oracy, clear thinking and the use of the imagination are also important to over 50% of them.

(iv) Student Autonomy (see point (v)).

In general, students did not cope well with autonomy. See Appendix E, page cxxxvi, where it can be seen that about a third (33.2%) of the students' time was spent waiting for help or in being helped by the teacher (see Teacher-Pupil

Work); page cxxxvii provides further evidence in that an additional 22.7% of student time is recorded under the category "Non-Instructional Use of Pupil-Time." This lack of autonomy was also directly observed by the researcher.

(v) Range and Context of Learning-experiences.

There was a need for a wider range of learning-experiences in most workshops. (See point (vii)).

In Appendix F, page clvii demonstrates that the vast majority of teaching/learning-materials (290/297) were geared towards an emphasis upon writing. Additional evidence from Appendix D, pages cv ff shows, for example, that over 50% of students rarely if ever experienced small-group work; about one third never worked on their own; over 50% rarely if ever helped each others' learning; over 50% rarely if ever had group discussions, yet about 75% "usually", "often" or "sometimes" experienced one-to-one tuition. Further evidence can be found in these pages as well as in summary in Chapter 4.

There was the additional need for a holistic approach to students in order to enhance learning. (That is, they needed informal counselling facilities.) (See point vii). Evidence for this can be found in Appendix B, page lxiv where 100% of tutors said they took part in informal counselling of students. Their perception of the need is supported in a general way by the statement made by nearly all the students that the atmosphere in the workshops was better than that in a normal classroom. This can be found on page xcvi of Appendix D.

THE MAIN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ILEA AND NON-ILEA WORKSHOPS

Non-ILEA Workshops

- 1 The ethos of non-ILEA workshops was particularly successful and the approachability and commitment of the teacher played a major role in developing students' confidence and heightening motivation.

- 2 Choice as to whether to attend also played an important part in student-motivation and had a strong effect on the ethos of the workshop.
- 3 The physical and affective environment was more successfully created than the written. Sensitivity on the part of teachers to the effect of social backgrounds upon linguistic use could have been greater. This gives rise to the question of how far teachers' spoken language takes this into account.
- 4 Students did not normally experience vocationally-related teaching.
- 5 More time and support, as well as training, is needed for the counselling element of the work. It would be productive to provide more materials which deal with personal issues.
- 6 Although the ethos was very sympathetic socially and students felt comfortable in making informal spontaneous comment, they did not generally become involved in sustained conversation. This was linked with the fact that workshops frequently employed exclusive one-to-one tuition, isolating students from each other. Many students would enjoy learning in groups.
- 7 Oral work was not normally a priority. Teachers need to be made conscious of the important link between the development of written and spoken linguistic skills.
- 8 There was a strong emphasis upon skills acquisition.

ILEA Workshops

- 1 Students were less well-motivated, attendance being compulsory. The lack of mature students in the groups was a further contributor to the less successful ethos in the ILEA colleges studied.
- 2 There was a more traditional approach to the teaching than in Non-ILEA workshops. Individual student-goals were less clearly defined, and the

purpose of the sessions was less clear than it was for non-ILEA students. Teachers were in authority and students experienced a low degree of autonomy.

- 3 Students had a good deal more experience of sustained conversation, but it tended to be of a more formal nature than that in non-ILEA colleges.
- 4 There was a better balance between written and spoken language in ILEA workshops.
- 5 There was a strong emphasis upon content.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- 1 More counselling-training was needed for non-ILEA teachers.
- 2 A more careful balance between written and spoken language was needed in non-ILEA workshops. Oral work in general needs to be more carefully planned and students would benefit from a mixture of the "domestic" style of the non-ILEA workshop and the more public approach encountered in the ILEA colleges in the sample.
- 3 There was a need in nearly all workshops for a wider range of learning-experiences.
- 4 There was a need for a reconsideration by ILEA tutors in the sample of the value of the principles laid down in *Transition and Access*, in particular those concerning student autonomy. Non-ILEA teachers especially needed to be made aware of the narrowing and isolating effect of exclusive, or almost exclusive, one-to-one teaching.
- 5 There would be a value in a review by these same tutors of their approach to the provision of language support, since not all students received this help elsewhere.

- 6 The students in each kind of workshop would benefit from a better balance in emphasis upon skills and content.
- 7 There is a need for staff development concerning negotiation of the learning-agenda with students.
- 8 There is a need to make greater use of the external environment in language teaching.
- 9 Many teachers would benefit from information concerning the nature of their verbal interactions with students for what it would reveal about the level of direction in their teaching.
- 10 Student autonomy can be achieved effectively only in the context of teacher-autonomy. This implies training for senior managers.
- 11 Teachers need to be aware of the ways in which they can defend workshops politically in a time of scarce resources.
- 12 There is a need to work with other providers and, in particular, ALBSU.
- 13 There is a need for more communication between teachers working in ILEA and non-ILEA workshops; each has much to offer the other. There is a need for more communication between workshop tutors in general.

FINAL CONCLUSION

In the absence of a lead from the HE Sector, staff development must come from workshop tutors themselves. Many of these aims could be achieved by the formation of a national association for workshop teachers. Others could be attained by means of in-house or inter-house staff development, preferably across LEA boundaries. Now that colleges are forced to earn a proportion of their income through self-financing courses, this could be an attractive proposition for one or two colleges with the necessary expertise and an overview of the situation.

APPENDIX A

Contents: The LEA Survey

- (1) Introductory Letter**
- (2) Follow-up letter**
- (3) Sample of the questionnaire**

- (4) Outcomes of the initial survey**
 - (i) Results**
 - (ii) Analysis of results**
 - (iii) Colleges selected for research**

APPENDIX A: THE INITIAL SURVEY

136 Sinclair Avenue
BANBURY
Oxon OX16 7BL

10 May 1985

The Principal

Dear Sir or Madam

Survey into English Workshops in Further Education

I am a serving teacher in Further Education and am about to embark upon a study of literacy provision in colleges.

I should therefore appreciate it if you could pass the accompanying questionnaire on to the appropriate person in your college with a request to fill it in.

Yours sincerely

J Ware
Staff Team Leader in English
North Oxon Technical College

Enc

APPENDIX A: THE INITIAL SURVEY

October 1985

Dear Colleague

Research into English Workshops

You may remember that I wrote to you at the end of last term asking whether there is an English Workshop in your college. As I know this was a very busy period for you, I'm writing again in the hope that you might now have time to reply.

The main points in my letter were that I am about to embark on research into English Workshops and would like to know whether there is one in your college. If there is, I'd like to know whether you'd be prepared to help by providing staff and students for interview. This would involve the person in charge of the workshop, one other English tutor, 12 students and 4 tutors in other subjects who teach students who might be/have been referred.

Even a nil return would be useful and if you're prepared to help by providing people for interview I'd be most grateful. In either case, I'd appreciate it if you'd fill in the accompanying form and return it to me.

Yours faithfully

Jenny Ware
Staff Team Leader in English

Enc

APPENDIX A: THE INITIAL SURVEY

Questionnaire

NORTH OXFORDSHIRE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Name

College

Address

Telephone Number

Approximate number of students in workshop

Approximate number of staff involved

I am willing to help with your study by providing students and staff for interview.

Thank you Jenny Ware

APPENDIX A: THE INITIAL SURVEY

THE RESULTS OF THE INITIAL SURVEY

No of colleges contacted:	304
Initial replies:	28
Replies to follow-up:	123
Total replies:	151 (15 of these were from ILEA colleges)
Yield:	50%
No running a workshop:	35 (23.1%)
No about to begin:	16 (10.7%)
No without a workshop	100 (66.2%)
Total:	151

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INITIAL SURVEY

The Differences Between ILEA and Non-ILEA Colleges

	Total ILEA	% of Replies	Non- ILEA	% of Replies	Total Total
No of colleges who replied:	7	4.6%	144	95.4%	151
		% of ILEA Sample		% of Non- ILEA Sample	
Those with a workshop:	7	100%	28	19%	35

Data Indicating Possible Size of Workshops

	ILEA	% of ILEA Sample with wshps	Non- ILEA	% of Non-ILEA Sample with wshps	% of total Sample with wshps
100+ students	4	57%	2	7%	17
5+ staff	5	71%	8	27.5%	37
under 20 students	0	0%	5	17.7%	14.2
1 staff	0	0%	7	25%	20

APPENDIX A: THE INITIAL SURVEY

COLLEGES SELECTED FOR RESEARCH

Non-ILEA Colleges

College One:	Abingdon College of Further Education.
College Two:	East Warwickshire College.
College Three:	Nelson and Colne College.
College Four:	North Oxfordshire College (Collaborating Institution).
College Six:	High Peak College of Further Education, Buxton.
College Seven:	Soundwell Adult Education Centre, Soundwell Technical College, Bristol.

ILEA Colleges

College Five:	City and East London College.
College Eight:	Vauxhall College of Building and Further Education.

APPENDIX B

Contents

- (1) The Workshop Tutors' Interview Schedule**
- (2) Results**

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. RECRUITMENT

(a) Is there a referral system: Y/N.

If Y, is it:

- (i) drop-in self-referral;
- (ii) tutor-referral;
- (iii) college-wide screening;
- (iv) is attendance voluntary/compulsory?

If compulsory, do students resent this: Y/N;

(b) If (iii),

(i) how is this done?

If with a test,

- (ii) can you provide an example? Y/N
- (iii) is there support from tutors in other subjects with marking/advising on/supervising tests/encouraging students?
- (iv) If Y, how did you achieve this cooperation?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(c) How does college management support this?

- (i) money;
- (ii) remission;
- (iii) extra staff;
- (iv) help with publicity;
- (v) a supportive structure;
- (vi) other?

(d) How is the student's learning programme decided? Who decides it?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(e) Do you advertise? Y/N; if Y which of the following do you use:

- (i) the college prospectus;
- (ii) specially devised leaflets;
- (iii) local newspapers;
- (iv) internally, with posters;
- (v) other?

(f) At whom is the advertising aimed?

(g) What evidence is there of its effectiveness?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- (h) What proportion of the students in the Workshop could be said to fit into any of the following categories:
- | | |
|--|--|
| (i) come from socially deprived areas and schools: | DON'T KNOW /ALL /MOST /SOME /NOT MANY /NONE; |
| (ii) come from families with damaging tensions: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (iii) come from families unsupportive towards education: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (iv) had a disrupted education through illness, or other causes: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (v) left school at the earliest opportunity: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (vi) have some record of truancy: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (vii) have learning problems: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (viii) behave badly in college: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (ix) have social and/or personal problems which could impede learning: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (x) are ill-prepared to start work: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (xi) are mentally or physically handicapped: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (xii) are educationally disadvantaged because they are members of ethnic minorities: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (xiii) are mature students returning to education: | D/A/M/S/NM/N. |

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(i) Approximately what proportion are from the following kinds of courses:

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| (i) general education courses for F/T and P/T students including 'O' level: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (ii) low-level vocational courses: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (iii) link courses: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (iv) community-based courses: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (v) an 'A' level or Access course: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (vi) an Open Learning course: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (vii) registered purely to Workshops for basic skills: | D/A/M/S/NM/N; |
| (ix) other. | |

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

2. ORGANISATION

- (a) How much time do students spend in it? _____
- (b) How much money is allocated? _____
- (c) How many staff hours are allocated? _____
- (d) Is it timetabled to be:
 - (i) drop-in: _____
 - (ii) open access: _____
 - (iii) a normal classroom: _____
 - (iv) other? _____
- (e) How is student progress monitored:
 - (i) By profiles: _____
 - (ii) By tests: _____
 - (iii) By a record of work: _____
 - (iv) Other? _____
- (f) Who records the progress? _____

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(g) How does the information then affect teaching strategies?

(h) Do you consider the siting of the accomodation suitable? Y/N: if N, why not; why is it being used?

(i) Do you consider the furnishings suitable? Y/N: if N, why not?

(j) Are you satisfied with the arrangement of the room? If not, how would you prefer it to be? Why isn't it like that?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(k) Do you prefer this kind of arrangement to that of a traditional classroom? Why/Why not?

(l) What facilities are there for handicapped people?

(m) (i) What is the proportion of P'T to F'T staff?

(ii) Do you consider the staffing adequate?

(n) What is the average group size?

(o) Is the administrative organisation of the college sufficiently flexible to allow students to be referred from all areas?

(p) Does the physical organisation of the college have any effect upon the ways in which the Workshop operates?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(q) Is the Workshop well supported by college management? Y/N; if Y, in what ways:

(r) Is any specific support provided by the LEA; eg., special posts, literature, advisers.

3. MATERIALS

(a) Which of the following kinds of materials are used:

- (i) Commercially produced;
- (ii) Computer software:
- (iii) Video-based:
- (iv) Teacher devised:
- (v) Teacher-devised and individualised:
- (vi) Other:

(b) Why do you use these particular kinds?

(c) Which do you find most useful; why?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(d) In what ways are the materials made relevant to the students; are they:

- (i) linked to vocational studies: _____
- (ii) linked to environmental/social concerns: _____
- (iii) take account of the linguistic background of students: _____
- (iv) linked to gender: _____
- (v) linked to work-experience or other real-life situations: _____
- (vi) other? _____

(e) Do you seek help from teachers in vocational areas in order to devise vocationally relevant materials/tasks?

(f) Do all the students use the same materials in any one session?

(g) How are the materials classified?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(h) How are they graded?

(i) What kind of booking system is there?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4. TEACHING STRATEGIES

- (a) What do you consider to be your main priorities in developing your students' skills, eg.,
- (i) oracy;
 - (ii) autonomy in learning;
 - (iii) providing language support;
 - (iv) preparation for employment;
 - (v) education for leisure/unemployment;
 - (vi) other.
- (b) How often do you employ the following teaching strategies:
- (i) emphasis upon class discussion led/directed by the teacher: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (ii) one-to-one: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (iii) directing the learning: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (iv) acting as learning-guide and resource-manager: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (v) students learning from each other: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (vi) emphasis upon informal conversation: how do you set out to achieve this: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (vii) small group work: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
If Y what success have you had with this: does it have any disadvantages?
 - (viii) emphasis on writing: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
 - (ix) learning integrated with other basic skills: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- (x) leaving the students totally on their own for a specific purpose: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
If Y, for what purpose? Is it successful?
- (xi) students setting their own pace: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
- (xii) students assessing their own work: always/usually/often/sometimes/never;
If N, what is your aim when you mark (eg success for the student)?
Do you insist that they do all the work and give it in on time?
- (xiii) other.
- (c) Which do you feel to be the most useful strategies in fulfilling your priorities:

1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8/9/10/11/12/13);
how do they achieve this?
- (d) Do you have objections to any of these methods?
-
-
- (e) Is a part of the workshop's role to be concerned with helping students deal with day-to-day problems, e.g.
(i) welfare rights advice
(ii) help with form filling, letter writing, applications for driving licences and tests, etc.
(iii) other.

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- (f) Does the teaching encompass any of the following:
- (i) Basic English exam;
 - (ii) RSA Stage I or above;
 - (iii) O Level;
 - (iv) RSA Profiling scheme;
 - (v) A Level;
 - (vi) S Level;
 - (vii) Core of CPVE/Voc. Prep;
 - (viii) CIGLI;
 - (ix) Distance/Open Learning;
 - (x) other?
- (g) Are any of these courses taught at the same time Y/N; if Y, how is this managed:
- (i) by organising students into groups;
 - (ii) by individualised study packs;
 - (iii) by individualised teaching;
 - (iv) other?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- (h) Are there opportunities for staff to go into non-workshop contexts to help students, eg:
- (i) in the college, working alongside craft teachers;
 - (ii) on work-experience placements;
 - (iii) other?

- (i) If Y,
is this done formally/informally?
Was it successful?

- (j) How is it supported by your college management?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(k) How is it funded?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

5. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

- (a) Do you consider the Workshop to be the place to develop courses with an integrated curriculum like CPVE? Y/N.
- (b) If Y, what advantages do these courses have over the traditional kinds for workshop approach?
- (c) Does it have the potential for any other kind of curriculum development?
- (d) If Y, who does the work?
- (e) What facilities would be provided: Money/Staff/Remission/In-service training/Other?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

6. TUTORING

- (a) Is there a special tutoring system for Workshop students? Y/N. If Y:
 - (i) how is it organised?
 - (ii) does it include careers advice for those not receiving it on their main course?
 - (iii) where do the majority of the students go next:
unemployed/mainstream education/work/Don't Know?

- (b) Do the Workshop tutors take part in the personal counselling of the students? Y/N. If Y
 - (i) is this: a formal arrangement in the college: Y/N. If N:
 - (ii) is it additional to teaching-time/part of the class discussion?
 - (iii) Approximately what proportion of the time do you spend on it?
More than you would in an ordinary classroom/less than/the same. Why?
 - (iv) Do you consider it essential to the student's educational development?
 - (v) Is the workshop an appropriate place for this work? If Y, why?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

7. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- (a) Is there
- (1) an overall 'workshop' approach or
 - (2) do teachers interpret the method individually? 1/2.

If Y,

- (i) who decides and how?

- (ii) Do staff actively support it? Y/N.

- (iii) How are staff introduced to it?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(iv) What resources are provided for the introduction of staff to the workshop policy?

(b) Do any newly qualified teachers/student teachers you have show evidence of having been trained in the Workshop method? Y/N.

(c) As a result of using the Workshop approach, have staff met new demands that they feel ill equipped to meet?

(d) (i) If Y, what training/support has it been possible to provide? Y/N. If Y, how?

APPENDIX B: THE WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(ii) What support has been provided by management: time for meetings/remission/extra money/additional staff/other?

(iii) What support is provided by the Authority in terms of in-service training?

(e) How would you like to see the Workshop provision improved?

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION ONE: RECRUITMENT									
No of tutors interviewed for this section	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
(a) Existence of referral system	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Mode of referral									
(i) drop in/self	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
(ii) tutor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
(iii) screening	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
(iv) timetabled class	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Attendance:									
Voluntary	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	6
Compulsory	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
No who said students resented compulsory attendance	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	1	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(b)									
(i) Use of test	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
(ii) Support for testing from non-w tutors	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1
(c) Forms of management support for testing									
(i) Money	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1
(ii) Remission	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1
(iii) Extra staff	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
(iv) Help with publicity	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
(v) Supportive structure	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
(vi) Other	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
(d) Method for deciding learning-programme									
(i) Test	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
(ii) Performance in class	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
(iii) Negotiation	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	5

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

xxx

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(e) Mode of advertising									
(i) Prospectus	1	1	1	1	NA	0	0	NA	4
(ii) Leaflets	1	1	1	1	NA	1	1	NA	6
(iii) Newspaper	1	1	1	1	NA	0	0	NA	4
(iv) Posters	1	0	1	0	NA	1	0	NA	3
(v) Other	1	1	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	2
(f) Target group									
(i) P/Time adults	0	1	1	1	NA	0	1	NA	4
(ii) Internal students	0	0	1	1	NA	1	0	NA	3
(iii) Past students	0	0	1	0	NA	0	0	NA	1
(iv) General	1	0	1	1	NA	0	1	NA	4
(g) Evidence of effectiveness of advertising	0	1	0	0	NA	1	0	NA	2

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(h) Assessment of students' social background:									
Proportion suffering from									
(i) social deprivation									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	4
Some	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(ii) damaging tensions in family									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Some	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Not many	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DK	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(iii) unsupportive educational attitudes at home									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Some	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Not many	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
(iv) disrupted education through illness									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
Some	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Not many	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(v) having left school at earliest opportunity									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
Some	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(vi) record of truancy									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Some	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Not many	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DK	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
(vii) learning problems									
All	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Most	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Some	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	5
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(viii) bad behaviour in college									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Not many	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
None	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(ix) social/personal problems acting as an impediment to learning									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Some	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(x) being ill-prepared for employment									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	4
Some	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Not many	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(xi) mental/physical handicap									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Not many	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
None	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
(xii) educational disadvantage as a result of being part of an ethnic minority									
All	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Some	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
None	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
(xiii) educational disadvantage through scanty educational background (ie mature returners)									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
Some	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 ⁺	6	7	8 ⁺	
(i) Prop of students from following courses									
(i) Gen/Ed									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Some	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
(ii) Low-level voc									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Some	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
(iii) Link									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Not many	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
None	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	5

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(iv) Community-based									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Some	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Not many	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
None	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
(v) "A" level/Access									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Some	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
(vi) O/Learning									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Not many	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
None	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
DK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(vii) Basic Ed									
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Some	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(viii) Other (Special Needs)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION TWO ORGANISATION									
No of tutors interviewed for this section	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
(a) Amount of time per week spent in workshop by students									
Less than 1 hour	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 - 2 hours	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4
2 - 4 hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
4 - 6 hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 - 8 hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More than 8 hours	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Varies widely	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
(b) Financial allocation									
Adequate	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	6

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(c) No of staff hours allowed per week									
70+	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
50 - 70	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
30 - 50	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
20 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fewer than 20	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Don't know	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
(d) Type of provision									
(i) Drop-in	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
(ii) By appointment	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
(iii) Open access	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
(iv) Normal class	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
(e) Method of monitoring student progress									
(i) Profiles	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
(ii) Tests	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(iii) Record of work	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
(iv) Other (examination results)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(f) Who records progress									
Tutor	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Student	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	4
Not recorded	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
(g) Effect of information on teaching-strategies									
Work based on needs revealed	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Work based on negotiation	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Suggestions made on basis of written work	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(h) No who thought site suitable	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Reasons for thinking unsuitable:									
Not central	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
Room-size limits expansion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Inadequate building	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
(i) No who thought the furnishings suitable	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	5
(j) No who thought arrangement of the room appropriate	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
(k) No who preferred workshop layout to traditional arrangement	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
(l) Presence of facilities for handicapped people	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	4

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(m) (i) Proportion of f/t:p/t staff:									
Over 50% f/t	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	5
Under 25% f/t	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
(ii) No who found staffing adequate	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
(n) Average group size:									
1:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
1:6/8	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
1:12/13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
1:16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
(o) No who thought college admin arrangements were flexible enough to support workshop activity	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	N/A	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(p) No who thought physical organisation of the college affected workshop activity	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	6
Details:									
(i) Outside door providing privacy for students	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
(ii) Additional site(s) with no facilities/problems of coordination	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	4
(iii) Ability to create different ethos by means of separation from main activity	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
(q) No who thought college management were supportive	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	5

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(r) Specific support from LEA	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	6

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION THREE: MATERIALS									
Number of tutors interviewed	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
(a) College usage of different categories of teaching-materials									
(i) Commercially produced	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
(ii) Computer-software	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	5
(iii) Video-based	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
(iv) Teacher-devised	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
(v) Teacher-devised and individualised	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	6
(b) See reasons in body of Chapter Four.									
(c) Popularity of materials in rank order:									
1. (i) Commercially produced									(5 colleges preferred)
(v) Teacher-devised and individualised									(5 colleges preferred)
3. (iv) Teacher-devised									(2 colleges preferred)

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*		
4. (ii) Computer-software (iii) Video-based										(1 college preferred) (1 college preferred)
(d) Ways in which the materials were made relevant to the students:										
(i) Tutor claims for link with vocational studies	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	
(ii) W/Tutors claiming links with social/ environmental concerns	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	
(iii) Tutor claims for relevance to social/linguistic needs	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	
(iv) Tutor claims for relevance to gender	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	
(v) Tutor claims for link with work-experience or other real-life situations	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7	

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(e) Affirmative replies to written with help from vocational staff	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
(f) Tutor statements concerning use of individual materials within group	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	7
(g) Tutor statements concerning classification	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	4
(h) Tutor statements concerning a grading system	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
(i) Tutors stating presence of a booking system	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION FOUR: TEACHING STRATEGIES									
No of tutors interviewed	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
(a) Tutors' main priorities									
(i) Oracy:									
tutor 1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
tutor 2	-	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	7
(ii) Autonomy:									
tutor1	0	3	3	0	1	0	1	0	8
tutor2	-	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	7
(iii) Language support:									
tutor1	0	2	0	3	3	0	3	0	11
tutor2	-	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	4
(iv) Preparation for work									
tutor1	0	1	2	0	0	3	2	0	8
tutor2	-	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	5

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(v) Education for leisure:									
tutor1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
tutor2	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Priorities in rank order:

- 1 (ii) Autonomy (15)
(iii) Language support (15)
- 2 (iv) Preparation for work (13)
- 3 (i) Oracy (11)
- 4 (v) Education for leisure (2)

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]		
(b) (i) emphasis on class discussion led by the teacher										
Always	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	10
Usually	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	12
Often	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	6
Sometimes	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	8
Never	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4
Totals									15	40
(ii) one-to-one										
Always	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	8	40
Usually	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	8
Often	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	9
Sometimes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals									5	61

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*		
(iii) directing the learning										
Always	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	15
Usually	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	12
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	6
Sometimes	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	7	14
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals									15	47
(iv) acting as learning-guide and resource-manager										
Always	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	25
Usually	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	8
Often	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	4	12
Sometimes	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	6
Never	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Totals									15	52

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]		
(v) students learning from each other										
Always	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	20
Usually	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	12
Often	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	9
Sometimes	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	8
Never	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Totals									15	50
(vi) emphasis upon informal conversation										
Always	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	25
Usually	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	12
Often	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	4	12
Sometimes	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Totals									15	54

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]		
(vii) small group-work										
Always	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
Usually	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Sometimes	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	8	16
Never	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	3
Totals									15	35
(viii) emphasis upon writing										
Always	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	20
Usually	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	5	20
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Sometimes	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	10
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals									15	53

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]		
(ix) learning integrated with other basic skills										
Always	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	15
Usually	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	8	16
Never	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	3
Totals									15	38
(x) leaving the students on their own for a specific purpose										
Always	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Usually	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
Often	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6
Sometimes	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	6
Never	0	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	8	8
Totals									15	29

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals	
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*		
(xi) students setting their own pace										
Always	1	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	12	60
Usually	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	12
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals									15	72
(xii) students assessing their own work										
Always	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	15
Usually	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Sometimes	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	8	16
Never	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2
Totals									15	40

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
Rank Order of Tutors' Preferences									
1	(xi)	72	students - own pace						
2	(ii)	61	one-to-one tuition						
3	(vi)	54	informal conversation						
4	(viii)	53	emphasis on writing						
5	(iv)	52	teacher as enabler						
6	(v)	50	mutual learning between students						
7	(iii)	47	teacher as director of the learning						
8/9	(i)	40	emphasis on class discussion						
	(xii)	40	students assessing own work						
10	(ix)	38	learning integrated with other skills						
11	(vii)	35	small group-work						
12	(x)	29	leaving students on their own for a specific purpose						

(d) Strategies to which tutors objected:

No	(i)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	(ix)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	(xii)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(e) No of tutors who thought it was role of workshop to help with day-to-day problems	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
(f) Exams encompassed by the work:									
(i) Basic English exam	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
(ii) RSA Stage 1 or above	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
(iii) O level	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
(iv) RSA Profiling scheme	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
(v) A level	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
(vi) S level	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
(vii) Core of CPVE	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4
(viii) CIGLI	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
(ix) Open Learning	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
(x) Other: (Salvation Army officers' exam; Police/Army exam; Accreditation with Manchester Open Learning Federation).	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(g) No taught at the same time by means of									
(i) small group-work	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
(ii) individual study-packs	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
(iii) individual teaching	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	5
(h) No of staff claiming opportunities to teach literacy in new contexts:									
(i) Alongside a craft teacher	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
(ii) Work-experience placements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
(iii) Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(i) No who said this was an informal arrangement	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
No who said it was formal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
No who found it successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(j) Whether (it is or would be) supported by management	1	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	1	2
How: provision of time	1	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	1	2

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION FIVE: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT									
No interviewed for this section	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
(a) No who thought the workshop was a suitable place for the development of integrated courses (eg CPVE)	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	7

For (b) to (d), please see body of Chapter Three.

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION SIX: TUTORING									
No interviewed for this section	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
(a) No referring to a special tutoring-system	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
(i) Organisation:									
- Each student given a tutor (for instruction)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
- Time (10 hrs) provided for pastoral care, but not necessarily by workshop tutors	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
- Special tutor for Personal Learning Course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
(ii) No including careers advice	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(iii) Destinations of students:									
Unemployment	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Mainstream education	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	3
Employment	-	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	1
Don't know	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	13
(b) No who said workshop tutors take part in counselling students	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
No who said the arrangement was									
(i) Formal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Informal	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
(ii) Additional to teaching-time	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Part of class discussion	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	13

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(iii) Proportion of time spent in comparison with a traditional classroom									
More	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	13
Less	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The same	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
N/A because manages but does not teach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
(iv) No who thought it essential to development	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	14
N/A because manages, but does not teach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
No who thought the workshop an appropriate environment for this	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	13

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

⁺ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
SECTION SEVEN: STAFF DEVELOPMENT									
No interviewed for this section	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
(a) No who said there was an over-all policy	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
(i) Who decides this:									
Tutor in charge	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Negotiated between staff	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
(ii) No who said staff support it	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	6
(iii) Method of induction to policy									
Training-sessions/ meetings	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
Tutor in charge -	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
Other tutors responsible	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(iv) Resources provided									
Time/money	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
None	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	6
(b) Evidence of preparation of newly qualified teachers for use of workshop method									
Some	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
Much	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
(c) No who said staff felt ill-equippeded to meet new demands	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
(d) (i) No able to provide training	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	6

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(ii) No supported by management by means of									
Time	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	6
Money	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Additional staff	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
(iii) No supported by the LEA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP TUTORS' SCHEDULE: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(e) Improvements tutors would like									
More recognition	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Base/better base	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	4
More time	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
More publicity	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
More staff	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
More storage	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4
More INSET	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	4
More computers	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Complete working team	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Better reprographic facilities	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
More opportunities to pool ideas/resources between workshops	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Staff to use the workshop properly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
More money	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
Realistic payment for work done by part-timers	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C

Contents

- (1) Interview Schedule for Non-Workshop Tutors**
- (2) Results**

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. a) Have you found the teaching done by workshop staff helpful to your students? Y/N.
b) If Yes, in what ways?

2. a) Do you and your colleagues set out to identify in your classes students who may be struggling, not because they do not understand the work but because they are experiencing difficulty with reading and writing? Y/N.
b) If yes, how?

- c) What do you then do with them?

3. Do you think it is/would be useful for all students to be tested for literacy skills when they enter the college? Y/N.

4. Do you/would you be prepared to/provide help, for example in supervising the testing if this were necessary? Y/N.

5. a) If students were/are identified in this way as being in need of extra help do you/would you encourage them to use the workshop? Y/N.

- b) If Y, at which point do you think they should go for help?

i) When they can read and write fairly well, but would like some extra help, or the test indicates that this would be valuable to help their performance in general;

ii) When they can cope with the course, but need help to improve their ability to manage the demands made on their literacy skills by a more advanced course later;

iii) When they can cope with their present course but might need extra help to manage the demands made on their literacy skills by a more advanced course later;

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- iv) When they are obviously struggling with a course because they cannot cope with the demands made upon their literacy skills.
6. a) At which point would you be prepared to release them from your own classes for this purpose: NOT AT ALL/1/2/3/4?
- b) Why?
7. a) Is the timetable in your department/subject area organised to allow students to attend the Workshop? Y/N.
- b) If No, is this something you would be committed to pushing for?
8. a) Which of the following aims do you think workshop staff should pursue?
- i) To help students improve their performance on craft or vocational course: Y/N?
 - ii) To teach them to fill in forms and write business letters: Y/N?
 - iii) To help them to communicate better with close family and friends: Y/N?
 - iv) To encourage them to read for pleasure: Y/N?
 - v) To encourage them to find ways of employing their leisure time/possible? periods of unemployment constructively: Y/N?
 - vi) To think and write clearly for its own sake: Y/N?
 - vii) To speak clearly and confidently in a group of friends or within the family: Y/N?
 - viii) To speak confidently in a job interview: Y/N?
 - ix) Other.
- b) For which of these purposes would you be prepared to release students from your classes if this were necessary? 1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8.
9. Do you ever work closely with Workshop staff or other English teachers for any of the following reasons?
- i) To help them to plan the materials used in the Workshop so that it is relevant to your students' needs: usually/often/occasionally/never;

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- ii) To plan the language on your handouts to ensure it is at the right level for the students': usually/often/occasionally/never;
- iii) To plan the language you use in your lessons and the ways in which you might present it in order to help students with reading and writing difficulties: usually/often/occasionally/never;
- iv) To help them to deal with any difficult student/student with problems whom you have sent to the Workshop: usually/often/occasionally/never;
- v) In correcting your written work: usually/often/occasionally/never;
- vi) In deciding which of your students should have workshop help: usually/often/occasionally/never;
- vii) Other.

10. Is there any reason why there should be co-operation that does not yet exist?

11. a) If not, would you be prepared to do so if asked: Y/N?

b) If yes, in which particular ways: 1/2/3/4/5/6/7?

12. Would you be interested in the ideas of inviting a literacy teacher to work alongside you in the classroom as an alternative or a supplement to Workshop teaching?

13. Would this be likely to create problems for a literacy teacher?

14. Would it be likely to create problems for you?

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

15. Do you think it would bring any advantages?

16. Is the Workshop well advertised: Y/N If No how could this be improved?

17. Can you suggest any improvements that could be made to the service provided by the Workshop?

18. Do you have any other observations?

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Schedule for Non-Workshop Tutors

COLLEGE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS

1. a) Have you found the teaching done by Workshop staff helpful to your students?
Y [] N []
b) If Yes, in what ways?
2. a) Do you and your colleagues set out to identify in your classes students who may be struggling, not because they do not understand the work but because they are experiencing difficulty with reading and writing?
Y [] N []
b) If Yes, how?
c) What do you then do with them?
3. Do you think it is/would be useful for all students to be tested for literacy skills when they enter the college? Y [] N []
4. Do you/would you be prepared to/provide help, for example in supervising the testing if this were necessary? Y [] N []
5. a) If students were/are identified in this way as being in need of extra help do you/would encourage them to use the workshop? Y [] N []
b) If Yes, at which point do you think they should go for help?
 - i) When they can read and write fairly well, but would like some extra help, or the test indicates that this would be valuable to help their performance in general: []
 - ii) When they can cope with the course, but need help to improve their ability to cope with the demands made by the adult world upon their literacy skills: []
 - iii) When they can cope with their present course but might need extra help to manage the demands made on their literacy skills by a more advanced course later: []
 - iv) When they are obviously struggling with a course because they cannot cope with the demands made upon their literacy skills:

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

6. a) At which point would you be prepared to release them from your own classes for this purpose: NOT AT ALL/1/2/3/4.
- b) Why?
7. a) Is the timetable in your department/subject area organised to allow students to attend the Workshop? Y [] N []
- b) If No, is this something you would be committed to pushing for?
Y [] N []
8. a) Which of the following aims do you think Workshop staff should pursue?
- b) For which of these purposes would you be prepared to release students from your classes if this were necessary?
- i) To help students improve their performance on craft or vocational courses:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- ii) To teach them to fill in forms and write business letters:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- iii) To help them to communicate better with family and close friends:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- iv) To encourage them to read for pleasure:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- v) To encourage them to find ways of employing their leisure time/possible periods of unemployment constructively:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- vi) To think and write clearly for its own sake:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- vii) To speak clearly and confidently in a group of friends or within the family:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- viii) To speak confidently in a job interview:
a) Y [] N [] b) Y [] N []
- ix) Other.

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

9. Do you ever work closely with Workshop staff or other English teachers for any of the following reasons:
- i) To help them to plan the materials used in the Workshop so that it is relevant to your students' needs: usually/often/occasionally/never.
 - ii) To plan the language on your handouts to ensure it is at the right level for the students: usually/often/occasionally/never.
 - iii) To plan the language you use in your lessons and the ways in which you might present it in order to help students with reading and writing difficulties: usually/often/occasionally/never.
 - iv) To help them to deal with any difficult student/student with problems whom you have sent to the Workshop: usually/often/occasionally/never
 - v) In correcting your written work: usually/often/occasionally/never.
 - vi) In deciding which of your students should have workshop help: usually/often/occasionally/never.
 - vii) Other.
10. a) If not, would you be prepared to do so if asked? Y [] N []
- b) If yes, in which particular ways: 1/2/3/4/5/6/7?
11. Is there any other reason why there should be co-operation that does not yet exist?
12. Would you be interested in the idea of inviting a literacy teacher to work alongside you in the classroom as an alternative or a supplement to Workshop teaching? Y [] N []
13. Would this be likely to create problems for a literacy teacher?
14. Would it be likely to create problems for you?
15. Do you think it would bring any advantages?
16. Is the Workshop well advertised? Y [] N []
If No, how could this be improved?

APPENDIX C: THE NON WORKSHOP TUTORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

17. Can you suggest any improvements that could be made to the service provided by the Workshop?
18. Do you have any other observations?

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	
No of tutors interviewed	5	11	4	1	3	24	48
1 Teaching useful to students							
YES	5	10	4	1	2	22	44
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DK	0	1	0	0	1	2	4
2 (a) No who try to identify students with problems	5	9	2	1	1	18	36
(b) Method							
Exam results	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Initial interview/enrolment	2	1	0	0	0	3	6
Assessment by workshop staff	2	3	0	0	1	6	12
Performance in class	1	8	2	1	2	14	28
Initial test	0	1	0	0	0	1	2

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	
(c) Result of discovery							
Give help themselves	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Refer to workshop	5	9	3	1	2	20	40
Exclude from course	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Nothing	0	2	1	0	0	3	6
3 Opinion as to value of initial testing of all students							
Yes	4	11	2	1	3	21	42
No	1	0	2	0	0	3	6
4 Willingness to help with test	5	10	2	1	2	20	40

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	
5 (a) Would encourage use of workshop	5	11	4	1	3	24	48
(b) Opinion of reason why help should be given							
(i) Enhance existing competence	3	5	3	0	1	12	24
(ii) Improve ability to cope with adult world	2	5	3	0	0	10	20
(iii) Improve ability to cope with a more advanced course in future	0	0	2	0	0	2	4
(iv) Enhance ability to cope with present course	2	3	2	1	2	10	20

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	
6 Reasons for which prepared to release from own classes							
(i)							
(ii)	1	2	0	0	1	4	8
(iii)	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
(iv)	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Not at all	2	6	3	1	2	14	38
	2	3	1	0	0	6	12
7 (a) Timetabling allows workshop attendance							
Yes	3	7	2	1	2	15	30
No	1	5	2	0	1	9	18
(b) If no, commitment to asserting the need							
Yes	0	3	1	NA	0	4	8
No	4	8	1	NA	3	16	32

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	
8 (a) Opinion of desirable workshop aims							
(i) Aid performance on craft/voc courses	4	11	4	1	3	23	46
(ii) Fill in forms/ write business letters	3	7	3	0	3	16	32
(iii) Better informal communication	5	3	4	1	2	15	30
(iv) Read for pleasure	4	5	4	1	3	17	34
(v) Enhance leisure	4	4	4	1	2	15	30
(vi) Think clearly	3	1	4	1	3	12	24
(vii) Improve orally	1	0	4	1	3	9	18
(viii) Improve interview technique	0	2	4	1	3	10	20

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	
(b) Reasons for which would release from class							
(i)	3	8	3	1	1	16	32
(ii)	1	3	3	0	0	7	14
(iii)	0	2	3	0	0	5	10
(iv)	0	2	2	1	0	5	10
(v)	0	4	2	0	0	6	12
(vi)	0	2	2	0	0	4	8
(vii)	1	0	3	0	1	5	10
(viii)	0	3	3	0	1	7	14

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	
9 No who work with literacy staff for the following reasons							
(i) Plan their materials							
Usually	2	1	1	0	3	7	14
Often	1	1	0	1	0	3	6
Sometimes	1	3	0	0	0	4	8
Never	1	5	3	0	0	9	18
(ii) Plan language on own handouts							
Usually	1	0	4	0	1	6	12
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Never	3	10	0	1	2	16	32

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	
(iii) Plan language in own lessons							
Usually	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	3	1	1	0	0	5	10
Never	2	1	3	1	2	9	18
(iv) Help them with discipline							
Usually	1	3	3	1	1	9	18
Often	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Sometimes	1	2	0	0	0	3	6
Never	1	4	1	0	2	8	16
(v) Correcting own written work							
Usually	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Often	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Sometimes	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Never	5	7	4	1	3	20	30

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	
(vi) Deciding referrals							
Usually	4	3	2	0	2	11	22
Often	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Sometimes	0	3	0	0	0	3	6
Never	4	3	2	1	1	11	22
10 (a) No who would cooperate if asked	1	6	1	1	1	10	20
(b) Reasons for which prepared to cooperate							
(i)	1	4	0	0	0	5	10
(ii)	1	3	0	0	0	4	8
(iii)	1	3	0	0	0	4	8
(iv)	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
(v)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(vi)	1	2	0	0	0	3	6
(vii) Other	0	0	1	1	1	3	6

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX C: TUTORS IN OTHER SUBJECTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGES						Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	
11 No who said there were reasons for cooperation that did not exist	1	6	4	1	1	13	26
12 No prepared to invite a literacy teacher into own class							
Yes	3	6	3	0	3	15	30
No	2	5	1	1	0	9	18
13 No who thought this would cause problems to literacy teacher	1	4	0	0	0	5	10
14 No who thought it would bring problems to self	0	3	1	0	1	5	10
15 No who thought it would bring advantages	1	6	2	0	3	12	24
16 No who thought the service well advertised	4	6	3	1	NA	14	28

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D

Contents

- (1) Interview Schedule For Workshop Students**
- (2) Results**

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS

1. How did you come to be in the Workshop?
 - a) Were you referred?
 - b) Is it automatically part of your course?
 - c) Did your employer send you?
 - d) Did you choose to be there?
 - e) Other?
A/B/C/D/E: If A/C/D, why did you go?

2. Does you tutor/employer encourage you to go? Y/N.

3. Do teachers from other subjects ever send you along if you get stuck with your English in their lessons? Y/N.

If yes, sometimes/often/not very often?

Do they think/seem to think it's useful?

4. What do you think of the Workshop room and atmosphere: is it good/bad? Why?

Does it:
 - a) Help you to concentrate?: Y/N.
 - b) Make you feel at home and want to come?: Y/N.
 - c) Make you feel as if you were back at school?: Y/N.
 - d) Provide a chance to sit comfortably and read on your own if you want to: Y/N.
 - e) Let you work with your friends if you feel like it?: Y/N.
 - f) Let you work at your own pace?: Y/N.
 - g) Let you talk when you want to?: Y/N.
 - h) Seem:
 - i) Just like all your other lessons?
 - ii) Different from you other lessons?
If different how?

5. Do you like the atmosphere in the workshop as much/more/less that the atmosphere in other kinds of lessons?

6. Do you feel you are getting on as well as/less well/better than in a normal classroom?

7. How important do you think the college as a whole thinks the workshop is: more important than/as important as/less important than other courses? What makes you think this?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS

8. a) How important is it to you to be able to write good English: more important/as important as/less important than/your other subjects?

If yes

- b) Do you find the Workshop useful?: Y/N.
c) If yes, is it because it will help you to:
- i) Fill in forms/apply for jobs/write formal letters? Y/N.
 - ii) Understand newspapers better? Y/N.
 - iii) Get a better job? Y/N.
 - iv) Write better letters to friends and family? Y/N.
 - v) Think more clearly? Y/N.
 - vi) Express your ideas aloud more effectively? Y/N.
 - vii) Use your imagination? Y/N.
 - viii) Other.

If no, why do you go? Are you made to ?

9. Do you attend regularly? Y/N.
What would happen if you didn't/What happens if your're caught?

10. What do you think are the main things you do in the workshop out of this list: which do you like and which dislike: why?

- a) Work in small groups: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- b) Work on your own: usually/often/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- c) Help each other: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS

- d) Listen to the teacher doing the talking: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- e) Decide for yourself what you need to do: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- f) Get told by the teacher what to do rather than deciding for yourself: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- g) Have group discussions: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- h) Choose your own materials from a workshop stock: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- i) Are given materials by the teacher: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- j) Sit with whoever you like: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS

- k) Get told by the teacher who to sit with: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- l) Work as a class: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- m) Have class discussions: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- n) Discuss with the teacher what you need to work at and decide together what you will do: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- o) Get one-to-one tuition from the teacher: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS

- p) Get left on your own in the room to work while the teacher does something else: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- q) Use materials that will help you with everyday English: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- r) Use material about/talk about ideas and subjects that are new to you: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- s) Use material about/talk about ideas and subjects that involve the use of the imagination: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- t) Take part in a project that requires you to go out and about: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. Y/N. Why?

- u) Do work that is based on work-experience or some other activity you've been involved in outside college: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. L/D. Why?

- v) Work at your own pace: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. L/D. Why?

- w) Assess your own/other student's work: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. L/D. Why?

- x) Use a computer/video/other hardware on your own: usually/often/sometimes/not very often/never. L/D. Why?

11. If the teacher ever leaves the room expecting you to get on, do you:

- a) Work normally?
b) Mess about?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR WORKSHOP STUDENTS

- c) Sometimes work, sometimes mess about?
- d) Talk?

If (d) what sort of things do you talk about? ie. work, home, boyfriend, sport, what you're going to do at lunch time etc?

12. Do you find the work:
- a) Helpful in other lessons? Y/N.
 - b) Helpful at work? Y/N.
 - c) Useful in your everyday life? Y/N.
 - d) Not very helpful? Why?

13. If you get the work materials yourself:
- a) Are they easy to find? Y/N.
 - b) Can you always tell if they are suitable for you? Y/N.
 - c) Are there always enough there? Y/N.

14. Is the material interesting: always/usually/often/sometimes/not very often/not at all?

15. Is the material usually: hard/easy/about right?

16. Are there any materials that you found especially interesting or helpful?

17. a) How easy is it to talk to the teacher compared with in your other lessons: harder/the same/easier?
- b) Why?

18. a) The layout of the Workshop is different from in an ordinary classroom: Do you think it is: better/as good/not so good?
- b) Why?

19. (If with a disability): are the facilities good enough?

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
Number of students interviewed	9	12	12	12	11	11	12	10	89
1 Method of referral									
(a) tutor/other	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
(b) part of course	0	1	0	6	11	0	0	4	22
(c) employer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(d) own choice	4	8	11	6	0	11	12	6	58
(e) other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals									89
2 Encouragement from tutor/employer									
Yes	5	3	1	10	10	9	3	10	51
No	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
NA/DK	2	9	11	1	0	1	9	0	33
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
3 Referral for specific help with written content of other lessons									
Sometimes	4	3	1	3	1	2	0	5	19
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not very often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not at all	5	1	0	2	0	7	0	4	19
NA/DK	0	8	11	7	10	2	12	1	51
Total									89
Do tutors think it's useful									
Yes	4	0	1	4	6	0	0	6	21
No	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	6
Don't know/NA	5	9	11	8	5	11	12	1	62
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
4 Is the atmosphere									
Good	7	12	12	7	9	9	11	6	73
Bad	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	8
DK/NA	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	8
Total									89
Does it									
(a) aid concentration									
Yes	6	10	9	8	0	10	9	8	60
No	1	2	3	4	10	0	3	2	25
DK	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(b) have a comfortable atmosphere									
Yes	6	11	12	10	8	8	12	7	74
No	1	0	0	2	3	3	0	3	12
DK	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total									89
(c) have a school atmosphere									
Yes	1	1	9	5	7	2	2	3	30
No	6	11	3	7	4	9	9	7	56
DK	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	7	8*	
(d) provide opportunities for private reading									
Yes	5	8	9	4	7	3	12	0	48
No	2	4	3	8	4	8	0	10	39
DK	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total									89
(e) allow friends to work together									
Yes	7	12	11	8	10	5	12	10	75
No	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	9
NA/DK	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Total									89
(f) allow working at the student's own pace									
Yes	9	12	12	12	9	11	12	7	84
No	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	5
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

c

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(g) allow students to talk freely									
Yes	9	10	12	11	9	9	12	6	78
No	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	4	9
DK	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total									89
(h) seem									
(i) like other lessons	3	1	1	4	4	0	2	2	17
(ii) different from "	6	11	11	7	7	11	9	8	70
DK	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
5 Student assessment of atmosphere in relation to that in other lessons									
Like									
As much	3	1	1	3	3	2	0	3	16
More	3	7	11	8	3	8	11	2	53
Less	1	3	0	0	4	1	0	5	14
DK	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	6
Total									89
6 Student assessment of own performance compared with that in standard classroom									
As well	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	7
Less well	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Better	9	10	12	9	7	11	8	5	71
DK	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	8
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
7 Student assessment of college management priorities in relation to other courses									
More important	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	6
As important	1	1	0	1	4	3	0	0	10
Less important	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	6
DK	6	9	12	9	4	7	12	8	67
Total									89
8 (a) Student assessment of value of learning to write well in relation to other studies									
More	6	9	8	4	9	6	6	2	50
As	0	3	4	7	2	4	5	4	29
Less	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	7
DK	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Total	9	12	12	12	11	11	12	10	89
(b) Student assessment of workshop's usefulness									
Yes	9	12	12	12	9	11	12	4	81
No	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	8

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

ciii

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	7	8*	
(c) Reasons									
(i) fill in forms/apply for jobs/write formal letters	9	9	10	10	10	11	8	5	72
(ii) understand newspapers better	4	6	9	6	3	3	7	2	40
(iii) get a better job	7	12	10	12	7	11	7	5	71
(iv) write better personal letters	7	5	8	5	7	8	6	1	47
(v) think more clearly	5	8	10	8	10	9	9	1	60
(vi) better orally	6	6	9	7	9	9	10	6	62
(vii) use imagination	6	7	8	4	10	7	9	4	55
9 Regular attendance									
Yes	9	4	8	10	11	11	0	5	58
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
NA	0	8	4	2	0	0	12	0	26
Total									89
Absence pursued by tutor	2	0	0	5	11	4	0	5	27

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

civ

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
10 Frequency of use of teaching strategies/opinion of these									
(a) Small group-work									
Usually	1	3	1	2	0	2	0	4	13
Often	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	5
Sometimes	1	0	1	1	6	2	4	0	15
Not very often	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	6
Never	5	9	9	7	2	7	4	5	48
DK	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Total	9	12	12	12	11	11	12	10	89
Like (or would like)	6	6	2	3	6	3	6	8	40
Dislike (or would dislike)	2	2	2	0	3	0	1	2	12
DK	1	4	8	9	2	8	5	0	37
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(b) Work on own									
Usually	5	11	10	10	4	7	7	2	56
Often	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
Sometimes	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	11
Not very often	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	1	8
Never	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	10
									89
Like (or would like)	9	12	11	6	10	7	9	5	69
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	2	8
DK	0	0	0	4	1	2	2	3	12
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(c) Help each other									
Usually	1	4	5	3	8	4	6	7	38
Often	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Sometimes	3	2	1	3	1	0	2	1	13
Not very often	1	2	3	1	2	0	2	0	11
Never	3	3	3	5	0	7	1	2	24
Total									89
Like (or would like)	6	6	8	8	9	4	9	7	57
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	1	1	4	2	0	1	0	9
DK	3	5	3	0	0	7	2	3	23
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

⁺ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(d) Listen to the teacher talk									
Usually	3	2	1	4	2	1	1	2	16
Often	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Sometimes	4	10	10	4	7	10	9	8	62
Not very often	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	5
Never	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total									89
Like (or would like)	4	12	5	5	2	1	6	2	37
Dislike (or would dislike)	5	0	7	5	8	10	1	8	44
DK	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	0	8
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(e) Decide own learning-agenda									
Usually	1	8	0	2	0	0	1	4	16
Often	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sometimes	6	3	6	1	1	11	10	0	38
Not very often	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Never	6	9	9	0	1	0	0	6	31
Total									89
Like (or would like)	7	8	1	5	3	11	6	4	45
Dislike (or would dislike)	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	7
DK	0	2	10	7	8	0	5	5	37
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	7	8*	
(f) Teacher decides									
Usually	1	2	6	9	11	1	3	6	39
Often	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
Sometimes	7	6	6	2	0	5	8	2	36
Not very often	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Never	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	7
Total	9	12	12	12	11	11	12	10	89
Like (or would like)	1	4	8	9	3	0	9	3	37
Dislike (or would dislike)	7	3	0	3	2	7	1	0	23
DK	1	5	4	0	6	4	2	7	29
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(g) Group-discussions									
Usually	1	0	0	10	0	0	3	4	18
Often	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4
Sometimes	1	1	2	2	1	2	4	1	14
Not very often	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	6
Never	5	10	8	0	7	9	3	5	47
Total									89
Like (or would like)	3	2	2	10	6	2	5	7	37
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	6
DK	6	9	9	2	4	9	4	3	46
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(h) Choose own materials									
Usually	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sometimes	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
Not very often	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Never	7	1	12	11	10	9	9	10	69
Total									89
Like (or would like)	6	9	9	1	0	2	1	1	29
Dislike (or would dislike)	2	1	1	3	1	0	3	1	12
Don't know	1	2	2	8	10	9	8	8	48
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(i) Teacher gives materials									
Usually	0	0	9	7	3	6	7	5	38
Often	4	0	2	4	5	6	5	5	31
Sometimes	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
Not very often	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Never	2	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	9
Total									89
Like (or would like)	4	1	11	6	6	8	10	7	54
Dislike (or would dislike)	1	6	0	1	2	1	0	1	12
DK/NA	4	5	0	5	3	3	2	2	24
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(j) Sit with own choice									
Usually	5	12	10	1	10	0	11	10	59
Often	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not very often	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Never	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	6
NA/DK	4	0	2	1	0	11	0	0	18
Total									89
Like (or would like)	9	12	10	4	8	0	11	10	64
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
DK/NA	0	0	2	6	3	11	1	0	23
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(k) Told whom to sit with									
Usually	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not very often	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Never	9	12	10	11	11	0	11	10	74
NA	0	0	2	0	0	11	0	0	13
Total									89
Like (or would like)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	0	10	12	3	0	1	10	36
DK	9	12	2	0	8	11	10	0	52
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(l) work as a class									
Usually	1	0	0	0	4	0	4	8	17
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Sometimes	1	0	0	5	3	0	3	0	12
Not very often	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	1	8
Never	7	12	11	7	0	0	2	0	39
NA	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	11
Total									89
Like (or would like)	2	0	1	5	7	0	8	10	33
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	8
DK	7	7	11	7	3	11	2	0	48
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(m) Have class discussions									
Usually	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	16
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sometimes	1	0	0	2	7	0	3	0	13
Not very often	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Never	7	12	11	9	2	0	3	1	45
NA	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	11
Total									89
Like (or would like)	4	0	1	4	8	0	6	9	32
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	1	7
DK	5	11	10	8	1	11	4	0	50
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(n) Negotiated agenda									
Usually	7	2	4	6	0	11	11	2	43
Often	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	7
Not very often	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Never	2	8	4	6	11	0	0	6	37
Total									89
Like (or would like)	7	2	6	6	0	11	8	3	43
Dislike (or would dislike)	1	0	6	0	0	0	2	1	10
DK	1	10	0	6	11	0	2	6	36
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(o) One-to-one tuition									
Usually	6	11	12	10	6	9	9	1	64
Often	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	4
Sometimes	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	6
Not very often	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	5
Never	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	10
Total									89
Like (or would like)	7	12	12	10	7	11	10	4	73
Dislike (or would dislike)	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
DK	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	6	13
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(p) Left on own by teacher									
Usually	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	6
Often	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	6
Sometimes	2	5	6	0	2	2	5	1	23
Not very often	1	0	0	4	4	4	5	1	19
Never	5	1	3	5	5	4	1	7	31
DK/NA	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Total									89
Like (or would like)	4	6	4	4	2	2	4	5	31
Dislike (or would dislike)	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	0	11
DK	3	4	7	6	7	9	6	5	47
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(q) Use material that would help with everyday English									
Usually	8	9	12	6	3	11	10	7	66
Often	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Sometimes	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	8
Not very often	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	6
Never	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	6
Total									89
Like (Or would like)	9	12	7	7	6	11	6	3	61
Dislike (Or would dislike)	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	2	9
Don't know	0	0	4	2	2	0	6	5	19
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
(r) Use material with new informative content									
Usually	0	7	5	0	3	0	2	4	21
Often	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	6
Sometimes	3	1	3	1	4	3	2	5	22
Not very often	2	0	3	0	4	0	2	0	11
Never	4	2	0	10	0	8	5	0	29
Total									89
Like (Or would like)	3	9	9	3	4	2	6	9	45
Dislike (Or would dislike)	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	5
Don't know	6	3	2	8	4	9	6	1	39
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	7	8*	
(s) Use material that would develop imagination									
Usually	1	5	10	1	2	0	4	0	23
Often	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
Sometimes	5	3	1	4	1	3	3	2	22
Not very often	1	4	0	1	2	0	2	1	11
Never	2	0	1	6	3	7	3	7	29
Total									89
Like (or would like)	7	5	8	6	8	6	7	6	53
Dislike (or would dislike)	1	3	1	3	1	3	2	3	17
Don't know	1	4	3	3	2	2	3	1	19
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(t) Outside project									
Usually	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Often	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Not very often	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	6
Never	9	11	11	12	3	11	12	10	79
Total									89
Like (or would like)	2	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	9
Dislike (or would dislike)	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	6
DK	6	11	11	12	4	10	12	8	74
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

⁺ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(u) Tasks based on work-exp.									
Usually	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	6
Often	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Sometimes	3	0	1	5	3	0	3	1	16
Not very often	0	2	0	5	2	0	0	0	9
Never	5	8	11	0	6	11	8	7	56
Total									89
Like (or would like)	3	3	2	5	4	1	1	3	22
Dislike (or would dislike)	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	5
DK	5	8	10	5	6	10	11	7	62
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(v) Work at own pace									
Usually	9	11	12	12	6	11	10	7	78
Often	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not very often	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Never	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	1	7
Total									89
Like (or would like)	9	11	12	12	6	11	8	4	73
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
DK	0	1	0	0	5	0	3	6	15
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(w) Assess own/others' work									
Usually	0	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	7
Often	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	5
Sometimes	2	4	3	1	1	0	0	1	12
Not very often	0	4	2	0	1	0	2	0	9
Never	7	2	5	8	8	9	9	7	55
DK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total									89
Like (or would like)	2	5	6	2	2	2	1	3	23
Dislike (or would dislike)	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	5
DK	7	6	6	10	8	9	10	5	61
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(x) Use hardware on own: independent use of any type									
Usually	3	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	10
Often	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4
Sometimes	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	7
Not very often	0	5	2	0	3	3	3	0	16
Never	4	6	5	12	6	6	7	6	52
Total									89
Like (or would like)	5	6	5	0	3	5	4	3	31
Dislike (or would dislike)	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	6
Don't know	3	6	7	12	6	5	7	6	52
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
11 Student behaviour in absence of the teacher									
(a) Work normally	3	10	5	4	7	5	7	2	43
(b) Waste time	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
(c) A mixture of (a) and (b)	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	6
(d) Talk	2	2	0	1	5	0	0	1	11
(e) DK/NA	2	0	7	5	0	1	2	9	26
Total									89
12 Usefulness of the work									
(a) in other lessons	7	4	1	4	10	8	1	8	43
(b) at work	7	6	3	5	5	0	3	2	31
(c) normal life	8	9	10	10	6	9	9	5	66
(d) not helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
13 Is it:									
(a) Easy to find									
Yes	2	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	14
No	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Don't know	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
(b) Easy to tell if suitable									
Yes	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	13
No	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Don't know	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
(c) Always enough there									
Yes	2	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	13
No	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Don't know	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

⁺ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5*	6	7	8*	
14 Student opinion of interest-level									
Always	1	2	3	7	1	0	2	2	18
Usually	2	2	4	3	2	2	2	4	21
Often	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	6
Sometimes	5	6	5	1	5	2	2	1	27
Not very often	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	10
Not at all	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	6
Total									89
15 Student opinion of difficulty-level									
Hard	3	3	3	1	1	0	0	4	15
Easy	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	11
About right	5	8	6	9	9	6	8	4	55
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	8
Total									89

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX D: WORKSHOP STUDENTS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	COLLEGE								Totals
	1	2	3	4*	5*	6	7	8*	
16 For responses to this question see the body of Chapter Four									
17 Ease of teacher/pupil communication relative to a traditional classroom									
Harder	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
The same	2	3	1	3	5	5	0	8	27
Easier	6	9	11	7	5	5	12	2	57
DK	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Total									89
18 Success of layout relative to that of a traditional classroom									
Better	7	11	10	5	6	7	9	3	58
As good	0	1	1	3	5	3	2	0	15
Not so good	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
DK	2	0	0	4	0	1	0	6	13
Total									89
19 No students with a disability were available for interview.									

* ILEA Colleges with Communications Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E

Contents

- (1) Categories For Student Observational Form: Results**
- (2) Flanders' Interaction Analysis: Results**

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE												TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 JH	2 JL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4+ TR	4+ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU	

INDEPENDENT WORK

The student is
independently

A reading	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B working on a worksheet	0	0	30	30	30	24	27	30	30	30	9	30	270
C listening to a tape-recorder	27	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	47
D viewing a film strip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E checking his work	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE												TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 JH	2 JL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4 ⁺ TR	4 ⁺ PM	5 [*] NG	5 [*] HB	6 GD	7 RU	
F working with a language-master	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G working with a record-player	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H using programmed material	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I correcting a test	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J taking an individual test	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
K correcting an exercise	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

cxxxv

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE												TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 JH	2 JL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4 ⁺ TR	4 ⁺ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU	
L working with supplementary reading-material	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M Miscellaneous (working on computer)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
TEACHER-PUPIL WORK													
The pupil:													
A seeks assistance from the teacher	31	0	0	4	4	10	15	6	16	9	3	11	109
B receives assistance from the teacher	5	30	16	14	30	23	27	12	17	23	25	13	235

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE												TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 JH	2 IL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4+ TR	4+ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU	
C discusses his progress with the teacher	0	0	0	15	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	22
NON-INSTRUCTIONAL USE OF PUPIL TIME													
Pupil													
A spends time at desk not working	12	0	0	3	4	13	6	0	30	24	0	0	92
B waits for lesson materials	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
C waits for prescription	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	16

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE												TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 IH	2 IL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4+ TR	4+ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU	
D goes to get materials	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	8
E waits for papers to be corrected	0	0	0	6	0	4	0	0	30	10	0	0	50
F talks to other pupils	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	0	0	14	0	19*	32
G leaves room to get material (* to chat in coffee-bar)	0	0	0	9	30*	6	30	0	0	0	0	2	47
H Miscellaneous (* sings)	0	0	0	2	0	2*	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

cxxxviii

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE												TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 JH	2 JL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4+ TR	4+ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU	

PUPIL-PUPIL ACTIVITY

Pupil

A asks assistance from another pupil	0	0	0	6	0	0	9	0	0	10	0	0	25
B receives assistance from another pupil	0	0	0	6	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	24

GROUP ACTIVITY

A contributes to a class discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	14	0	19	63
B takes a group test under supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CATEGORIES FOR STUDENT OBSERVATIONAL FORM: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES	COLLEGE													TOTAL (out of 360 mins)
	1 Wshp	1 Lit tut	2 JH	2 JL	3 Wshp	3 DISC	4+ TR	4+ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU		
C answers a question directed to him	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
D asks a question	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	
E listens to a teacher lecture or demonstrate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	5	0	0	22	
F watches a film with the group	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
G listens to records with the group	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
H watches a performance with the group	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
I Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

cx1

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

	COLLEGE										
	1 Wshp	1 Lit T	2 JH	2 JL	3 DISC	4 ⁺ TR	4 ⁺ PM	5* NG	5* HB	6 GD	7 RU
Highest individual category	5	5/8	5	9	9	9	5	9	4	4	9
Highest individual cell	5/5	4/8	5/9	4/8	9/3	4/8	5/8	4/8	4/8	4/8	4/8
Percentage of talk in the lesson (Sum of categories 1-9)	87	97	95	99	98	99	98	96	98	91	99
Percentage of teacher-talk	75	68	67	59	58	65	70	66	71	77	62
Percentage of teacher-lecture	55	35	52	28	22	19	36	21	26	28	19
Percentage of sustained pupil-talk	30	1	2	0	1	4	18	5	2	0	9
Percentage of "indirect" influence	83	188	91	257	286	330	101	128	102	199	394
Pupil-initiation ratio (as percentage of total talk)	25	25	58	59	78	55	67	51	37	7	67

* ILEA College with Communication Workshop

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

COLLEGE ONE

ABINGDON WORKSHOP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	5	21
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	26	14	0	0	45	0	13	98
5	0	3	0	26	95	0	0	2	6	11	143
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	13	0	18	15	0	0	18	2	0	66
9	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	5	21
10	0	0	0	13	13	0	0	2	5	17	50
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9) 87%

Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9) 75%

Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7)) 55%

Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9) 30%

Proportion of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 5-7) 83%

Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9)) 25%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

ABINGDON LITERACY TUTOR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	1	48	17	0	0	0	5	0	71
3	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	1	1	0	11
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	0	0	90
5	1	1	0	25	38	0	0	19	8	0	92
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	64	1	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	92
9	0	10	8	1	10	0	0	0	2	1	31
10	0	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	11
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	97%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	68%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	35%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	1%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 5-7)	188%
Pupil-initiation Ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	25%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

COLLEGE TWO

RUGBY: JH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
2	0	6	8	0	35	0	0	0	10	2	61
3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4
4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	44	0	4	52
5	0	14	0	34	14	2	0	2	56	10	132
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	2	24	6	2	16	0	0	0	2	0	52
9	0	19	4	8	38	0	0	2	2	0	73
10	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	2	2	0	20
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	95%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	67%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	52%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	2%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 5-7)	91%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	58%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

RUGBY: JL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	3	35	0	55
2	7	0	0	7	3	0	0	9	21	0	47
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	59
5	3	7	0	20	12	0	0	0	23	0	65
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	12	14	3	10	25	0	0	0	0	3	67
9	37	17	4	2	26	0	0	0	6	3	95
10	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9) 99%

Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9) 59%

Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7)) 28%

Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9) 0%

Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 5-7) 257%

Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9)) 59%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

COLLEGE THREE:

NELSON DISC WORKSHOP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	7	1	5	3	0	0	0	21	0	37
2	1	5	0	8	5	0	2	2	20	2	45
3	0	4	0	4	11	0	2	0	30	0	51
4	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	33	0	0	36
5	1	2	0	9	3	2	1	2	30	0	50
6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	7
8	4	11	8	4	4	0	0	0	6	0	37
9	35	16	43	5	21	0	2	2	2	2	128
10	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	6
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	98%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	58%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	22%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	1%
Proportion of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 5-7)	286%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	78%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

COLLEGE FOUR:

BANBURY: TR

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	1	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	12	0	27
2	13	3	5	22	9	1	0	2	11	0	66
3	1	6	0	10	9	3	0	1	11	0	41
4	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	56	1	1	64
5	2	8	3	15	5	3	0	1	13	0	50
6	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	3	1	10
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	4	25	5	9	7	1	0	0	11	0	62
9	7	20	29	2	7	2	0	0	6	2	75
10	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	99%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	65%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	19%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	4%
Proportion of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 6-7)	330%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	55%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

BANBURY: PM	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	2	1	2	7	2	0	0	3	1	18
2	3	13	4	8	25	5	0	1	2	4	65
3	1	6	0	2	7	2	0	4	2	0	24
4	0	1	1	2	7	3	0	1	17	0	32
5	8	11	4	7	9	8	0	33	19	1	100
6	3	5	0	4	7	2	2	6	7	0	36
7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
8	1	10	2	0	18	4	0	0	3	0	38
9	2	13	12	6	18	6	0	0	21	0	78
10	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	98%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	70%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	36%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	18%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 6-7)	101%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	67%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

COLLEGE FIVE:

VAUXHALL NG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	3	6	0	2	0	1	0	12
2	0	0	7	3	8	1	4	1	11	0	35
3	1	3	1	5	4	1	2	6	9	0	32
4	0	2	2	1	2	1	2	50	3	0	63
5	3	5	1	13	6	1	10	4	9	0	52
6	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3	10
7	2	1	1	9	5	1	2	2	21	5	49
8	2	16	8	20	5	0	4	0	6	3	64
9	4	9	10	7	9	3	18	0	6	1	67
10	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	0	3	1	15
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	96%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	66%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	21%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)/	5%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 5-7)	128%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	51%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

VAUXHALL: HB	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	10
2	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	1	0	5	14
3	0	0	0	5	3	4	0	0	3	0	15
4	0	0	2	2	3	2	0	91	2	0	102
5	4	2	33	16	3	0	5	0	10	0	73
6	0	0	2	12	4	0	4	2	10	2	36
7	0	0	0	8	4	4	2	0	11	0	29
8	6	5	7	10	9	16	10	0	8	0	71
9	0	2	6	5	6	8	10	0	2	2	41
10	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	98%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	71%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Cat 5)/(Sum Cats 1-7))	26%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)/	2%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 6-7)	102%
Pupil-ination ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	37%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

**COLLEGE SIX
BUXTON GD**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	14	21	33	1	0	0	1	1	71
3	0	1	2	7	10	2	0	2	2	4	30
4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	67	0	15	86
5	0	6	0	50	0	11	0	2	1	9	79
6	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	1	5	15
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	57	9	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	78
9	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
10	0	9	0	12	10	0	0	2	1	0	34
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	91%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	77%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	28%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	0%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 6-7)	199%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	7%

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FLANDERS' INTERACTION ANALYSIS: RESULTS

COLLEGE SEVEN

RU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1	5	4	4	3	10	0	0	0	20	2	48
2	6	4	2	4	4	0	0	0	8	0	28
3	6	6	10	10	12	0	0	0	31	0	75
4	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	41	0	0	46
5	4	2	4	19	4	0	0	0	15	0	48
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
8	2	6	18	4	6	0	0	0	14	0	50
9	27	9	33	4	9	2	0	2	14	0	100
10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total											399

Amount of talk (Sum 1-9)	99%
Amount of teacher-talk (Sum 1-7)/(Sum 1-9)	62%
Amount of teacher-lecture (Category 5/(Sum 1-7))	19%
Amount of sustained pupil-talk ((8-8) cell + (9-9) cell)/(Tot Cat 8 + tot Cat 9)	9%
Percentage of "indirect" teaching (Sum of cats 1-4)/(Sum of cats 6-7)	394%
Pupil-initiation ratio (Sum Cat 9/(Sum 8+9))	67%

APPENDIX F

Contents

- (1) Workshop Materials: Results**

APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS: RESULTS

	COLLEGE								Total
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
1. Number of materials scrutinised	21	48	60	71	40	14	43	0	297
2. ASSESSMENT									
Test used:	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	-	6
- own	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	-	6
- commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
3. TEACHING MATERIALS									
(i) Range of Linguistic tasks revealed by scrutiny:									
(a) "Everyday English"	21	26	58	69	12	14	27	-	240
(b) Informative content	1	9	2	2	27	0	8	-	49
(c) Stimulation for imagination	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	-	8
Total									297

* ILEA Colleges with Communication Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS: RESULTS

	COLLEGE								
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	Total
(ii) Range of Media used									
(a) Commercial	0	18	0	22	4	2	0	-	46
(b) Computer-related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
(c) Video-related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
(d) Teacher-devised	17	32	60	49	36	12	43	-	249
(e) For use with cassettes	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	-	2
Total									297
(iii) Relevance to students:									
(a) No showing vocational orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
(b) No designed for integration with other basic skills	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	11
(c) No designed for use within the context of a craft class	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	3
(d) No that would require students to go out and about	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communication Workshops

clv

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS: RESULTS

	COLLEGE								Total
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(e) No relating to work-experience	1	0	0	0	8	0	2	-	11
(f) No showing relevance to social/environmental concerns	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	-	14
(g) No taking account of students' cultural/liguistic background									
(i) Class	1	7	3	8	2	0	0	-	21
(ii) Race									
(h) No taking account of gender	1	0	0	1	7	0	0	-	9
(i) No reflecting student interest	6	4	8	26	22	0	8	-	74
(j) No dealing with day-to-day concerns (e.g. form-filling)	3	14	11	22	14	0	13	-	77
(k) No concerned with personal development - pastoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
- study skills	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	-	15

* ILEA Colleges with Communication Workshops

clvi

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS: RESULTS

	COLLEGE								Total
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
4. TEACHING STRATEGIES									
(a) No attempting to enhance									
Oracy	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	1
Learning-autonomy	11	37	42	69	19	14	47	-	239
Written skills	21	39	60	71	39	14	46	-	290
Employment prospects	1	0	0	0	8	0	2	-	11
Leisure/unemployment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	-	2
(b) No designed to embrace specific teaching-strategies									
Directing the learning	10	0	18	0	21	0	0	-	49
Teacher as learning-guide	11	37	42	0	19	14	47	-	170
Small group-work	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	-	3
Emphasis upon writing	21	39	60	71	39	14	46	-	290
Learning integrated with other basic skills	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	3
Students setting their own pace	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK	-	0
Students assessing their own work	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	-	3

* ILEA Colleges with Communication Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS: RESULTS

	COLLEGE								Total
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	
(c) No of teaching-packs geared for individual syllabuses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
6 STUDENT AUTONOMY									
Negotiated agenda: evidence of:									
Diary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Form	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	1
Form, with space for student comment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Utilisation by students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
No showing evidence of a booking system	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
No of materials classified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
No of materials graded	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	-	24
No of materials suitable for independent use by students	11	37	42	69	19	14	47	-	239

* ILEA Colleges with Communication Workshops

* Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP MATERIALS: RESULTS

	COLLEGE								
	1	2	3	4 ⁺	5 [*]	6	7	8 [*]	Total
7 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING									
No of handouts apparently designed for specific individuals	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	1

* ILEA Colleges with Communication Workshops

+ Collaborating Institution

APPENDIX G

Contents

- (1) Workshop Layout: Results**

APPENDIX G: WORKSHOP LAYOUT: RESULTS

	YES	NO	COMMENTS
1. Large room.	7	1	One college had a suite. Most had a large room divided off with screens.
2. Mobile Furniture for flexibility.	8	0	
3. Booths with tape-recorders.	2	6	
4. Videos.	4	4	
5. Computers .	4	4	
6. W.Ps./typewriters.	4	4	
7. Storage facilities for students' work/handouts.	8	0	
8. Wall-coverings.	8	0	
9. Facilities for the disabled.	3	5	One College was about to acquire these.
10. Books/Bookshelves.	5	3	
11. Magazine racks.	3	5	
12. Quiet reading-corner.	3	5	
13. Internal telephone system.	1	7	All of the ILEA Colleges appeared to lack this.
14. Telephone directories.	3	5	All of the ILEA Colleges appeared to lack these.
15. Maps/A-Z, etc.	5	3	All of the ILEA Colleges appeared to lack these.
16. Cameras.	2	6	All of the ILEA Colleges appeared to lack these.

APPENDIX H

Contents: The HE Survey

- (1) Preliminary letter**
- (2) Questionnaire**
- (3) Results**

APPENDIX H: THE HE SURVEY

136 Sinclair Avenue
Banbury
Oxon
OX16 7BL

1st February 1986

Dear Sir

RESEARCH INTO ENGLISH WORKSHOPS

I am a serving teacher currently on secondment at Garnett College in London to carry out research into English Workshops.

Because I am concerned to assess the staff development needs in my own college, I should like to find out how important this approach to teaching is likely to become in the next few years and for this reason am conducting a survey into institutions providing teacher-training.

I recognise that such requests can be a nuisance to busy people, but would much appreciate it if you could find the time to fill in the short questionnaire which is attached, or would pass it on to the most appropriate person in your institution to do so.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

From
North Oxfordshire Technical College,
Broughton Road,
Banbury
Oxon
OX16 7BL

Principal: Mr M Mahoney

APPENDIX H: THE HE SURVEY

QUESTIONNAIRE: HE SURVEY

NB. IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 1 IS NONE, IT WOULD STILL BE HELPFUL TO HAVE A REPLY SAYING SO.

1. How may teachers do you train to teach English and/or Communications in institutions in any of the following categories?
 - a) FE.
 - 1) PGCE. _____
 - 2) In service. _____
 - 3) Other: please specify. _____
 - b) Secondary.
 - 1) PGCE. _____
 - 2) B.ED. _____
 - 3) In service. _____
 - 4) Other: please specify. _____
2. Do you consider English Workshops as:
 - a) A major teaching method? Y/N.
 - b) A method to mention in passing? Y/N.
 - c) Not at all important in relation to the other methods available? Y/N.
3. Is the method used in any of the following kinds of institutions in your T/P area?
 - a) FE: Y/N.
 - b) Secondary: Y/N.
 - c) Adult Education Centres: Y/N.
 - d) Other: please specify.
4. Is there any institution in your area which has a course specifically designed/which is itself specifically designed to promote workshop styles of teaching (eg. the Curriculum Development Base in ILEA)?
5. Do you have any documentation (eg handouts) that you would be willing to enclose (for my personal use only)?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. JENNY WARE

APPENDIX H: HE SURVEY: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	FE	Secondary	Total
No contacted			82
No replied		-	51
No training teachers for one or more of the categories			36
No training for particular sector	8	31	39
View of workshops:			
(a) A major method	6	27	33
(b) A method to mention in passing	1	1	2
(c) Not important	0	0	0
(d) Did not know ILEA definition/ used term in a different sense	2	14	16
Knowledge of whether workshop methods used in t/p area in			
(a) FE	4	0	21
(b) Secondary	1	17	1
(c) Adult Education Institutes	1	1	2
Awareness of the presence of an LEA institution for the promotion of workshops	2	6	8

NB Some institutions trained teachers for both sectors, so figures overlap.

APPENDIX I

Contents: The LEA Survey

- (i) Introductory letter**
- (ii) The questionnaire**
- (iii) The Results**

APPENDIX I: THE LEA SURVEY

136 Sinclair Avenue
Banbury
Oxon
OX16 7BL

22nd February 1989

The Chief Education Officer

Dear Sir or Madam

Survey into LEA Provision of Literacy Teaching

I am a serving teacher carrying out research into literacy teaching and I am interested in the involvement of LEAs in this activity.

I should therefore much appreciate it if you could fill in the accompanying questionnaire or pass it on the appropriate person.

I realise this is something of an imposition upon busy people and thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully

JENNY WARE

Head of Sector for Continuing and Special Education, Tamworth College.

APPENDIX I: THE LEA SURVEY

Survey of Local Education Authorities on Literacy Teaching. 22nd February 1989

Name of Authority

1. Do any of the colleges in your LEA have literacy workshops?

No

Don't Know

Yes

In how many colleges?

How many colleges are there in your Authority?

2. Does the Authority have a policy to promote the development of literacy workshops?

Yes

No

3. Does the Authority provide staff development/support for staff development specifically for the promotion of literacy workshops?

a) Regularly

b) Occasionally

c) None

4. Does the Authority have an institution set up for/involvement in the promotion of literacy workshops?

No

Yes

Is it:

a) Specifically for this purpose

b) In HE

c) Other

5. In view of the overlap in educational philosophy between TVEI and literacy workshops, is there any intention to develop such provision in the future?

No

Yes

APPENDIX 1: THE LEA SURVEY

6. Is there any specific support for ALBSU activities?
- a) Payment of staff
 - b) Provision of Premises
 - c) Staff development
 - d) Other
7. Is there an Authority policy on the interface between ALBSU and mainstream literacy provision?
- No
- Yes
8. Do you have any document/brief details you would be prepared to provide outlining this?

Thank you.

Jenny Ware

APPENDIX I: LEA SURVEY: RESULTS

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	FE	ADULT ED COLLS	TOTAL
No of LEAS contacted			97
No of replies	-	-	52
1 No of institutions with workshops	94	4	98
2 Total no of instutuions	197	41	238
Percentage with workshops	48%	10%	41%
2 No LEAs with policy to promote workshops			24
3 No LEAs who provide staff development			
(a) Regularly			17
(b) Occasionally			16
4 No of LEAs with an institution to promote workshops			
(i) specifically for this			8
(ii) in HE	-		0
(iii) other		-	7
5 No LEAs with intention to promote wshops with reference to TVEI		-	12
6 No LEAs who support ALBSU activities with			
(a) payment of staff			27
(b) premises			26
(c) staff development			30
(d) other			14
7 No of LEAs with a policy on the interface between ALBSU and FE			11

APPENDIX J

Contents: Original Material

(1) **College Three**

3 examples of Negotiated Student Programme.

(2) **College Six**

(a) 2 examples of student self-assessment sheet.

(b) 2 examples of Weekly Record and Planning Chart.

(c) 2 examples of summary Record Sheet filled in by student.

Negotiated

Student

Programme

Name: Student	Course	Name: Tutor
Peter Slater	English Reading + spelling	Shirley Windle

<u>Reading Skills</u>	<u>Access Skills</u>	<u>Comprehension Skills</u>	<u>Spelling</u>	<u>Writing</u>		
choice of books from workshop library (+ tape)	Units on alphabetical order - telephone directory	Unit on newspaper articles	Follow Spelling tape units + follow up exercises	Follow letter writing units.		
	index	Unit on instructions				
			CLXXii			

Negotiated

Student

Programme

Name: Student	Course	Name: Tutor
Beatrice Milner	English Introduction to 'O' level	Brenda Dyer.

<u>Punctuation and Spelling</u>	<u>Essay Writing Skills</u>	<u>Grammatical Skills</u> e Access Skills	<u>Comprehension Skills</u>	<u>Summary Skills</u>	<u>Letter Writing Skills</u>	<u>Oral Skills</u>
Punctuation assessment - necessary exercises.	Paragraphs - Tape 7 (Literary) - Chapman. - Secondary Cert. Cng.	Sentence Construction - Tape 7 (Literary) - Pen to Paper. - Creative Writing Units.	Practice in a range of comprehensions with answers Tape 6. (Literary)	Reading books or a short summary. Unit in 'How to do a summary'	Follow letter writing units where appropriate.	Preparation Practice in a) giving info. b) telling a st.
Spelling assessment - 1 necessary exercises.	Planning - Sec. Cert. Cng. - Huddersfield Path. - English for Composition	An introduction to Grammar - Tape 5. (Literary)	Vocabulary Ext - meanings of words.	Newspaper articles - summary.	Different types of letters - Informal; Formal - requests, complaints, job applications.	c) introducing speaker. d) taking part in a discuss
More difficult Punctuation & Spelling from English Workbook. Assignments in pure Spelling	Vocabulary Ext. - Checklist in Vocab. - Smudge & Chaspen. - Various exercises - Pen to Paper.	Dictionary Work. Tape 5 (Literary)	More difficult comprehensions - Factual Passages - Functional " - Poetry	More difficult passages - with answers.		
	Different Types of essay - Narrative, Descriptive, Factual, Argumentative.		Ch XXVII			

Negotiated
Student
Programme

Name: Student	Course	Name: Tutor
Masood Akhtar	English - Preparation for Tests in English	Brenda Dyer.

<u>Vocabulary Extension.</u>	<u>Oral Skills</u>	<u>Listening Skills</u>	<u>Writing Skills</u>	<u>Comprehension Skills</u>	<u>Grammatical Skills</u>
Reading - use library system for borrowing	Follow group oral units - question form. - word order	Follow graded listening units - with answers.	Follow graded writing pack. - Writing in English - Anita Aricas.	Study skills in Reading (+ tape).	Sentence Construction - Tape 7. Use of conjunctions Pen to Paper.
Exercises from Pen to Paper. Checklist in Eng. vocabulary	- Vocabulary ext.	Practice in types of listening activities - a speech - a message - a discussion	Punctuation - follow units.		Use of article. Verb tenses. Use of passive Nouns, adjectives adverbs. Prepositions.
Notebook System for recording all new vocabulary	Practice giving simple instructions b) telling a story.	Listen to radio, announcements, telephone, teacher. make notes.	Spelling - follow graded units & exercises		
Study Skills in Eng (with tape)	c) taking part in a discussion		Letter Writing - follow units where appropriate CLXXIV		

CLXXV

NAME Winston Chutkan
COURSE Secretarial

DAY AND TIME WED 9 - 10am

Common sheet

SKILL	ORILLIANT	OK.	NOT SO GOOD
Spelling Grammar Concentration (for Reading) Secretarial			✓ ✓ ✓

NAME C: Chapman

COURSE G Catering

DAY AND TIME monday 1-15-2-15

SKILL	BRILLIANT	OK.	NOT SO GOOD
Spelling			✓
Exam technique		✓	
taking notes		✓	✓
Handwriting		✓	
Reading			✓
maths .		✓	
Punctuations			✓

WEEKLY RECORD AND PLANNING CHART.

Put sheet

A. Dyer

NAME: Winston Clayton COURSE: Secretarial TUTOR: Mrs. B. Angus TIME: WED 9-10am

DATE	WORK DONE	COMMENTS	FURTHER WORK
12/9	<p>Discuss work to cover - spelling, grammar, study skills. Check through work for pattern of errors. Discuss methods of spelling choose words for "hook check".</p> <p><u>Isosyllabic/nonsyllabic/statistical</u></p>	<p>Accent differs in language \Rightarrow spelling problems. Uses proof reading, dictionary, phones + meanings of words. Grammatical structures. Study skills - concentration</p> <p>For reading [several] seems ok. New words: distribution, horticulture, catty, tertiary</p> <p>ok on many words, prob with successful + necessary.</p>	<p>work on "c" and "s" homophones, middle of words, vowel sounds.</p> <p>Interested eventually in English qualification Findings (Americanised) refer / ar etc</p> <p>Net of what meant Winston hadn't practised words as much as poss</p> <p>\Rightarrow further work on "hook, deck" sheet</p> <p>next week - hard 'c' (ck) and slc in verbs / nouns</p>
11/10	<p>Test "hook, deck" words - some ok transfer on to new sheet</p> <p>hook at the who for hard "c" - k sound and examples to get who.</p> <p>deck "hook, deck" words</p> <p>- all ok apart from statistical. choose 2 more words.</p> <p>revising "c" - hard and soft.</p>	<p>Winston has a lot of homework which means less time to practise spelling</p> <p>Found examples from dictionary. Interested in 10' level English (Honesty)</p> <p>Deborah has to do much work to do English 10' this year.</p> <p>Winston happy with diff. "c" words</p> <p>CLXXV 11</p>	<p>'k' at the beginning of words, slc in verbs / nouns + ck.</p>
15/10	<p>Test "hook, deck" words - some ok transfer on to new sheet</p> <p>hook at the who for hard "c" - k sound and examples to get who.</p> <p>deck "hook, deck" words</p> <p>- all ok apart from statistical. choose 2 more words.</p> <p>revising "c" - hard and soft.</p>	<p>Winston has a lot of homework which means less time to practise spelling</p> <p>Found examples from dictionary. Interested in 10' level English (Honesty)</p> <p>Deborah has to do much work to do English 10' this year.</p> <p>Winston happy with diff. "c" words</p> <p>CLXXV 11</p>	<p>Made up own who</p> <p>Found examples from "A to Z" + dictionary</p> <p>revising "c" - hard and soft.</p> <p>work on ck</p>

WEEKLY RECORD AND PLANNING CHART

NAME Mr Martin COURSE 1st EP TUTOR Mr Webb

DATE	WORK DONE	COMMENTS	FURTHER WORK
1/2	Discussed type of work (maths) Martin would like to cover.	Martin will bring in maths file from school ✓	look at maths assessment cards + profile sheet.
16/2	Martin away	- checked with Ian Webb ✓	
15/3	Martin looked through maths assessment sheets and sorted into "can do", "would like to do" - discussed work to cover. started work on decimals sheets.	used maths assessment cards and maths profile sheet - straightforward division OK, long division reqd.	Percentages, <u>division</u> , fractions volume, metric measures, decimals Martin took away worksheet on long division
12/3	checked long division - went through process again. Fractions: equivalent fractions and cancelling fractions	All correct bar two. Martin re-did these worksheets from "Maths for life" and "Make it count"	work on at 4 rules in fractions - Martin took worksheet away on cancelling fractions
9/3	started on addition + subtraction of fractions. Jenny Ware interview Michael	Michael took away worksheet + e - fractions	
6/3	Michael had worked on cancelling fractions - completed worksheet in class. showed	Some problems with cancelling - first 8 correct - Michael work on problems again - cancelling, (LXXVII)	Work for holidays: fractions: complete addition / subtraction of fractions

RECORD SHEETNAME OF STUDENT fayeDATE 27:11:86

WHAT WORK HAVE YOU DONE SINCE YOU LAST FILLED IN A RECORD SHEET?

spelling
essay writing

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE WAY YOUR WORK IS GOING?

K I enjoy working with sue and writing
descriptive essays

WHAT CAN YOU DO NOW THAT YOU COULDN'T BEFORE?

spell easier which is very sufficient

WHAT DO YOU STILL HAVE PROBLEMS WITH?

spelling and doubling words

WHAT DO YOU WANT TO WORK ON NEXT?

letters etc

RECORD SHEET

NAME OF STUDENT *Winston Chittler*

DATE *19/11/86*

WHAT WORK HAVE YOU DONE SINCE YOU LAST FILLED IN A RECORD SHEET?

FIRST RECORD SHEET

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE WAY YOUR WORK IS GOING?

Very Good.

WHAT CAN YOU DO NOW THAT YOU COULDN'T BEFORE?

Spell and speak better

WHAT DO YOU STILL HAVE PROBLEMS WITH?

WHAT DO YOU WANT TO WORK ON NEXT?

My English.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ALBSU	The Adult Basic Skills Unit
ATESOL	The Association for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.
CPVE	The Certificate in Pre-Vocational Education
CUP	Cambridge University Press
DES	Department of Education and Science
ESL	English as a Second Language
EWLP	The Experimental World Literacy Programme (This was initiated by UNESCO 1976 to achieve functional literacy in around 20 countries in five years.)
FE	Further Education
HE	Higher Education
HMSO	Her Majesty's Stationery Office
ILEA	The Inner London Education Authority
LAMP	The Low Attainers in Mathematics Project
LEA	Local Education Authority
NATFHE	The National Association of Further and Higher Education
NFER	The National Federation for Educational Research
OECD	The Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development
OUP	Open University Press
SL	Senior Lecturer
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
TEC	Training and Education Council
TES	The Times Educational Supplement
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
UNESCO	The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
WLP	The World Literacy Project

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Million New Students. THE CHALLENGE FOR FE. NATFHE, London, April 1990.

A New Training Initiative, Government White Paper, London, HMSO 1981.

After the Act, Developing Basic Skills Work in the 1990s, ALBSU, London, 1990.

Austin-Ward, B., Portsmouth Polytechnic, *A study of the Competence in Written English of 16 year old students in Further Education*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1980.

Barnes, D., "Talking to Learn", in *Language, the Learner and the School*, Barnes, D., Britten J., Rosen, D., and the LATE, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969.

"Basic Education in Further Education Craft Courses", Thames College of Technology.
"Special Development Projects Report", ALBSU, London, November 1984.

Basic Skill and Unemployed Adults: a Report on ALBSU/MSU Demonstration Projects, ALBSU and MSU, London, March 1987.

Bayliss, S. "Dissent grows as testing time approaches", *TES* no .3733, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 15/1/88.

Bowe, R., McBride R., and Wallace G., "Uncovering the ERA of Tension", *TES* no. 3844, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 2/3/90.

Brindley, G. (1984) *Needs Analysis And Objective setting in the Adult Migrant Education Programme*. Sydney: NSW Adult Migrant Education Service, cited in Nunan 1988.

Bullock, A., *A Language for Life*, HMSO London 1975.

Carroll, S., and McQuade, P., *The Voc. Prep. Manual*, The Framework Press, Lancaster, 1984.

"Cash runs out in shire and city", *TES* no. 3890, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 18/1/91.

Charmely A.H. and Jones H.A., *The Concept of Success in Adult Literacy*. ALBSU, London, 1979.

Davies, J., "Erratic market" (sic) *TES* no. 3798, Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 14/4/89.

Dean, C., "CTC Selectors face an 'impossible task'", *TES* no. 3873, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 21/9/90.

DES., *Education and Training for Young People*, HMSO, London, April 1985.

DES., *Education and Training for the 21st Century*, HMSO, London May 1991.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Destined to have a very lean and hungry look", *TES* no. 3843, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23/2/90.

Edwards and Giles, "Applications of the Social Psychology of Language, Sociolinguistics and Education" in *Applied Sociolinguistics* Ed. Trudgill, P., Academic Press, London, 1984.

"Elementary, my dear Holmes", *TES* no. 3727, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 5/12/87.

Ellwood, M., "Many hands can make heavy work", *TES* no. 3843, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23/2/90.

"Europe agrees to improve the route to work", *TES* no. 3734, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 22/1/88.

Fisher, A., "More than chit chat and a bun", *TES* no 3777, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 18/11/88.

"Good work, bad behaviour", Virginia Makins, *TES* no. 3643, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 25/4/86.

Gorman, T.P., White, J., Orchard, L., Tae, A., Sexton, B., *Language Performance in Schools Secondary Survey Report No. 2*, APU, HMSO, London, 1983.

Hackett, G., "CTC 'for every local authority'", *TES* no. 3881, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16/11/90.

Haralambos, M., *Sociology, Themes and Perspectives*, University Tutorial Press, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, 1981 (6th Edition).

"Harrow and Barnet Top the GCE Table", *TES* no. 3585, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 1/3/85.

HMI, *Aspects of Further Education*, HMSO, London, May 1989.

"HMIs Praise Dutch Basics", *TES* no. 3728, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 11/12/87.

Hodge, B., (ed) *Communication and the Teacher*, Longman, London, 1981.

Hofkins, D., "Cut to the heart by loss of morale and manpower", *TES* no. 3852, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 27/4/90.

Hofkins, D., "SATs to emphasise literacy and numeracy", *TES* no. 3874, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 28/9/90.

Identification and Assessment of Basic Skill Needs: Psychological Survey Report No. 257/S, MSC, 1987. (Unpublished, for limited circulation only.)

Improving Teaching-Quality: A Learner-Led Approach, FEU Bulletin, London, August 1987.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ingram, D., "Methodology" Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Canberra, 1981, quoted in D. Nunan, *The Learner Centred Curriculum*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.

Jackson, M., "Inflation Squeezes TVEI funding", *TES* no. 3881, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16/11/90.

Jackson, M., "CBI's credit vouchers idea to get a test drive", *TES* no. 3848, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 30/3/90.

Jamieson, I., and Watts, T., "Squeezing out Enterprise", *TES* no. 3729, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 18/12/87.

Krashen, S., "Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition", Pergamon, Oxford, 1982, cited in Nunan 1988.

"Lambeth braced for brutal cut", *TES* no. 3895, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 22/2/91.

"Language and Literacy in a Clothing Skills Training Workshop", Tower Hamlets Training Forum, *Special Development Projects Report*, ALBSU, London, November 1984.

Lankshear, C., with Lawlor, M., *Literacy Schooling and Revolution*, The Falmer Press, East Sussex, 1987.

"Less able most likely to be the have-nots", *TES* no. 3841, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 9/2/90.

Limage, L. J., "Adult Literacy Policy and Provision in an age of Austerity", *Education*, Vol 32, No 4, 1986.

Lodge, B., "Chirpy despite heads' mutiny", *TES* no. 3852, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 27/4/90.

Long, M. H., and Porter, P., "Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition", *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 2, 1985, cited in Nunan 1988.

Long, M., "Input, Interaction and Second Language Acquisition", in Winitz, H., (ed), New York Academy of Sciences, New York, 1981, and Nicholas, H., *Interactive Strategies*, "input" and "output" ATESOL, 4th Summer School Proceedings: Volume 1, ATESOL, Sidney, 1985, cited in Nunan 1988.

Mahoney, M., *Student Achievement in Relation to Readability of Technical Examinations*, unpublished MSc, University of Surrey, 1977.

Mobley, M., *Making Ourselves Clearer; readability in the GCSE*, SEC Working Paper 5, 1987.

"More staff exit early", *TES* no. 3881, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16/11/1980.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Nash, I., "LAMP shows up training needs", *TES* no. 3733, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 2/1/88.
- "New drive to improve literacy rate", *TES* no. 3893, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 8/2/91.
- Nunan, D., *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*, CUP, Cambridge, 1988.
- Nunan, D., *Language-Teacher Course Design: Trends and Issues*, National Curriculum Resource Centre, Adelaide, 1985, quoted in Nunan, 1988.
- O'Shea, L., "Numbers of graduate entrants plummet again", *TES* no. 3871, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 7/9/90.
- "Paying Attention", *TES* no. 3824, The Times Newspapers Ltd., London, 13/10/89.
- Peters, T., and Austin, N., *A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference*, Fontana/Collins, Glasgow, 1990.
- "Pupils confound staff test forecasts", *TES* no. 3881, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 16/11/90.
- Rae, P., (1985) "Language testing and the communicative language teaching curriculum", cited in Lee, Y. P., Fok, C. Y. Y., Lord, R. and Low, G. (eds), "New Directions in Language Testing", Pergamon, Oxford, cited in Nunan, D., 1988.
- "Report on NAHT Conference", *TES* no. 3847, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23/3/90.
- Riseman, A., "Adult Illiterate Students", 1975, in Jones, H. A. (ed), *Studies in Adult Education*, 7 (2), pp 142 - 149, quoted in Charnley and Jones 1979.
- "Roars of dismay echo around the economic jungle", SHA Conference Report, *TES* no. 3850, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 13/4/90.
- Rogers, R., "Jobs threatened as Home Office alters the rules", *TES* no. 3873, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 21/9/90.
- "Shake-up for post-16 education", *The Independent*, 21/3/91.
- Scholtes, P., and Hacquebord, H., *Joiner: A Practical Approach to Quality*, Joiner Associates Inc. Madison, WI USA, 1987.
- Simon, B., *Bending the Rules: the Baker 'Reform' of Education*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1988.
- Simonite, V., *Literacy Numeracy and Adults Evidence from the Child Development Study*, ALBSU, London, 1983.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Spencer, D., "Half the UK's teenagers shun training", *TES* no. 3848, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 30/3/90.

"Teenagers prepared to stay on for £3,000", *TES* no 3855, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 18/5/90.

Transition and Access: A Review of Further and Higher Education in London ILEA Appendix II, FEU, London, 1981.

Vora, K., "Shame of Illiterate Millions", *The European* no. 0094, The European Ltd., London, February 27th - March 24th 1992.

Williams, C., "Special needs face LMS crisis says union", *TES* no. 3855, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 18/5/90.

"Worried soothsayers see a future that does not work", *TES* no. 3847, The Times Supplements Ltd., London, 23/3/90.

Wragg, E., *Classroom Interaction*, The Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1979.