UNIVERSITY OF SURREY

Management of post-16 institutions: perceptions based on the implementation of TVEI (extension)

JOHN McCANN, M.Sc, MIBiol, PhD

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy, January 1993.
ABSTRACT

The management of post-16 institutions was studied in relation to the perceptions of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers. The institutions included 11-18 Schools, Sixth Form Colleges, Tertiary Colleges and Technical Colleges. A case study approach was adopted and involved twelve institutions in Hampshire and four institutions elsewhere (described as 'distant' case studies).

The initial focus of the research programme stemmed from an investigation of TVEI-implementation. The active phase of the research related to six 'research questions' and utilised four different research tools; a semi-structured interview, the construction of a concept map, the completion of a repertory grid and an 'information model' grid. The general approach of the research related to the field of personal construct psychology (PCP).

The initial focus of TVEI-implementation was itself a research tool, used to gain access to the personal constructs of the participants. The analysis of the data was systematic and was pursued through four 'levels'.

The degree of integration of each TVEI coordinator within the management structure was found to be affected by the type of institution in which they were located and by other responsibilities (with a higher profile). There was a link between the type/size of the institution and the type of management model identified. Types of model were classified according to 'shape', 'key groups' and 'superior positions'.

The various groups within each of the four types of institution did relate to each other to varying degrees. Such relationships were not found to be simple and often stemmed from many personal constructs. Furthermore, the routes of communication were complex and varied greatly.

The perceptions or personal constructs of the TVEI coordinators indicated a different 'prejudice' to that of the Senior Managers. 'Construct routes' were devised to demonstrate such prejudice.

Key factors such as the location of the Senior Management Team (SMT), line-management routes, the profile of individuals and the constraints of 'incorporation' (due to take effect in April 1993) were considered in relation to the operation of a management model. The management model proposed was based on the perceptions of the participants and was viewed as an operational model rather than an organisational structure.

The value of the research programme was found to be in its application to the area of staff development. Various staff development 'exercises' were proposed, based on the use of concept maps, repertory grids and information models.
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A. FOCUS AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY
A. FOCUS AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY.

1. Introduction

The extension of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) into the post-16 sector of education has taken place at various times according to the County or Local Education Authority (LEA) involved. A five year trial period, the 'pilot scheme', was devised by the then Manpower Services Commission (MSC) and involved fourteen LEA schemes from 1982 (Green, 1987). The pilot, and later the extension, was based on the 14-18 age group, thereby including post-16 institutions by necessity.

The LEA's currently differ in respect of the type of post-16 institutions in operation. Some have retained schools with sixth forms to complement the provision available in Technical Colleges (Colleges of Further Education), whereas others have developed Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges (in addition to the established Technical Colleges). The overall 'picture' is somewhat confused but is to be changed significantly in April 1993 through the legislation for 'incorporation' (DES, 1991).

Hampshire LEA has demonstrated a major shift away from the education of 16-19 year olds in schools to that of Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges. The introduction of the first Tertiary College in Exeter in 1970 was rapidly followed by the formation of many similar institutions in Hampshire during the early and mid-1970's (Macfarlane, 1980). The county therefore has a commitment to post-16 education in a variety of institutions, including some existing school sixth forms and long-established Technical Colleges.

2. The 'TVEI organisation'

The extension of TVEI was introduced across the country during the mid- to late-1980's. Each county adopted a phased entry so that various geographically-based consortia (operating as a number of schools working collectively with one or more post-16 institutions) joined the initiative over a period of time. Most post-16 institutions became members of a single consortium but large establishments, notably the Technical Colleges, joined more than one consortium.

At the county level, the management of TVEI became the responsibility of individual advisers operating within specific fields eg. a post-16 adviser for TVEI. Some counties, such as Hampshire, established a central management team or directorate with fixed-term appointments for the personnel involved. The general organisational approach was to devolve the local
management of TVEI to consortium or divisional 'managers', again often with fixed-term appointments. Each manager became responsible for the operation of an individual consortium or group of consortia (division).

3. TVEI management: the institutional level.

The introduction and management of a previously-established initiative, the Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education (CPVE), in 1979 became the responsibility of individual members of staff identified as CPVE coordinators. Such coordinators were appointed in schools and, to some extent, in the various post-16 institutions throughout the country. The evaluation of this initiative has been frequent and has led to similar findings (Waddington, 1985; Hodkinson, 1991). There was a clear indication that this particular initiative had become 'marginalised' within the curriculum, with the resulting formation of CPVE cohorts in schools and colleges.

The pilot schemes for TVEI frequently included separate cohorts of TVEI-students (Sumner, 1988). This would seem to be antagonistic to the objectives of the initiative i.e. the development of both implicit and explicit aspects of technology and vocationalism across the broad curriculum (Hampshire TVEI, 1988a). It was therefore a general aim of TVEI extension to introduce the initiative to the full age range of 14-18 year olds irrespective of institution (within the maintained sector) and of the 'ability' of the students involved.

A whole-college or holistic approach to the implementation of TVEI at the post-16 level was therefore required. Each LEA submission to the Training Agency had an essential reference to the way in which TVEI was to be introduced across the curriculum (Hampshire Education Committee, 1987) but also provided the management structure within the LEA designed to support the initiative. A generic job description for the TVEI coordinator was eventually to develop within each county (Appendix 1) within the school/college management structure and the routes of communication open to the coordinator were not necessarily described.

The type and operation of a particular management structure, already in place at the time of introducing TVEI at the post-16 level, was likely to affect the function and responsibility of each TVEI coordinator. The NFER (National Foundation for Educational Research) carried out an evaluation of schools (Stoney, 1986) and showed that 'central staff' i.e. TVEI coordinators and liaison staff, not only had to carve out a new role for themselves but had to gain acceptability with the
schools. Furthermore, TVEI coordinators were appointed at very different levels within their respective schools or colleges. College coordinators were often found to be at a more 'lowly' status (Lecturer I and II) than their school equivalents, who were often on Scale D, Senior Teacher or even Deputy Head scales.

The position of a TVEI coordinator within the hierarchy of a management structure (irrespective of the type of structure in operation) would be likely to affect the way in which the initiative was to be implemented. Similar observations have been noted for the operation of TRIST (TVEI-Related InService Training) coordinators within institutions (Evans, 1990; p110).

Some structures would, presumably, automatically enable instant 'access' for the TVEI coordinator to the Headteacher, Principal and/or the Senior Management Team. The marginality of TVEI, referred to earlier for CPVE, would be avoided or exaggerated according to such organisational features.

The task of the TVEI coordinator was therefore expected to be affected by personal status, the school/college structure and the routes of communication. The perceptions of the coordinator and others within the management structure would also be of paramount importance.

4. Initial focus of the current study

The initial focus of the current study was to investigate the way in which the 'environment' of the post-16 institution would affect the implementation of TVEI within an established management structure. The main objectives were therefore to understand:

(1) the 'environment' and management structures of four different types of post-16 institutions (11-18 Schools, Sixth Form Colleges, Tertiary Colleges and Technical Colleges)

(2) the perceptions of the TVEI coordinators and nominated 'Senior Managers' within such institutions in relation to the various components or elements of the management structures

(3) the perceived 'routes of communication' open to the TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager within each particular management structure.

The three objectives listed above became the foci of the study.
At the time of initiating the active phase of the research programme the researcher was appointed as a TVEI coordinator within a post-16 institution in Hampshire and had established many TVEI-related contacts across the county. The full range of post-16 institutions available within Hampshire and the availability of an already-established network therefore led to the choice of case studies within Hampshire (but with the introduction of 'distant' or out-of-county case studies as a point of comparison).

The factors affecting the 'environment' within each institution studied were considered to be:

(i) the 'type' of institution eg. Sixth Form College, with its respective history and philosophy

(ii) the particular curriculum available eg. predominantly academic or vocational, with the associated management structures required to maintain the curriculum (often dictated by validating bodies).

A theoretical background to the study was therefore developed, firstly, to establish an understanding of institution 'environment'. The history of post-16 institutions was examined in the following chapter in the context of institutional and curriculum change. Secondly, the early introduction of TVEI was also studied to determine the developmental work that had occurred prior to TVEI extension into the post-16 phase. Finally, a theoretical view of 'management' was investigated to provide a baseline for the current study, in the light of TVEI-implementation.
B. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
B. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

PURPOSE:

The title of the study encompasses aspects of post-16 education, TVEI (extension) and educational management. The purpose of this chapter is to use previous literature/research findings to provide a background to the study, in the context of these areas. During the phase of analysing and documenting the results of the current study the process of 'incorporation' (DES, 1991) was introduced for post-16 Colleges (with the exclusion of 11-18 Schools). A brief review of this process has therefore been included within this chapter since it is anticipated that the process will have a profound effect on the application of the research findings.

The theoretical background is presented within the following sections:

1. History of post-16 education
   1.1 Institutional development
   1.2 Curriculum development
   1.3 'Incorporation' of colleges

2. Introduction and extension of TVEI
   2.1 Historical context
   2.2 Management issues

3. Perceptions of management
   3.1 What is management?
   3.2 Management systems
   3.3 Management and TVEI
   3.4 The current research
1. HISTORY OF POST-16 EDUCATION

Introduction:

Post-16 education has evolved along with pre-16 education since the late 19th Century. Much has been written on educational history and it was realised that the 'complete analysis' of this evolution would not necessarily be relevant when considering the management of an educational initiative such as TVEI. Some authors have written texts dedicated to educational history (Morrish, 1970; Wardle, 1974). Only those events considered to be significant to the current study will therefore be noted.

In terms of the history of post-16 education, what are these 'events'? Slater (1985, p 177) had observed that throughout the detailed historical analyses of education for 16-19 year olds three issues have generally been identified ie. institutional, governmental and curricular issues. The issue of 'governmental influence' on this sector of education has been seen to be both explicit and implicit in terms of institutional and curricular development. The most recent trends shown by initiatives such as TVEI and the process of 'incorporation' have clearly shown a strong and explicit intervention by the government (Sockett, 1987 p33; DES, 1991).

Although the influence of the government on the history of post-16 education is of interest and, as will be seen, cannot be avoided, the issues of institutional development, curricular development and 'incorporation' are to be described within this section.

1.1 Institutional development

The types of post-16 institutions currently established within the maintained sector of the educational system vary considerably in relation to their curriculum and students, and therefore their 'environment'. This situation is likely to change significantly as a result of 'incorporation' (DES, 1991).

The institution-types have evolved along different lines and have been subject to different 'selective pressures' from within and outside. A brief review of the history of this evolution is considered to be relevant in the context of the current study since one of the foci of the study is based on the 'environment' of each institution-type.

The turn of the 20th Century marked the time when the country had a recognizable national education system. The Board of Education Act (1899) and Balfour's Act (1902) led to a significant increase in government participation.
in educational administration and policy-making (Wardle, 1974; p 56). It is of interest that it was the area of technical education that heralded the way for this participation.

Technical education had already attracted public attention in the second half of the 19th Century, particularly after 1870 (Wardle, 1974; p 58). It was apparently a result of the needs of the labour market that led to such early 'selective pressures' for technical education. One indication of this pressure was the introduction of the Technical Instruction Act (1889) which empowered local authorities to establish and maintain the first publicly-provided schools or colleges (Mann, 1979; p 211).

It is appreciated that the current Technical Colleges are not direct-descendants of these 19th Century schools/colleges and yet it could be assumed that this development must have had some effect on the 'environment' of the current colleges. Indeed, some authors have considered that this early period of educational evolution is fundamental to the present system. In a relatively recent review of the educational system of England and Wales, Dunford and Sharp (1990) observed that;

'although our system has some features of recent origin, certain of its most basic facets have survived directly and visibly from the 19th Century.'

(p 1).

The notion of post-16 education is not a new phenomenon. Morrish (1970, p 54) summarised the Hadow report of 1926 and concluded that, with the exception of the Higher Education Sector, two main stages of education had been identified; 'primary' and 'post primary'. There was a clear indication from the report that secondary education was for all and that, for the majority, this education would go on until 14+ or 15+. It was also proposed that some would continue to study within this secondary sector until they were 18 or 19 years old.

The notion of post-16 education (excluding Higher Education) has therefore been evident since the 1920's but it was not until the 1940's that secondary education was fully valued. The Norwood Report (1943) emphasised the post-16 element of this educational provision and the 'secondary school' was seen as a route into industry and commerce. Some of these early secondary schools also
provided facilities for more 'advanced work' to children from 16-18 years of age (Morrish, 1970; p 58).

Although this early history led to an apparent understanding that post-16 education was to be valued, the period of compulsory education was not raised to 15 until the recommendations of the 1944 Education Act were established in April 1947.

In 1944 the concept of elementary education was dropped and Local Education Authorities (LEA's) were required to organise their provisions into three successive stages - primary, secondary and further. Post-16 education was to follow two different routes from this point; secondary and further education. The implications of this dichotomy will be considered later (p 22) in the context of the academic/vocational divide.

The relevance of institutional development will be pursued further under the headings of Secondary Schools (since 11-18 Schools and, their 'descendants', the Sixth Form Colleges form part of the current study), Sixth Form Colleges, Tertiary Colleges and Technical Colleges.

1.1.1 Secondary Schools

It has been observed that the biggest changes in education since the war have taken place in the secondary schools (Vaizey, 1962; p 43). This view is presumably to be shifted to the post-16 colleges as the requirements of 'incorporation' become more evident (Touche-Ross, 1992).

The 'tripartist' division of secondary education (following the 1944 Act) including modern, technical and grammar schools was subject to political and social pressures. During the period 1954-62 the number of children who left school before taking 'O' level GCE's (General Certificates of Education) became 'negligible' (Vaizey, 1962; p 43) and the rate of growth of school sixth forms was about 5 percent a year. Post-16 education was clearly becoming established within the secondary school system. However, only the technical and grammar schools developed a post-16 provision at this time (Slater, 1985; p 178).

Many children were subject to a 13+ examination in order to enable them to benefit from grammar school opportunities and to transfer from a secondary modern school. Other children transferred across to the grammar school to join the sixth form at the age of 16. It should be noted that some of the 'products' of this post-16 provision are currently the parents and (for some) the teachers of post-16 students. The attitudes of such individuals will likely to have been affected, to some
degree, by this obvious secondary modern/grammar school divide.

Eventually, as a result of pleas by bodies such as the Central Advisory Council, the school-leaving age was raised to 16 with the opportunity for further work in the 'final year' to be pursued in various centres including the Technical Colleges (Morrish, 1970; p 64). The DES report of 1968 observed that by the end of 1968 the great majority of LEA's had completed the preparation of their schemes for comprehensive education. It was only after further delay that the school-leaving age was raised to 16 in 1972 (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 19).

It can be concluded that it was during the 1970's that the secondary school system was marked by the raising of the school-leaving age to 16 and by the introduction of a comprehensive rather than a tripartist system. This left the sector of post-16 education as 'post-compulsory' which is still the current situation; even with the significant changes to the curriculum and institutional organisation planned for 'incorporation' in April 1993.

The apparent 'status quo' for the post-16 sector was, however, not reflected within the schools. The interpretation of 'opportunities for all' in educational terms was seen to vary greatly (during the 1980's) according to political forces within the LEA's. The initiative, TVEI, was even considered to be one of the forces responsible for re-opening the debate about the nature and desirability of comprehensive education (Gordon, 1991; p 197).

What is the present link between post-16 education and the secondary school system? This sector of education is available in comprehensive (or sometimes grammar) schools in the provision of individual sixth forms, shared or federal sixth forms and sixth form centres. The Sixth Form College is, until April 1993, also under secondary school regulations and is the subject of the following discussion.

1.1.2 Sixth Form Colleges

The move towards post-16 education was not restricted to the introduction of sixth forms in secondary schools. Another type of post-16 institution, other than an FE institution, was recommended by Crowther (1959) and endorsed by a Ministry of Education circular (10/65). According to Slater (1985; p180), the work of Crowther (1959) led to the introduction of the term 'junior college' and that such colleges were later known as Sixth Form Colleges.

The first Sixth Form 'Centre' was opened at Mexborough in Yorkshire in 1964 (Turner, 1979; p 36) but the first
independent, autonomous Sixth Form College was formed in Luton in 1966. Several were opened in the following year in Hampshire. It could be concluded that Hampshire LEA has been committed to an 'institutional break' at 16 (with the formation of both Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges) since the mid-1960's. This conclusion is used later as a part of the rationale followed in the selection of Hampshire as one of the main sources of case studies for the current research.

The growth of this type of post-16 institution was rapid. By 1987 there were 106 Sixth Form colleges in 44 different LEA's, coexisting alongside FE colleges (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 97). Which LEA's became involved in this trend and why?

Political and governmental issues were involved in the evolution of such colleges in some cases. Slater (1985, p 180) recognised a common move toward Sixth Form (and Tertiary) Colleges in both Conservative- and Labour-controlled LEA's, but for different reasons. It was observed that;

'sixth form colleges, if selective, did have their attractions for some Conservative-controlled LEA's who saw them as possible 'centres of excellence' to replace grammar school sixth forms....(whereas for Labour-controlled LEA's) a break at 16 with all potential students in one college seemed the very obverse of a dozen years previously, sweeping away the divide at 16 between the 'elitist' sixth forms and FE colleges for the rest.'

(p 181).

Has this difference in perception continued? It is interesting to note that the (Conservative) White Paper describing the proposals for the process of incorporation still referred to the retention of Sixth Form Colleges as 'centres of excellence' (DES, 1991). Furthermore, such colleges were considered to be given 'freedom' to develop within the new structure due to their 'striking success over the last 20 years' (Kelly, 1991; p 1). The implication of these attitudes in the context of Sixth Form College management will be discussed later in relation to the results of the current study (p 184).

The history of an individual Sixth Form College, whether as a new institution or as (more commonly) a converted school must have had some effect on the environment and therefore the management of the college. Teachers within such institutions may well have found themselves subject
to a very different environment in relation to their previous 'school experience'. It is possible that some teachers are likely to have held on to their history/attitudes and taken them with them into the new management structure (an aspect discussed later, p 184).

The recent period of decline in the numbers of students in the 16-19 age range, corresponding to the drop in birth rate during the mid-1970's placed schools with sixth forms under further selective pressure than that described by Slater (1985; p 177) as 'the movement in favour of an institutional break'. Furthermore, the local management of schools (LMS), introduced within the Education Reform Act of 1988, created a financial environment in which some schools were forced to merge sixth forms or to close sixth forms in favour of local Sixth Form or Tertiary Colleges.

Apart from the economic and demographic pressure described above, there was perhaps a change in opinion with regard to post-16 education. Many believed that a separate institution better provided for the need of the 16-19 age group (Thomas, 1985, p 136). Others considered that the 'break' at 16 was neither good nor bad but should be appropriate in the context of 'coherent progression' (Evans & Watts, 1984; p 6).

Sixth Form Colleges have therefore grown significantly in number and (until the recent demographic decline) in size within the educational system. They are viewed by some as 'elitist' centres of excellence, by others as an extension of secondary school's regulations and environment and by many as an essential 'institution break' at 16. Irrespective of such perceptions, they are likely to be managed in a different manner to secondary school sixth forms; an issue to be investigated within the current study.

1.1.3 Tertiary Colleges

Tertiary Colleges are comprehensive post-16 institutions within the FE system and therefore not controlled directly by secondary school's regulations. In relation to the post-16 provision within secondary schools and Technical Colleges, Tertiary Colleges are relatively new to the education system. The first of these colleges was opened in Exeter in 1970; by 1977 there were 12 and by 1980 there were 15 in operation (Macfarlane, 1980; table 4).

The first of such colleges were therefore established only four years after the first Sixth Form College. It is significant that at present there are 117 Sixth Form
Colleges and only 54 Tertiary Colleges within the educational system (Evans, 1990).

There is clearly an 'overlap' between the post-16 provision of Tertiary Colleges and Technical Colleges since both types of institution operate within the FE system, have both full- and part-time courses and the curriculum offered is both vocational and academic.

Tertiary Colleges are often the sole-providers for post-16 education in their catchment areas (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 108) and have been seen as an end to the potentially wasteful competition that can exist between schools and FE. However, not all LEA's support the operation of Tertiary Colleges. Those who oppose the 'organisational structure' of such colleges claim that their size makes them impersonal i.e. with a lack of the pastoral care found within the schools (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 109). The issue of pastoral care, as viewed in the context of management, is encountered within the current study (p 119).

Tertiary Colleges may therefore be seen as the 'sandwich' between the 'elitist' academic centres of excellence of the Sixth Form Colleges (Slater, 1985; p 180) and the view of Technical Colleges as serving the needs of industry, commerce and the professions (Bristow, 1970; p 328).

Not all Tertiary Colleges have been opened as a newly-established institution, many having been formed from Sixth Form Colleges and others from the merging of Sixth Form and Technical Colleges. The individual 'evolution' of a Tertiary College may therefore often be seen to culminate in an institution managed under systems similar to those found in both Sixth Form Colleges (i.e. Secondary School's regulations) and Technical Colleges (i.e. FE regulations). This observation will be continued when analysing the results obtained in the current study (p 184).

1.1.4 Technical Colleges (Colleges of Further Education)

During the 30 year period (approximately) following the 1944 Act significant changes were taking place in the FE system. However, Mann (1979; p 211) noted that the basis of the FE system in 1978 was still the 1944 Education Act. What was so special about the 1944 Act?

The 1944 Act provided for the creation of county colleges which were to supply compulsory 'part-time' education for the 15-18 age range. Although the Act had linked only part-time education to the FE system, this system was notionally ahead of the secondary schools (with the
exception of the grammar schools) in terms of post-16 education.

As a consequence of the County Colleges Order of 1947 it became the responsibility of each LEA to form and maintain county (technical) colleges (Slater (1985; p 178). Unfortunately, due to a scarcity of resources an implementation date was not fixed.

During the period 1950-70 the expansion of formal vocational training became a prominent feature of the FE system and the numbers of Technical Colleges increased accordingly (Wardle, 1974; p 57). The 'nature' of the Technical College was also changing during this 20 year period to form four main types; Local, Area, Regional and Colleges of Advanced Technology (CAT's). This organisational change formed the basis of the current system of FE with the exception of the CAT's which were to be designated as Technological Universities due to the Robbins Report of 1963 (Morrish, 1970; p 108).

The FE system has continued to be subject to pressures from outside sources. Fowler (1973) remarked that;

'...no area of British education has expanded so explosively since the war as full-time FE..' (p 181).

The nature of this expansion would not seem to be a simple correlation between increased provision needed (due to industrial/commercial growth) and the increased numbers of students requiring full-time courses. In an attempt to summarise the changes in the FE system, Twyman (1985; p 325) concluded that the FE provision in Britain had been characterised by a high degree of turbulence, complexity and change. The effect of this 'complexity', in particular, will be the subject of further discussion based on the results of the current study.
1.1.5 Summary: The organisation of post-16 education prior to the changes of 'incorporation' (April 1993)
1.2 Curriculum development

The management of any recent educational initiative must be affected by the plethora of other initiatives within post-16 education during the past twenty years. Such initiatives frequently demand a significant commitment of resources from the post-16 institution and the management structure may be, by necessity, adjusted to implement the 'new' approach or curriculum.

The history of both pre- and post-16 curriculum development should be considered when reviewing the current situation. The curriculum-experience of students prior to entering the post-16 phase is of direct relevance to the success and suitability of the post-16 curriculum. The introduction of a management system in the post-16 institution capable of supporting the transition of students at 16 years of age should logically reflect the 'evolution' of curriculum over a period of many years.

1.2.1 Non-vocational (academic) curriculum

During the 1970's both colleges and schools were affected by the emphasis on vocationalism (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 103). Prior to this move towards the vocational curriculum and towards criteria-referencing of the National Curriculum in the 1980's, secondary schools were faced with spasmodic periods of change. Before the 1988 Education Act it was observed that the school's tasks were much less diverse than those of further education (Mann, 1979; p 210).

One of the most significant changes in the non-vocational curriculum took place in the early 20th Century with the formation of the Secondary Schools Examination Council (SSEC) in 1917 (Ministry of Education circular 996). Between the wars (1918-38) the SSEC investigated the previously-established School Certificate and Higher School Certificate. The two examinations were monitored simultaneously and the recommendations led to the publication of the Norwood Report (1943). This report proposed a radical shake-up of the School Certificate examination system.

The SSEC had approved the Norwood (1943) report by 1947 and the new GCE was established with ordinary [O], advanced [A] and scholarship [S] levels (Gordon, 1991; p 300). The introduction of this new examination occurred during the establishment of the 'tripartist' school system under the auspices of the 1944 Education Act, as discussed earlier (p 9). The GCE became a prominent part of the curriculum in all three types of secondary school, presumably with varying degrees of success. The post-16 curriculum leading towards the advanced (A) level GCE was, however, restricted primarily to the grammar schools.
The non-vocational curriculum remained virtually unchanged until the 1960's. It is significant that the 'selective pressures' experienced by this curriculum paralleled those for institutional change toward comprehensive education during the same period (DES, 1968).

The next curriculum change was restricted to the pre-16 curriculum of the secondary school but was to have an effect on the post-16 sector in relation to the 'transition' of students at 16. Hyndman (1978; p 103) reviewed the operation of the Beloe Committee, formed by the SSEC to look into the question of an external examination for all secondary schools. As a result of the Beloe Committee the first CSE (Certificate of Secondary Education) examinations appeared in the mid-1960's.

Students experienced the new curriculum of the CSE in 1965 (Gordon, 1991; p 194). The introduction of the CSE and the retention of the GCE may be considered as the formation of a 'bipartist' non-vocational curriculum. Although the two examination courses followed a different approach (some CSE coursework being compiled by teachers themselves), an attempt was made to correlate the two sets of examination grades. In post-16 terms, students with an experience solely of CSE curricula were often 'guided' into vocational courses in Technical Colleges, others with a successful GCE background often pursued 'A' level GCE in secondary schools.

It was clear that many sixteen year olds wanted a further year (or more) of full-time education. Schools and colleges satisfied this requirement in the 1970's by fitting such students into a curriculum largely provided by a 'diet of re-sit 'O' levels' (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 103). However, the vocational curriculum was also undergoing significant changes during this period (to be discussed later, p 20) in response to the increased numbers of students requiring a post-16 curriculum.

As noted earlier (p 10), the school-leaving age was to be raised to 16 during this period (Morrish, 1970; p 60) and yet a single examination course capable of dealing with the increasingly 'broader' ability range had yet to be devised. One attempt to extend the curriculum beyond that of the non-vocational (academic)/vocational divide was the introduction of the CEE (Certificate of Extended Education) in 1972 (Slater, 1985; p 187). The course content of this qualification was often relevant to the 'world of work' and therefore contained vocational elements. This was a significant point along the evolution of the secondary school curriculum and heralded
the way towards a much more vocational theme due to be introduced some 10 years later.

The introduction of the CEE in secondary schools was paralleled by the development of pre-vocational courses in the FE sector. The 'Mansell Committee' was set up to examine pre-employment courses for young people in FE (Mansell, 1979; para. 1). Slater (1985; p 188) noted that the recommendations formed the basis of the 17+ pre-vocational course (CPVE).

The CPVE was managed and validated jointly by the City and Guilds of London Institute (CGLI), Business Education Council (BEC) and Technician Education Council (TEC); the latter two soon to be merged to form BTEC in 1983. This course provided an important part of the Government's training strategy, a curriculum-link between the school and FE sectors and can be viewed as a 'breakthrough' in post-16 education for all.

The CPVE was not without its critics. It has been subject to criticism since it was considered to focus primarily on meeting the needs of under-achieving students and generated a new form of division (Spours & Young, 1990; p 219).

Further developments took place to strengthen the link between the school and FE sectors. Various consultation groups were established with interests in both pre- and post-16 education eg. the Standing Conference of Regional Advisory Councils for FE and the CGLI became associated through the review of both the school and college curriculum/examinations (Waddington, 1985; p 116).

Some of the most important events in the 'evolution' of post-16 education (in both institutional and curriculum terms) were related to the 1988 Education Act and the 5 year period prior to the Act. As Waddington (1985) noted;

'by the end of 1983 it was clear that the DES was moving in the direction of criteria-referencing rather than norm-referencing for examinations at 16+

(p 115-116).

The speech given by Sir Keith Joseph in January 1984 (Education, 1984; p 28) announced the decision to replace the 'O' level and CSE (and joint 16+) examinations in England and Wales with a GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education), with its first examination in summer 1988. Was this to be the end of the 'bipartist' examination system of 'O' level/CSE ? It is of interest to note that the newly-formed regional examination boards
attempted to relate GCE 'O' level and CSE grades with the new grades of the GCSE. The notion of a grade C 'pass grade' has perhaps retained the two-way route of 'academic' versus 'vocational' courses for post-16 education in the school and FE systems.

The introduction of the National Curriculum (NC) within the 1988 Act was a 'selective pressure' that probably caused the most comment (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 39). This new curriculum has continued to be applied across the 'compulsory' period of education and therefore does not directly affect post-16 education. However, many consider that the NC must have some effect, if not least at the phase of transition at 16. Since TVEI has been applied to the 14-18 age group attempts have been made to relate it to the NC (Davies, 1988). The management of any post-16 educational initiative at the present time must consider the effect of the NC due to the impact of this curriculum on both teachers and students since its introduction in 1988.

Within post-16 education, one element of the non-vocational curriculum that remained virtually unchanged until recent developments is the GCE 'A' level. The completion of coursework leading to a pass grade in this examination is still considered as a major academic achievement. It is significant that the Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges have generally retained 'A' level courses as a prominent part of the curriculum.

Educational initiatives introduced during the 1980's may have affected the experience of students prior to entering 'A' level courses at 16+ (eg. National Curriculum attainment targets and GCSE) but did not directly affect 'A' level provision. Higginson (DES, 1988) reviewed the nature of that provision in a paper 'Advancing 'A' levels' but his tentative recommendations have yet to be fulfilled. The Thatcher Government of the 1980's was firmly committed to retaining 'A' levels since they were regarded as an essential means for setting standards of excellence (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 106).

The implementation of educational initiatives, such as TVEI, during the 1980's was therefore balanced against a relatively traditional background of 'A' levels within the post-16, non-vocational curriculum. This balance has been subject to adverse criticism. Slater (1985) referred to comments made by a former Senior Chief Inspector, Sheila Browne, as suggesting that;

'the MSC's 14-18 TVEI project will, take pupils away from 'A' level subjects.'

(p 188).
The support of this traditional view of non-vocational versus vocational elements of the curriculum by teaching staff (and perhaps school/college Managers) would undoubtedly have some influence on the implementation of initiatives such as TVEI within an institution. One of the most recent developments of the non-vocational curriculum in the post-16 sector has been the introduction of the 'AS' level GCE. This examination course has affected, at least potentially, the education of 16-19 year olds. This change to the curriculum was first offered in September 1987 and has broadened the experience of students within the 'A-level framework' but has not necessarily advanced the vocational theme.

At the present time the non-vocational curriculum available to 16-19 year olds therefore consists of GCSE re-sits (including some 'mature' courses for post-16 students only), 'AS' levels and 'A' levels. The management of this provision in relation to the vocational curriculum (and initiatives such as TVEI) will be considered later in the context of the findings of the current study (p 125).

1.2.2 Vocational curriculum

It has been observed that the school's tasks have been much less diverse than those of further education in relation to curriculum development (Mann, 1979; p 210). Much has happened in the vocational curriculum of colleges within the FE system so that a more extensive list of courses and examinations is currently available within this system in comparison with lists for institutions within the secondary school system. This imbalance is expected to change with the arrival of 'incorporation' for the post-16 colleges (DES, 1991; Kelly, 1991).

The vocational curriculum of both schools and colleges has moved away from the 'diet of re-sit 'O' levels' described earlier (p 17) for the 1970's. The merging of the validating-bodies, BEC and TEC, to form BTEC in 1983 represented an important development in the introduction and 'control' over a wide range of vocational awards.

It would appear from early events in the evolution of vocationalism in the FE system that colleges within this system would be much more 'receptive' environments for the implementation of educational initiatives (such as TVEI) during the 1980's, than institutions under secondary school's regulations. There was, however, already a range of validating bodies and vocational-based courses placing additional pressures on the FE system. Weaver (1966; p 130) had identified that such pressures prior to the 1970's had become complex within the FE
system due to mechanisms of course approval, control and validation. Regulations were laid down by RSA, CGLI, BTEC, GCE and CSE etc.

Colleges within this complex system were under pressure to construct a management structure to maintain an efficient, and relevant, vocational curriculum. The consequence of this structure will be considered later in relation to the current research findings (p 165).

The introduction of the CEE in schools (1972) and CPVE in both schools and colleges (1979) was reviewed earlier (p 18). The post-16 curriculum was clearly moving towards vocationalism during this period. The link between the FE 'control' of vocationalism and the school curriculum was finally established with the formation of the SEC (Schools' examination council) in 1982. Perhaps a more coherent post-16 vocational curriculum was to develop. However, the coordination between central government departments has been subject to much criticism. Waddington (1985; p 120) was suspicious of this cooperation and concluded that there was every indication that an atmosphere of confusion would continue since there was much uncertainty about the connections between CPVE, TVEI and CEE.

During the early 1980's a more significant 'force' was to emerge, the Manpower Services Commission (MSC), later known as the Training Agency. This agency was considered to be much more influential than BTEC and the other validating bodies (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 98).

There has been a desire on the part of many 16 year olds to continue a broad-based, general education with a vocational basis; hence the introduction of initiatives such as YOP, YTS and TVEI (Twyman, 1985; p 329). In relation to the post-16 school curriculum, Waddington (1985; p 113) showed that the education/training element within YOP (Youth Opportunities Programme) took second place to work experience and dealt exclusively with the 16+ school-leaver.

By 1981, the Department of Employment (DE) had already referred to the need for a better preparation in schools and colleges for working life (DE, 1981). In 1983 fourteen LEA's received funding from the MSC (Training Agency) to formulate experimental technically-orientated courses for the 14-18 age group in full-time education at either school or college under the auspices of the TVEI (DE/DES, 1984). This initiative was soon to be considered as the 'new curriculum' and the notion of 'TVEI students' following a specialised set of examination courses was lost.

The MSC's influence over the curriculum was extended further after 1984 by the implementation of government
policy set out in the paper 'Training for Jobs' (DE/DES, 1984). Both YTS and TVEI were hailed as a great success (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; p 100) but it was emphasised that there was much still to be done. The further development of TVEI into the extension-phase is to be considered later (p 26).

The DES and MSC undertook a review of vocational qualifications in 1986, under the chairmanship of Oscar De Ville (DES/MSC, 1986). The main recommendation was the setting up of the NCVQ (National Council of Vocational Qualifications). This council was given the power to regulate vocational examining and evolved into a significant validating body, operating primarily in post-16 institutions within the FE system.

Two more recent developments may well impose further selective pressures on the post-16 curriculum and related initiatives (including TVEI). The first development occurred in late 1988 when the Government issued a White Paper entitled 'Employment for the 1990's (DE, 1988). One hundred Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs) were established but the impact of the TECs is not yet fully appreciated.

The second development is the process of incorporation due to affect post-16 colleges (thereby excluding 11-18 schools) in April 1993. This development is the subject of a brief review later (p 24).

1.2.3 Academic/vocational divide

Prior to the introduction of TVEI, Turner (1979; p 23) had observed that the vocational curriculum was overwhelmingly associated with one particular type of institution - the FE College. Recent curriculum development, notably the introduction of TVEI, has been credited with an attempt to move away from long-standing perceptions about the academic/vocational divide but the 'move' was incomplete (NFER, 1991; p 12). The significance of the impact of TVEI within this area was questioned further since there was an expectation that the new vocational courses, with their NVQ status, would be taken by the 'academically less-able' (Watts & Jamieson, 1992; p 419).

Some authors have considered that 'institutional development' has been associated with a change in the perceptions described above. Terry (1987) reviewed the future of Tertiary Colleges and suggested that they represented a bringing-together of the academic and vocational curricula. However, Hodkinson (1989; p 369) noted that the root of many of the problems still facing
post-16 education continued to be the academic/vocational divide. Hodkinson (1989) argued that;

'this division is more than structural. It is deeply rooted in history, and supported by different ideologies'  

(p 369).

The earlier discussion of institutional and curriculum development showed clearly that the history followed by the various post-16 institutions (with their related curriculum) was very different. The 'products' of this evolution are expected to still differ in their ideologies, as expressed in their management systems. This issue is to be investigated further in the context of data obtained in the current study.(p 185).

1.2.4 Summary

The post-16 curriculum has therefore experienced significant changes in both non-vocational and vocational terms. The non-vocational curriculum originated within the school system and its development has paralleled that of the institutions within that system. The 1980's have represented a period of significant change for the post-16, non-vocational curriculum. The changes have ranged from the introduction of the National curriculum and the GCSE (both affecting the experience of students at the 16+ transition) to the review of 'A' level provision in relation to criteria-referencing. Such changes have placed additional demands on the management structure of post-16 institutions and, it can be assumed, on the implementation of initiatives such as TVEI. The result of such 'demands' is to be investigated within the current study.

The vocational curriculum has been subject to change over many years. This curriculum originated within the FE (Technical) system but had gradually encroached upon the school system, particularly in the late 1980's with the increased power of the Training Agency (MSC). It could be assumed that the FE management structure would respond to initiatives such as TVEI with minimal reorganisation in relation to the 'school' structure. However, the extensive range of courses within the primarily, vocational curriculum of the FE system has over many years placed a heavy burden in terms of validation and moderation (eg. BTEC, CGLI and RSA). This burden has resulted in the creation of posts within the management structure with the function of coordinating such tasks.
This history of vocational-based elements within the structure could well support the implementation of TVEI but may well resist the 'imposed' nature of the initiative and view its management as a 'threat'.

1.3 'Incorporation' of colleges

For many years there has been a widespread feeling that post-16 education within England and Wales should be 'better integrated' (Hodkinson, 1989; p 380). The earlier sections within this chapter demonstrated the degree of variability in both institution-type and curriculum associated with the different post-16 institutions. In the context of the implementation of initiatives (such as TVEI) it has been observed that the location of post-16 students within a variety of institutions, often with more than one type in a local area, has led to problems (Hodkinson, 1990; p 8).

The 1992 Act for Colleges has already been heralded as the opportunity to provide a new framework of 'unified regulations' for post-16 colleges (Kelly, 1991; p 1). As a consequence of the Act, the 11-18 Schools will be retained under Secondary School's regulations but the Sixth Form Colleges will be incorporated along with the FE colleges. This shift for the Sixth Form Colleges is expected to be significant and has been the subject of a consultancy study 'Getting Colleges Ready' (Fallon, 1992; p 3). The results of the study focused on the use of Management Information Systems (MIS) to enable both FE and Sixth Form Colleges to manage their financial 'independence' efficiently (Touche-Ross, 1992).

It is possible that the turbulence in curriculum change observed earlier (p 14) for Technical Colleges is to continue and that the Sixth Form Colleges (due to their new status) will take part in this change. It is expected that this process will receive much attention. Watson (1992; p 357) noted that education is presently under public scrutiny (as seen in the 1992 General Election); at a level not experienced with such prominence since the 'heady debates' of comprehensive versus selective schooling (discussed earlier, p 10).

The pilot scheme for the introduction of the GNVQ (General National Vocational Qualification) is one example of curriculum development associated with the process of 'incorporation'. The GNVQ's are planned to offer a full-time vocational route for 16-17 year olds in colleges and schools and are expected to have an effect on the management of the post-16 curriculum (Watson, 1992; p 357). The 'effect' is anticipated to be significant since earlier developments such as the introduction of a 'national framework' via NCVQ (National Council for Vocational Qualifications) were seen to
affect all aspects of college-life, including its organisation (Kedney & Parkes, 1988; p 59).

It is not surprising that some have attributed this recent curriculum development to the removal of the division between the academic and vocational routes (Kelly, 1991; p 2).

Many workers had predicted the need for a post-16 merger similar to that found for 'incorporation'. Turner (1979) had questioned;

'should the pattern of institutions be permitted to remain the same, or should they ... be rationalised on a Tertiary College basis?'

(p 63).

It is debatable as to whether such a rationale will develop as a result of 'incorporation'. It is quite possible that the distinct and separate curricular traditions described for 16-19 year olds (Turner, 1979; p 11) will continue. This issue will be considered later in the context of the current research findings (p 186).

The provision of post-16 education within the maintained sector of Education within England and Wales will therefore change due to the 1992 Act. The following scheme summarises the institutional basis of this provision.

The organisation of post-16 education following the completion of 'incorporation' (April 1993).
2. INTRODUCTION AND EXTENSION OF TVEI

2.1 Historical context

The Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI), was launched by the then Manpower Services Commission (MSC) in 1982. The initiative was to be directed toward enhancing the technical and vocational education of fourteen to eighteen year olds within existing schools (Green, 1987; p 24). A five year trial period, the 'pilot scheme' was devised by the MSC and eventually involved fourteen LEA schemes. The number of schools and colleges involved was expected to vary from scheme to scheme (Green, 1987; p 24).

In 1986 the MSC announced that the further extension of TVEI was to be funded to cater for all pupils in the fourteen to eighteen age group (DES, 1986; p 2). The submission of LEA proposals was requested by the MSC, with a phased entry of LEA consortia based on their involvement within the pilot schemes. The procedure of submissions directed to the MSC indicated the degree of central government involvement in the running of schools and colleges and drew attention to wider changes in policy and decision-making processes in education (Gleeson, 1987; p 3).

Much has been attributed to the introduction and extension of TVEI. Green (1987; p 26) viewed TVEI as a method of promoting change in the educational system, with a profound effect on many secondary schools. Was the extension phase to have 'profound' effects on post-16 education? A review of education and training of 14-19 year olds showed that, although it was considered to be too early to assess the full implications of TVEI for post-16 education, there was 'considerable potential' for major change (SEO, 1987; p 105).

Whatever the final outcome is for the innovation of TVEI within the post-16 sector, it has been observed that the process involved (for any innovation) can result in the emergence of 'new directions' (Naisbitt, 1984). The new directions in the area of institution management and staff development, related to the implementation of TVEI (extension), will be the subject of further discussion later (p 195).

One of the main contributing LEA's in the current study was Hampshire. As with other LEA's, Hampshire made a submission for involvement in TVEI. TVEI was piloted in the county during 1986-1988, following the outline agreed with the MSC in September 1984. The experience gained from the pilot scheme has been well-documented (Sumner, 1987; p 26).
The submission for the further extension of TVEI within Hampshire was completed in September 1987 and accepted by the MSC in the same year (Hampshire Educ. Comm., 1987). The evaluation of the 16-18 phase of TVEI (pilot) was not available at the time of submitting plans for TVEI extension.

Hampshire TVEI extension was established through a network of consortia. Such consortia differed in size and represented clusters of schools and college(s). The 13 consortia formed also reflected the phased entry established in other counties. During the first year of the extension phase of TVEI within Hampshire it was recognised that the initial focus had been on the 14-16 age group but the consortia appreciated the significance of TVEI as a 'four year' student experience (Hampshire TVEI, 1988a; p 12).

The bridging of the gap between the 14-16 and 16-18 elements of TVEI was an issue faced by all LEA's. Hampshire dealt with this transition through the introduction of curriculum objectives for the post-16 phase, with much reference to the work carried out within the pre-16 phase. However, it is significant to note that in the planning stage of this implementation consultation between the 'senior management' within the two phases was apparent but seminars for the newly-appointed TVEI coordinators were initially separate (Hamphsire TVEI, 1988b; p 2).

This somewhat fragmented approach to the management of TVEI at this time was not restricted to Hampshire. The approach could well have widened the school/college divide discussed earlier (p 22), rather than have narrowed it. Such observations had previously been made for other developments within this area (Cantor & Roberts, 1983; p 39). It was clear, however, that collaboration within the narrower environment of the consortium was evident (Sumner, 1988; p 15). The curriculum provision was seen to be markedly improved when staff from both sides of the post-16 divide worked together.

The issue of narrowing the school/college divide within Hampshire became the responsibility of the institution-based, TVEI coordinator (Hampshire Educ. Comm., 1987). The coordinator assumed the responsibility of providing communication between staff, the consortium manager and with other coordinators. The 'pivotal role' of the TVEI coordinator had been recognised (Appendix 1). It was therefore concluded, that the current study could not ignore the significance of the TVEI coordinators within the management of this initiative; their perceptions were to be valued.

It was also realised that an understanding of the way in
which an initiative, such as TVEI, was 'located' in a school or college was essential when reviewing the management strategies adopted. Hopkins (1990) considered that;

'the issues now at stake (for TVEI) are to do with management and implementation rather than on the substance of the programmes themselves'

(p 7).

In the context of this management it was observed that, whether a school or college followed 'separated', 'integrative' or 'collaborative' arrangements for the implementation of TVEI, staff directly involved ( coordinators and some Senior Managers) often formed a separate group, and were in some way isolated from their colleagues (Barnes, 1987). This aspect of isolation is to be pursued further within the current study (p 108-109).

2.2 Management issues

The implementation of any educational initiative must be affected to some degree by the management structure in existence at the time of introducing the initiative. The review of institutional and curriculum development (p 7 - 24) showed that the evolution of educational issues must create a 'unique' environment within an institution. Some generalisations can, however, be made irrespective of the status ie. Schools with a sixth form or Sixth Form, Tertiary and Technical Colleges.

Ribbins (1985) reviewed 'organisational theory' in relation to the study of educational institutions. It was concluded that;

'students of educational management who turn to organisational theory for guidance in their attempt to understand and manage educational institutions will find not a single, universally applicable theory but a multiplicity of theoretical approaches'

(p 223).

Nonetheless, many research workers have based their work on specific organisational approaches with much success (Janes, 1989; Tansley, 1989 and Sheils, 1991). In contrast, the current study was developed along a variety
of different approaches, primarily stemming from the field of personal construct psychology (PCP).

Ribbins (1985; p 224) also proposed that the following five elements could be applied to the school (or college) as an institution:

(i) a structure of 'formal roles'
(ii) individual human beings
(iii) informal or micro-political structures
(iv) a set of more or less related aims, values, beliefs and attitudes ...as the 'culture'
(v) a set of interactions constituting the 'environment'.

How can this complex world within an institution be understood? The political aspect, when considered alone, could be expected to have a significant effect on educational initiatives. Waller (1965; p 252) assumed that to understand the political structure of the school/college it was important to realise that the institution was organised on the 'authority principle' and that such authority was constantly threatened. Janes (1989 b; p 364), however, noted that it was quite possible to miss some of the 'real politik' of colleges due to the nature of the research-approach followed.

It has been observed that it was difficult to understand the management issues within the FE system, unless a clear appreciation of the 'changing context' was obtained (Twyman, 1985; p 325). Cuthbert (1987; p 27) concluded that there was a lack of clear understanding of what management was about, particularly during a time when colleges were under increasing pressures for change. Some form of systematic approach was apparently needed.

An understanding of the complex structures of management has often been best understood via the use of 'models'. What do these models represent? Within the FE system the application of management principles has led to the introduction of the classic organisational chart or tree (often expressed as a pyramid). The mode of interpreting the structure has been through the identification of 'vertical' channels, extending from the Principal and Vice Principals to the Lecturer.

Although organisational structures are the focus of further discussions (p 173) it is of significance at this stage to observe that a variety of structures or models have now emerged. The models have often been described as vertical (hierarchical), matrix or mixed (a combination of the two previous models).

As noted above, the vertical model has been associated with colleges within the FE system. However, by the late 1970's it was already apparent that there were more
colleges adopting the mixed approach than the vertical or matrix approaches (Ferguson, 1980; p 2). There has also been an attempt to develop a more flexible college structure with an improved form of 'lateral cooperation' across the structure and greater accessibility to the senior management (Gartside, 1990; p 177). Management development schemes have developed, in this context, to create a new college ethos.

If the management of different institutions is to be compared, as in the current study, it would therefore seem to be necessary to be fully aware of the type of management model perceived to operate within each institution. As will be discussed later, this formed the basis of one of the current research questions (p 39). The 'position' of the TVEI coordinator, as perceived by the coordinator and others within the institution, was also expected to be critical to the way in which TVEI was implemented.

It can therefore be concluded that the management issues associated with the implementation of TVEI will be varied. The issues relate to organisational structure (and its interpretation through 'models') and the perceptions of those involved. The following section considers the nature of management in more detail and concludes with a review of the management of TVEI as a background to the current study.
3. PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGEMENT

3.1 What is management?

The individual perception of management relates to personal experience and a range of external factors such as the degree of involvement in an organisational structure, system or process.

Within the context of education, 'management' often means a team of individuals (the Senior Management Team [SMT]) positioned 'high' in the hierarchical structure eg. headteacher/principal, deputy headteacher/vice principal and others such as the senior teachers/lecturers and cross-school/college coordinators. The SMT within the FE system may even be broader than this and include those primarily involved with administration (Cuthbert, 1987; p 11).

It is recognised that the quality of educational management is crucial to overall education effectiveness (Cuthbert, 1987; p 15). The success must be based on the sharing of mutually-agreed policies and expectations with colleagues across the school/college, as observed by Gilchrist (1990; p 425) when planning the management of one particular college into the next century.

The success is likely to be affected by;

(i) the environment of the institution

(ii) the perceptions of those involved within the management structure

(iii) the routes of communication open to those within the management structure

As noted briefly within the previous section (p 28), organisational theory is often considered to be the starting point in understanding the nature of management. The ways in which individuals relate to each other, group dynamics and concepts of leadership (from the field of social psychology) are expected to have a significant effect on the way in which a management structure operates.

Snape (1975; p 240) noted that one of the most crucial areas of management is the establishment of communications both within the organisation and within the parameters determined by the 'environment'. What does environment mean in this context?

In the case of TVEI implementation, the operation of the local consortium and imposed factors disseminating from the LEA and Training Agency (was MSC) are expected to be
at least part of the environment. This is not to imply that the environment has a 'negative' effect on the management of an institution. TVEI has often been viewed as a positive factor affecting management through the enhanced, successful networks established with other institutions (Kelly, 1991; p 2).

Can a model be constructed to represent the implementation of a complex initiative such as TVEI? So many initiatives can be found to be operating at any one time eg. GCSE, National Curriculum, Staff Appraisal and more-recently the process of 'incorporation' for many post-16 providers. Perhaps the answer should be that no model could represent such a specific part of school or college management since so many initiatives are intertwined. Kendall (1975; p 270), however, argued that models have to be built for specific purposes, not for all possible purposes. It can be concluded, therefore, that different models for the same system could be drawn for different purposes. The significance of model-construction in relation to TVEI implementation will be discussed later (p 153).

It has been considered by some (Owens, 1970; p 68) that a fresh view of organisations and their management is provided by 'role theory'. This theory is based on the fact that people in organisations have definite roles to perform, and many interactive factors help to determine precisely what kind of 'performance' each role will receive. The role theory acknowledges that each individual or 'actor' must interpret his/her role. An interesting extension of this type of theory is that of 'role conflict' ie. confusion over role expectation and role perception.

Since it has been observed that many TVEI coordinators were 'plucked' from the ranks of serving teachers (Jamieson, 1990; p 135) it would not be surprising to detect some role conflict for such individuals. The activity managers (including TVEI coordinators) described by Gartside (1990; p 205) in one FE college were not only concerned about the nature of their work but had a different understanding about the way in which other staff perceived them.

During the period of TVEI implementation it could therefore be predicted that many individuals found themselves in a situation in which they were adopting new 'roles' ie. TVEI coordinator and yet maintaining the responsibilities established in previously-held roles. If this situation were to lead to the form of role conflict described above, would it affect the implementation of TVEI? Furthermore, would the 'power' of individuals likely to be strengthened or weakened by this conflict?

The 'power' of school/college management and leadership
has attracted considerable attention in recent years (Twyman, 1985; p 332, Janes, 1989 b; p 377). In general, the introduction of governing bodies and academic boards may have led to some decentralisation of power within colleges. An understanding of the ways in which other management groups relate to these powerbases would inform the research of management in relation to TVEI implementation. This aspect of management has not been covered in the context of group-operation/function within the various institution-types of the post-16 sector (particularly in terms of the personal constructs of staff). Line-management routes have, however, been discussed by Gartside (1990; p 265) within an individual case study.

The various relationships between the powerbase(s) of the management structure and line-management routes will be the subject of a comparative analysis using various types of post-16 institutions within the current study (p 134). The following factors, from this review of management, will be considered in relation to the research findings:

(a) the management of a school/college must be affected by the 'environment';

(b) the success of a management structure is related to communication, actual and perceived roles and the perceived operation of working parties, committees or management groups;

(c) organisational theory and role theory may be effective ways of determining the working model of a particular management structure;

(d) the position of power is important in the operation of such a structure and for the effective implementation of initiatives such as TVEI.

3.2 Management systems (and 'roles')

The perceptions of individuals, or their constructs, were seen in the previous section to be important in the operation of a particular management structure. Why should the way in which an individual feels about his/her role or the operation of a committee or working party affect the way in which the structure operates? Is it simply to do with cooperation or is the effect much more subtle? Surely the level of involvement in the structure (or an aspect of the structure such as TVEI) and the inevitable, hierarchical position within the structure must be important.

Even within the matrix models of educational management,
the delegated middle and senior management posts have persisted since their formalised introduction in the mid-1950's (Ribbins, 1985; p 343). Most models have been seen to have embodied a chain of command (Best, 1983; p 32) and the issue of line-management has come to adopt a prominent position (Coopers & Lybrand, 1992). It is concluded that the self-perceived position within this chain must be a significant factor in terms of communication routes etc.

Some difference in opinion must develop when positions of responsibility within a hierarchy are introduced from outside forces, such as TVEI. How do other individuals within the school/college perceive their own role when such events take place? One survey of TVEI implementation within schools showed that Deputy Headteachers were often in conflict with the appointed TVEI coordinators (Stoney, 1986; p 44). In relation to the 'culture' of institutions, Jamieson (1990) reported that TVEI coordinators felt that the;

'main battle ground for change (was) in the schools and colleges' (p 135).

If resistance to the 'new' role of coordinator developed outside or even within the SMT it could be expected that the initiative related to the role would also receive some form of resistance. This has been identified as one aspect of the TVEI 'enclave' described by Saunders (1988).

Morgan & Turner (1976) defined roles as relationships between positions in a structure, expressed in the 'behaviours considered appropriate' rather than merely in the designated positions themselves. Interpersonal relationships and the awareness of the relationships between 'roles' are therefore important factors in the success of management systems.

Clearly there will be differences between the formal designation of roles within an organisation and the way in which those roles are actually perceived and 'played'. The effectiveness of relationships as a basis of line-management has been seen to operate at a personal rather than formal level (Gartside, 1990; p 265). The published work based on the relationships between middle and senior managers has tended to 'decontextualise' the process (Ribbins, 1985; p 366). Roles are often considered in isolation from the whole set of managerial and other roles with which they commonly interact. This aspect of post-16 management will be pursued further through a case study approach in the current study (p 157).
Can it be anticipated that headteachers or other senior managers within schools/colleges will perceive themselves as being central to almost all aspects of management (including that for the introduction of initiatives such as TVEI)? Senior Managers have already been shown to adopt an 'overview' of college management (Janes, 1989a; p 110) with the responsibility for 'strategic planning' (Limb, 1990; p 381). This would indicate that they assume a high-profile in many areas of management; an issue of some concern in the context of initiative-overload.

Research into the management techniques adopted by a cohort of new headteachers (Weindling & Earley, 1988; p 102) showed that the majority of teachers wanted the 'heads' to demonstrate through their actions that they were fully behind innovation. What were these actions to be? In some schools, the heads tried to chair several of the working parties but found that it became too time consuming or that their presence 'inhibited' some junior members of staff. Clearly, the perceptions of role and the relationship between that role and that of others are factors worthy of consideration when determining the way in which initiatives are implemented across the management structure.

Reid (1987; p 29) considered that the leadership role of the Principal/headteacher and SMT was vital to the success of implementing change. It was also shown that it was important that for 'whole school' development, the perceived style of management should be one of:

(a) consultation with, and participation of the 'body' of the staff
(b) commitment to the enterprise
(c) involvement in and ownership of the 'change process'

(Adapted from Reid 1987; p 225).

Although it had quite rightly been observed by Cuthbert (1987; p 11) that college-based initiatives (related to management development) should not be confined to members of the management team, it has been shown that the development of a responsive college is much affected by the Principal (Bilbrough, 1988; p 655).

A management system governed by consent does seem to be the current norm. The use of a consultative model has been seen to 'clear matters' prior to the implementation of new initiatives. Did the introduction of TVEI in the 1980's reflect the use of such consultation? Handy
argued that managers were hardly ever in the situation to enable interpersonal contacts with the majority of staff to influence the way in which initiatives develop within an institution. It was therefore proposed that there was a real need for one person (or a small team) to coordinate, manage, support and encourage the changes related to the implementation of initiatives.

In the case of TVEI implementation, coordinators were established in each school/college to carry out the management tasks described by Handy (1984; p 237). Such individuals established TVEI-related management groups to support their tasks and became integrated within the already established management system. This degree of integration within the various types of post-16 institutions will be the subject of further discussion (p 108-109).

3.3 Management and TVEI

Dale (1990) analysed the organisation and management of TVEI but limited reference was made to the approach followed within the institutions. Research based on the management of TVEI has operated at the county or consortium level (DES, 1986) but a case study approach has been adopted by some workers (Sumner, 1988; TVEI, 1989b). The larger-scale, National surveys have used interviews within some case studies and questionnaires for the 'remainder' to substantiate observations made (NFER, 1991; p 11).

TVEI has certainly become an 'experience' for both teachers and lecturers due to factors outside of institutional-control eg. looseness of contracts for coordinators. Furthermore, the headteachers have not always been in full support of the 'aid' given by the coordinators (Dale, 1990; p 166). How did this affect the TVEI coordinators? Dale (1990; p 166) concluded that the adjustment of institutional management structures to accommodate the newly-appointed coordinators was not always easy and occasionally resulted in difficulties over the scale/allowance (and therefore the perceived status) of the coordinators.

Within the schools it was demonstrated that 80 percent of the TVEI coordinators were on scale 4 or above (Stoney, 1986; p 42) and that in the FE colleges their seniority varied from Lecturer to Senior or even Principal Lecturer (Janes, 1989a; p 129). It was therefore not surprising for Dale (1990; p 166) to observe that the extent and nature of the participation of the institution-based TVEI coordinator within the management team varied considerably. The relevance of this factor and that of
status will be continued later in the context of the current research findings (p 101).

Although the impact of TVEI on the organisational structure of colleges has been minimal (Stoney, 1991; section 6), management issues have adopted a high profile. Headteachers, teachers and lecturers etc. have become much more conscious of the managerial structure of their institutions and the various roles that this has given to the groupings and individuals that constitute the structure.

The perceptions of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers (including Headteachers and Principals) will presumably vary greatly according to the type of post-16 institution in which they work and their respective roles. It has been noted that coordinator's groups within TVEI consortia have been much less homogenous than the equivalent groups of Senior Managers (Beck & Black, 1987; p 9). The coordinators also tend to be much more intimately associated with the 'mechanics' of TVEI implementation and yet they are likely to express shared perceptions with the Senior Managers in relation to 'attractive features' of the initiative. Does this imply that the two groups perceive the management of TVEI to operate in the same way? This particular aspect, based on personal constructs, has not been investigated through a comparative approach until the current work.

3.4 The current research

The need for a research programme based at the institution level has thus been established. The implementation of TVEI and other initiatives within post-16 institutions was expected to be affected by the nature of the institution (as verified by the review of institutional and curriculum development, p 7-24), the management structure already established, the perceptions of the coordinator(s) and Senior Manager and the way in which communication was achieved across the structure. Such aspects were reflected in the three foci of the study (p 4). The format of the research programme was designed to reflect the significance of such factors through the treatment of six research questions (p 39). A specific methodological approach was then pursued in order to 'answer' the questions proposed.
C. DESIGN OF THE STUDY
C. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter is divided into various sections as shown below;

1. Research questions

2. Case studies: organisation

3. Method
   3.1 Summary: the four research tools
   3.2 Factors considered
   3.3 Initial foci vs research tools
   3.4 Methodological support from other work

4. Analysis of the data
   4.1 Organisation of the data
   4.2 Analysis of data: the approach adopted
   4.3 Aims of analysis: a change in focus
   4.4 Levels of analysis
   4.5 Types of comparison
   4.6 The next step: the post-16 model
   4.7 Research tool analysis
1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions were investigated using a series of case studies, the majority within the Hampshire Local Education Authority and the rest within authorities in other counties (referred to as 'distant' case studies). Hampshire was chosen because;

(a) it had been involved with all aspects of post-16 education eg. tertiary colleges (p 2) as new developments had occurred. This would enable the evaluation of TVEI-implementation at the institution level to be compared between institution types and yet reduce the variation imposed between different authorities. The use of 'distant' case studies was devised, however, almost as a 'control' to eliminate inter-authority differences should they exist.

(b) the researcher was appointed as a TVEI coordinator at the time of the active phase of the programme within a post-16 institution in Hampshire and was therefore fully 'networked' into a range of post-16 institutions across the county.

The research questions were as follows;

(1) How was the post of TVEI coordinator integrated within the management structure of the respective post-16 institution?

(2) Was there a link between the type/size of post-16 institution and the type of management 'model' identified?

(3) How were the various groups within each management model perceived to relate to each other?

(4) How were the routes of communication perceived to operate across each management model?

(5) Did the perceptions or personal constructs of the TVEI coordinators indicate a different 'prejudice' to that of the Senior Managers?

(6) Would it be possible to devise a management 'model' capable of supporting the implementation of TVEI and future initiatives (such as 'incorporation') for all post-16 institutions?
2. CASE STUDIES: ORGANISATION

Twelve case studies were used in the study. As described earlier (p 39), the selection of the case studies, within Hampshire, stemmed from contacts established by the researcher prior to undertaking the research programme. The case studies outside of Hampshire, i.e. the distant case studies, were also either known to the researcher as part of the responsibilities carried out as a TVEI coordinator (at the time of the active research phase) or were based on personal contacts.

The case studies were selected to establish a replicate of three for each of the four types of post-16 institution. The structure can be described as follows;

```
11-18 Schools
   \_______________/   Tertiary Colleges
      \          /     Hampshire
         \    /       Hampshire
          \  /     Hampshire
            \ /     Hampshire
             B1 B2 C1 C2
               D1 D2
                D3
```

Key: A1, A2 etc. = each case study

The institution-based TVEI coordinator and a Senior Manager were selected for each of the case studies. In most cases the Senior Manager was either the Principal/Headteacher or Vice(Deputy) Principal/Deputy Headteacher but in some case studies other Senior Managers participated eg. Director of Studies. The title and responsibility of each participant was described as part of the 'interview notes' (Appendix 3).

The management structure of some case studies led to the involvement of more than two participants (i.e. in relatively large institutions involved in more than one TVEI consortium and therefore having more than one TVEI coordinator) and in some instances the TVEI coordinator was also a Senior Manager. In the latter, a second Senior Manager was invited to participate to provide a point of comparison.

The key shown below lists the number of participants involved within each case study and indicates the 'code' used to identify each participant.
CASE STUDIES AND PARTICIPANTS: KEY USED

The following details represent the abbreviations used for each case study and participant. The list indicates the order in which the data was analysed and is grouped for clarity, but does not reflect the chronological order of the interviews carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-16 institution</th>
<th>Case study abbreviation</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI coord.</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Type Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18 A1</td>
<td>05.03.90</td>
<td>/ PS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>15.11.89</td>
<td>/ PS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>02.07.90</td>
<td>/ AHS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.06.90</td>
<td>/ AHS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>20.06.90</td>
<td>/ SBS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.10.91</td>
<td>/ SBS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form B1</td>
<td>14.06.90</td>
<td>/ BPC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>04.07.90</td>
<td>/ BPC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>13.06.90</td>
<td>/ PSC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.05.90</td>
<td>/ PSC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>13.02.90</td>
<td>/ CC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.02.90</td>
<td>/ CC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary C1</td>
<td>18.01.90</td>
<td>/ AC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>10.05.90</td>
<td>/ AC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>09.05.89</td>
<td>/ BC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.07.90</td>
<td>/ BC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>14.03.90</td>
<td>/ SEDC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.03.90</td>
<td>/ SEDC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.03.90</td>
<td>/ SEDC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.03.90</td>
<td>/ SEDC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.03.90</td>
<td>/ SEDC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical D1</td>
<td>15.03.90</td>
<td>/ FC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>19.10.89</td>
<td>/ FC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>05.07.90</td>
<td>/ SC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09.07.90</td>
<td>/ SC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>25.10.90</td>
<td>/ PRC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.10.90</td>
<td>/ PRC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.10.90</td>
<td>/ PRC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. METHOD

3.1 Summary: the four research tools

The approach followed for each case study was the same. The designated 'Senior Managers' varied according to the type of institution but was also affected by the availability of individuals at the time of the research investigations (the active phase).

The basic format for each case study was divided into four sections, using a different research tool for each section, for both the TVEI coordinator and the Senior Manager. For some case studies the coordinator and Senior Manager participated on the same day (but in isolation from each other), in other studies the two individuals were consulted on separate days. The reason for such differences was that of availability of the participants and access to the institution (particularly relevant for distant case studies). Consultation dates were recorded for each study and were therefore available for analysis should they be required (p 41).

The four sections or research tools of the method were selected due to their application demonstrated in other work (discussed later p 46) and can be summarised as follow;

(a) an INTERVIEW (approximately 30 mins. duration) during which some questions common to all case studies were asked to identify features such as the size of the institution etc. (Appendix 3). Additional comments made by the participant while completing the following three sections were also recorded within the interview notes. An audio tape was not used but a simple procedure of verified reporting was followed. This consisted of a verbal summary of the notes at the time of the interview and at the completion of the consultation together with a signed, written summary completed some time after the consultation (Appendix 2).

(b) the construction of a CONCEPT MAP by the participant. Each participant was provided with a brief, verbal description of the approach to be followed. Care was taken not to influence the 'style' adopted since this was expected to relate to the perceptions specific to the participant. The participant was asked to place themselves in a 'box' or 'circle' on the map (starting with a blank piece of paper) and to place other 'key individuals' and/or management groups on the same map. Each box or circle was then to be connected by some form of arrow and, if possible, each arrow should bare a label to represent the level of communication or some other form of relationship important to the participant (particularly in the context of TVEI management).
(c) the completion of a REPERTORY GRID by the participant. The standard approach to the use of a repertory grid was followed with the use of the triadic method of eliciting constructs until the participant was familiar with the grid and was capable of expressing their constructs without assistance. Each grid consisted of headings for elements (horizontal position) and for constructs (vertical position), as shown in Appendix 6. The terms 'elements' and 'constructs' were not written on the grids used since they were of no apparent relevance to the participants and may even have hindered the process. The following descriptions were used to reflect the particular regime of the research questions:

(I) elements - committees and working parties (management groups)

(II) constructs - view of management

The management groups were chosen by each participant in relation to those stated in the respective concept maps.

(d) the completion of an INFORMATION MODEL by the participant. This relatively new approach to the expression of personal concepts (feelings/opinions) was completed as an extension of the repertory grid and used the same format. The management groups identified in each repertory grid were used directly within each information model (Appendix 10). However, the elicitation of constructs/concepts was not required since these were provided by the researcher. The five concepts and coded responses (termed attributes or sub-concepts) were selected as a result of earlier, informal discussions held between the researcher and various TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers (not involved as participants in the current study). The concepts were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Attribute (sub-concept)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>1a central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1n neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Verbal communication</td>
<td>2a central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2n neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>3a coopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3n neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3b invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>4a convoror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4n neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4b member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>5a major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5n neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5b slight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each attribute was expressed in relation to the specific role of the participant as either a TVEI coordinator or as a Senior Manager. For example, when considering the Senior Management Team (SMT) as a management group (already identified on the previously-completed repertory grid) the TVEI coordinator may have considered that both written and verbal communication from that team were central to his/her role, they may have only been invited to meetings and would therefore not regard themselves as a member or convenor, but could well have a major influence on the management of TVEI. Each participant was allowed only to select one attribute for each of the five concepts listed.

3.2 Factors considered

The four research tools of the method were undertaken so that the research questions could be answered and the initial foci could be completed. The initial foci of the research programme were considered in more detail so that each of the three foci [(a), (b) and (c)] consisted of various factors, as follows:

Focus (a) The environment and management structure of the institution:

Factor 1. type of post-16 institution
2. size of the school/college (number of students)
3. key individuals, groups or working parties involved with the implementation of TVEI
4. the period of time in which the school/college had been involved with TVEI
5. the size and operation of the TVEI consortium/consortia in which the school/college was located
6. matrix, vertical or a mixed 'model' representing the management structure
7. links with external agencies such as the TVEI consortium groups, local Headteacher or Principal groups etc.
8. types of groups or working parties within the overall management structure

Focus (b) The perceptions of the TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager in relation to the management structure:

Factor 1. involvement within the SMT (Senior Management Team)
2. relationships between key groups and individuals
3. support obtained from various groups and individuals
4. power of the participant and the location of power within the management structure
5. status of the participant in relation to others
6. position of the participant within the management structure eg. pivotal
7. issues relating to the understanding of TVEI
8. success of TVEI implementation within the institution

Focus (c) The routes of communication across the management structure:

Factor 1. form of communication ie. written and/or verbal communication between the various 'types' of groups and the TVEI coordinator or Senior Manager
2. links between the various TVEI-based groups and key individuals/groups
3. barriers to communication within the management structure and the related 'bridge' routes.

3.3 Initial foci vs research tools

The relationship between the three foci of the research (including their respective factors) and the four research tools (sections of the research method) can be expressed in the following summary.
It can be appreciated from the summary that the research questions, based on the three foci, could not be answered fully by the sole use of one research tool (or section). Both quantitative and qualitative elements of the research programme were covered by using the four sections eg. the interview notes provided basic facts (quantitative) about features such as the size of the school/college and the time involved with TVEI, whereas the repertory grid provided a personal response from the participant in relation to the operation of the management structure (qualitative). It was later appreciated (p 53) that some form of 'step by step' approach was required in order to analyse the results.

3.4 Methodological support from other work

Each of the four research tools of the current study can be put into context with reference to other research. The choice of each research tool was not random but was selected with care so that the response obtained from each participant was not guided or influenced. Very different areas of educational research have used a variety of research tools, often obtained from other areas such as psychology, sociology etc. Some tools have developed to such an extent that the data obtained (often being qualitative) has been analysed by sophisticated computer programmes.

(a) Interview

Audio tapes have been used for many years to support educational research. The tapes obtained have often been transcribed and related to other observations made using different research tools eg. the 'triangulation' method followed by Zubir & Pope (1984, p 7) demonstrated how both quantitative and qualitative approaches could successfully be achieved using questionnaires, repertory grids and interview 'transcripts'.

Within the field of research into TVEI-issues some workers have used many taped interviews (sometimes using the telephone) and transcribed selected parts to support a particular point of view (Barnes, 1987). It would seem to be difficult to determine the extent to which the transcription reflected the feelings or intentions of the participant under some circumstances.

In a relatively recent summary of personal experience of qualitative research Lyons (1989, p 3) considered the process of data collection. Lyons noted that research was no longer akin to clinical aseptic experimentation but that it had started to treat people as if they were human. It was recognised that confidentiality and anonymity were essential parts of the process of research and, as a result, clear protocols and contracts should be
established with each participant. Lyons recognised the 'double-edged' challenge of writing-up research findings in a persuasive and yet accurate account. A method of 'verified reporting' was therefore introduced.

This approach to interviewing participants was followed in the current research programme since it was considered that it was important to allow each participant to reflect on the response given and to agree with the notes taken during the interview. Audio tapes were therefore not used so that the participant would feel directly involved in the 'reporting' element of the process and the somewhat intrusive use of an audio tape recorder would be eliminated.

(b) Concept map

The construction of concept maps could be seen as an extension of the field of personal construct psychology (PSP). Kelly (1955) is recognised as the founder of this area of psychology in which the 'construction of reality' by an individual is active, creative, rational, emotional and pragmatic. Using the view of 'man the scientist', Kelly suggested that the way in which individuals go about their daily lives is not that dissimilar to the scientist doing science. All individuals were considered capable of developing 'personal constructs' or hypotheses in order to explain the events or world around them. Nystedt & Magnusson (1982) developed this further and concluded that 'man does not merely respond to the environment, he construes it'. What does this mean in terms of the current research programme?

Clearly, some form of research tool was required in order to allow the participants to express the way in which they viewed the management structures within their particular school/college (the 'environment'), as described earlier (p 4). The spatial arrangement of concepts is represented by the concept map. Such maps allow the participant to relate him/herself to others within the same environment or institution and to consider values or concepts such as status, efficiency etc.

Ausubel (1978) observed that concepts represent only one of many possible ways of defining a 'class' (view, feeling and so on) and they do not enjoy actual existence in the physical world. Psychologically speaking, however, concepts are real in the sense that they can be acquired, perceived and understood within a given culture (eg. school/college) and from one culture to another. This gives value to the use of concept maps since the construction of such maps may enable the participant to consider the environment in which they find themselves and, if willing, to share this understanding with others.
Adults acquire new concepts through a process of 'concept assimilation'. That is, they learn new conceptual meanings by being presented with the criterial attributes of concepts and by relating these attributes to relevant established ideas in their cognitive structures. The assimilation of concepts must occur over many years for most adults but the expression of those concepts may well be altered by recent experiences.

In the environment of educational management much has changed in recent years in both institutional and curricular terms (p 7-24). The views or concepts of those appointed as, for example, TVEI coordinators and those acting as Senior Managers may vary greatly according to personal experiences and shared experiences within the same institution. The type of institution must be of importance since it will either promote the sharing of concepts between individuals or may serve to isolate individuals to such an extent that their concepts are merely reinforced by a somewhat 'insular' position within the institution. This isolation of TVEI coordinators has been recognised by those considering the degree of collaboration within an institution (Barnes, 1987).

The two-dimensional view of the management structure within an institution was therefore constructed by participants in the current research programme as a form of concept map. The map drawn was eventually to be related to another qualitative research tool (the repertory grid) and compared between participants within the same institution and between different institutions. It is worth noting that Banghart (1969) showed that models or maps of organizational operations/structures are not necessarily an exact replica of the actual system but that certain essential aspects must be included in order to produce an 'idealized representation'. It was for this reason, and in an attempt to reduce other sources of variability between one case study and the next, that a simple format was explained to each participant prior to the completion of the concept map (described earlier, p 42).

(c) Repertory grid

Repertory grids evolved from the work of Kelly (1955) and are frequently proposed as a mode of inquiry within educational research. According to Pope & Shaw (1981, p 224), the kellian framework allows for diversity of viewpoints and constructive alternatives in education. This would therefore seem to be a most appropriate way of eliciting constructs or views of management from the different participants (in different case studies) in the current research programme.

It is the possibility of enabling the 'diversity' of
views to be expressed that is more challenging and realistic than, for example, the completion of questionnaires in which the interpretation of the questions is perhaps at the 'heart' of the response rather than the true expression of feelings.

Pope and Shaw (1981, p 225) also noted that in recent years a paradigm shift within education has resulted in a renewed interest in the individual's 'active' processing. It is as a result of this type of thinking that the current research was designed to relate the verified reporting of interviews (p 47) and the construction of idealized models of management structures i.e. the concept maps with the completion of a highly-personalized repertory grid. The 'perspective of the personal' was therefore elicited via the repertory grid. The analysis of such grids, using the computerised model FOCUS (Shaw, 1980, p 32), was intended to enable the study of 'personal meanings' (Pope & Denicolo, 1989; p 5) in relation to the views of the participants involved in the issue of TVEI-implementation.

(d) Information model

The information model could be considered in some ways as an amalgamation of the concept map and repertory grid due to the model having a two-dimensional presentation and being based on individual concepts.

This would, however, be an over-simplification since the concept map is constructed by an individual participant and represents the way in which the participant interprets or 'construes' the environment. In the current research programme the participant was encouraged to draw lines between boxes or circles representing key individuals or working parties (management groups), each line being identified as a route of communication or some other factor important to the participant. In the case of the 'information model'; each line simply links each of the attributes (or sub-concepts) to each other to provide a 'pattern' for comparison with the models constructed for other participants. Unlike the concept map, the lines are not subject to the application of personal constructs.

The repertory grid is constructed as a result of the weighting of elicited constructs from the participant. The grid is sufficiently flexible to allow for a 'free' response and actively seeks to encourage the participant to express themselves with minimal direction (Pope & Shaw, 1981). The data gained from the information model allows for a clear comparison between the response (i.e. selection of concepts provided) of one participant with that of other participants within a research programme. This particular research tool could be considered to be
'limiting' since the concepts are already determined prior to the completion of the model. There is some uncertainty about the advantages/disadvantages of the information model in relation to the repertory grid. It would logically depend on how the data was applied and the nature of the particular research question under investigation.

The information model was first developed by Kontiainen (1988) as an information structure used to build 'conceptual models' (not to be confused with concept maps). The general aim was to reduce the degree of 'subjectivity' of information concerning human behaviour. The approach could be considered as a paradigm for behavioural studies or as a 'step forward' (Kontiainen, 1988; p 2).

The term 'concept' refers to any variable or quality used in describing a particular state or a process; the 'information structure' representing a matrix of concept relations. It was the intention for the information model to structure the holistic view of people in their complex interactions with others (and with their environments). In a study of individuals within the same institution and in different types of institutions, as in the current research programme, it would seem appropriate to use both the repertory grid and the information model for each participant. This would therefore allow a subjective, or 'free' response (ie. perceptions of management) from each participant and would provide a structured framework (ie. matrix of concept relations). The research programme also represented the first direct comparison of the two research tools using the same participants and research questions.
4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

4.1 Organisation of the data

With the exception of two distant case studies (C3 and D3), the results of each case study consisted of:

(a) interview notes
(b) concept map
(c) repertory grid
(d) information model

for both the TVEI coordinator and the Senior Manager e.g. Headteacher, Principal etc. Data were obtained from C3 via a joint meeting of the four TVEI coordinators and the Senior Manager. Only the Principal of C3 was interviewed due to limited time and access. D3 was similar to other case studies but only one of the two TVEI coordinators was interviewed along with the Senior Manager.

In addition to the case study data a set of concept maps was also obtained for nine other TVEI coordinators of post-16 institutions within Hampshire, the 'Hampshire survey' (Appendix 5).

An initial view of the data collected revealed that many aspects were related and yet the perceptions of management systems obtained using the repertory grid could be analysed, in the first instance, in isolation of the other three sources of data. However, a much deeper understanding of the relevance of such perceptions would be gleaned when 'evidence' or supporting information from other sources were also taken into consideration. A structured analysis of the data was therefore required so that certain 'threads' constructed from one set of data could be pursued further using other data. The initial foci of the study (p 4) were used to provide the structure required to complete the analysis.

4.2 Analysis of data: the approach adopted

The initial focus of the study was to investigate the way in which the 'environment' of the post-16 institution would affect the implementation of TVEI within an established management structure.

The survey of literature used to provide a theoretical background to the study (p 7-15) clearly indicated that the four types of post-16 institutions investigated would differ in relation to their respective history and
philosophy. The type of curriculum generally associated with such institutions would also differ. The 'environment' of each institution was thus anticipated by the literature survey.

As stated earlier, the three initial foci consisted of:

(a) environment/management structures - as operational models

(b) perceptions of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers within the models

(c) routes of communication perceived by the TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers.

The ways in which the four sources of data could contribute to the three areas of the initial focus were observed earlier to be complex (p 45). For example, an appreciation of the particular management structure in operation within an institution could be obtained following the analysis of interview notes (to provide anecdotal reference to the way in which the management structure was constructed and operated), concept maps (to consider the spatial or two-dimensional structure of the model eg. matrix or hierarchical), repertory grids (to understand the way in which the participant viewed the various elements or groups within the structure) and information models (to obtain a point for comparison between 'imposed' concepts). Such varied sources of data could only be interpreted effectively through a relatively simple structured analysis.

4.3 The aims of analysis: a change in focus

The initial view of the data also indicated that the full analysis of the data should result in the proposition of a model for the management structure of the various types of post-16 institutions. As the study progressed it was appreciated that the educational initiative, TVEI, was itself being used as a 'research tool' to gain access to the operation of management systems within such institutions. The data was not intended for analysis as an evaluation of TVEI-success. TVEI evaluation had already been well-reported (Dale, 1990) in the context of curriculum aims etc.

During the process of data-collection it was realised that the perceptions of individuals were critical to the way in which an initiative such as TVEI could be implemented within a particular management structure. As noted earlier, the structure was likely to be a direct consequence of the history etc. of the institution-type
but the way in which the structure or model operated was seen to be different according to the particular individual being interviewed. Since it appears that communication is at the heart of a working system and that the use of relevant communication routes must be affected by the access or perceived access of individuals within the system, the perceptions of individuals were considered to be central to the analysis of the current study.

4.4 Levels of analysis

The starting point for the analysis of the data collected from the various case studies was therefore that of the repertory grids. It was expected that the repertory grids would give an opportunity to gain an understanding of the ways in which the various TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers viewed the environment of the respective institution around them. This environment was described in relation to a set of elicited elements, in this case the working parties or management groups operating in and around the management structure. The views or constructs of such groups were also elicited directly from the participants themselves.

The structured approach to the analysis was to operate at different 'levels' of detail. This would then allow for comparisons to be made in a variety of different ways.

The following four levels of analysis were applied and are described in the next chapter;

LEVEL 1 - individual analysis of repertory grid data for each participant, using the computer programme, FOCUS

LEVEL 2 - comparison of observations and responses of the TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager within each case study (post-16 institution), using the repertory grid and supporting data

LEVEL 3 - comparison of the perceptions of the TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers within each of the four groups of post-16 institutions eg. within the 11-18 Schools or within the Sixth Form Colleges

LEVEL 4 - comparison of the observations made between the four groups of post-16 institutions eg. differences and similarities between 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges. This level provided an overall or holistic view of the data.
The model shown below represents the application of the four levels of analysis in the context of the various participants and case studies.

**ANALYSIS ROUTES**

- **Key**: TC = TVEI coordinator
- SM = Senior Manager

```
Level 1
TC  SM
A1

Level 2
TC  SM
A2
TC  SM
A3

Level 3

11-18 SCHOOLS

Level 4
TC  SM
B1
TC  SM
B2
TC  SM
B3

SIXTH FORM COLLEGES

OVERVIEW OF DATA

TC  SM
C1
TC  SM
C2
TC  SM
C3

TERTIARY COLLEGES

TC  SM
D1
TC  SM
D2
TC  SM
D3

TECHNICAL COLLEGES
```
4.5 Types of comparison

The levels of analysis described above represented two types of comparison in relation to the different case studies: intraspecific and interspecific. Levels 1 to 3 were intraspecific since they considered data within the same type of institution e.g., 11-18 Schools. Level 4 was intended to provide a broader overview of the study i.e., the comparison of different types of institution. As will be described later (p 100) it was this final level of analysis that considered the six research questions of the current study and led to the proposition of a post-16 management model.

4.6 The next step: the post-16 model

Following the completion of the four levels of analysis for the various case studies it was anticipated that a number of generalisations could be made about the management models for the post-16 institutions considered. It was expected that the full range of data would be needed to propose a management model capable of representing a working structure for all such institutions. This particular aspect was therefore a natural extension of the fourth level of analysis in which all case studies were to be compared.

Concept maps constructed by participants within the case studies (Appendix 4) and those by TVEI coordinators within the 'Hampshire survey' (Appendix 5) would be considered in the context of a proposed management model. Such maps were to be analysed fully within Level 3.

4.7 Research tool analysis

The suitability of the various research tools used in the research programme and the 'contribution' made by each type were reviewed, following the detailed analysis of the data. Factors considered included; the limitation of the response by the participants, the accuracy of the conclusions and the quantitative or qualitative nature of the data generated.
D. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS
D. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

A review of the data indicated that the detailed analysis of personal constructs (via the FOCUSed repertory grids and supporting data) for all participants was complex and could unnecessarily confuse the process followed. The first and second levels of analysis for all case studies were therefore located in the appendices (Appendix 7 and 8), along with the interview notes, concept maps and information model data (Appendix 3, 4 and 11 respectively).

Since Level 1 and 2 analyses were based on individual case studies it was considered that it was feasible to use an example within this chapter to explain the process followed. The 'first' case study, an 11-18 School (A1), was selected. All other case studies were analysed in the same way and, as with A1, the outcome of this analysis was summarised in the comparative tables of Level 3.

The third and fourth levels of analysis provided a 'case study to case study' comparison and could not be simplified using the format described above for Level 1 and 2.
D1. LEVEL 1 - INDIVIDUAL REPERTORY GRID ANALYSIS
(FOR EACH PARTICIPANT)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

1. Data presentation

The use of the computer programme, FOCUS (Shaw, 1980), involved the introduction of abbreviations or symbols to represent the various elements and constructs. The analysis described in the following pages refers to the term 'management groups' to represent the elicited elements of the grid and considers constructs as 'views of management' (see example of repertory grid, Appendix 6).

The 'focused grid' was originally designed by Shaw (1980) to enable the elicitee (ie. the participant) to reflect on the initial relationship expressed between the constructs and elements. In the current study the participant was not given the opportunity to carry out this form of reflection. The repertory grid formed only part of the data collected for each case study and was used later to complement other sources of information gathered within the case study. eg. concept map.

Nonetheless, the presentation of data using the programme, FOCUS, was considered to be of value in relation to the overall analysis of the results.

2. Cluster analysis

Cluster analysis is now commonly used to analyse repertory grids. Shaw (1980; p 22) described the general 'starting point' as the matrix of similarities or distances between the elements of the data. The 'distances' are expressed in the form of a construct tree and are described as percentage matching scores eg. from 100 to 60 % (see example, p 61). The linkage between two elements (ie. management groups) within the range 100-90% implies that the two elements are very closely related due to the similarity of responses shown by the participant, using a score of 1 to 5. Linkages within the range 60-50% are less closely related or show little 'commonality'.

The benefit of this type of analysis is that it allows the researcher to use the grid to propose connections between certain elements and constructs without 'fear' of other construct systems (such as the researcher's personal constructs) interfering with the interpretation and with the reduced 'distortion' of the original ratings. The grid is completed using a purely subjective or qualitative standpoint ie. the view of the participant, but is analysed using a more objective or quantitative approach. The use of 'degrees of
commonality' between elements does enable some comparison to be made between different participants and different case studies (see focus of study, p 4).

3. A case study example : A1 (11-18 School, Hampshire)

The following example is used to show how the first level of analysis was carried out ie. the analysis of the individual participant within each case study. Later analyses, such as the 'case study to case study' comparisons, were based on the observations made from this starting point.

3.1 Participant - PS1 (Headteacher)

(a) The repertory grid had been completed by the participant while based at the post-16 institution (an 11-18 School in this case).

(b) The elements and constructs had been elicited using the method described earlier (p 43) and a score of 1-5 had been used, as in all other repertory grids within the study (p 60).

(c) The various scores obtained were then 'added' to the FOCUS computer programme and a display for the participant PS1 was constructed.

(d) The relationship between the various scores was then determined using FOCUS and construct/element trees were drawn to demonstrate the degrees of commonality between the different constructs or elements (identified as views of management or management groups respectively).

(e) The FOCUS printout (p 61) for PS1 showed percentage matching scores between 100-80% for the seven constructs or views of management and between 100-60% for the eight elements or management groups.

(f) The various clusters were then determined for the management groups based on the point at which they were linked on the element tree. Closely-related clusters identified within larger clusters were described as subclusters. For example, the management groups abbreviated as SMT and ROA (Senior Management Team and Record of Achievement group, respectively) formed a subcluster termed (a) within the cluster (b), which also contained the group HOY'S (Heads of Year group). This approach was used to show that two groups were very closely related, based on the perceptions of the
participant, and yet shared some commonality with a third group.

(g) For PS1, two further subclusters were identified [(d) and (c)] within a second cluster (e). This interpretation of the FOCUS printout therefore enabled comparisons to be made between a variety of groups elicited. The subclusters and clusters were superimposed as 'boxes' on the element tree to aid identification.

(h) The detailed analysis for PS1 (p 62), as for other individual analyses, consisted of comparisons between the different groups according to the types of constructs expressed. As stated earlier (p 53), the next step at Level 2 was to compare the observations made for the analysis of PS1 with the partner participant, in this case PS2 (the TVEI coordinator for the particular 11-18 School).

(i) The degree of commonality between constructs was analysed later (p 141) to demonstrate the prejudice of the participant in relation to that shown by all other participants.
### Repertory Grid: Management of TVEI via Committees & Working Parties

**Participant:** PS1 (Headteacher)

**Case Study Example:** A1 (11-18 School, Hampshire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of Management</th>
<th>PRG</th>
<th>SMT</th>
<th>IT w/p</th>
<th>CC w/p</th>
<th>RoA w/p</th>
<th>HOD'S</th>
<th>HOYS</th>
<th>Educ. Indus. Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equally Managed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prof. Exp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Involved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Forming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Unequal Management
- Low Prof. Exp.
- Not Fully Involved
- Weak Direction
- Not Dynamic
- Dynamic
- Not Decision-Making
- Not Policy Forming
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSeed data

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: PS1 (Headteacher)

Key: Subcluster (a)
Cluster (b)
Subcluster (c)
Subcluster (d)
Cluster (e)
Level 1 Analysis

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: PS1 (Headteacher)

(1) Two groups formed a closely-related subcluster (a), the groups; SMT (Senior Management Team) and ROA (Record of Achievement Group), were both considered to be 'equally managed', with a high professional expertise, had the headteacher almost fully involved, were decision-making and policy-forming.

(2) Subcluster (a) was linked to a third group, HOY'S (Heads of Year Group), to form cluster (b). The only slight difference between HOY'S and the other two groups was that HOY'S was not apparently demonstrating the very high professional expertise and was not as responsible for decision-making. The three groups showed a high degree of commonality.

(3) Cluster (e) contained the two following subclusters:

Subcluster (c) - HOD'S (Heads of Department Group)
PRG (Policy Review Group)

Subcluster (d) - EDUC/IL (Education and Industrial Liaison Group)
IT.WP (Information Technology Working Party)

(4) The two groups in subcluster (c) were neither equally or unequally managed, had some professional expertise, involved the headteacher and were not significantly dynamic. The headteacher did, however, observe that the groups were 'agents of change'. The groups differed since the PRG was more involved with decision-making and policy-formation.

(5) Subcluster (d) contained groups that did not directly involve the headteacher and the form of management within the groups was not known. The two groups did, however, have a relatively strong direction and were somewhat dynamic. They were both not involved with decision-making but EDUC/IL was more capable of forming policy than IT/WP.

(6) An eighth group, CC.WP'S (Cross-curricular working parties), was linked to cluster (e) more than to cluster (b). This group was not responsible for decision-making and was therefore similar to the groups in cluster (e). The observation that the headteacher was involved to a certain extent in the running of CC.WP'S did provide a weak link between this group and cluster (b). The group was very different from all other groups since it was considered to have a low professional expertise.
3.2 Participant - PS2 (TVEI coordinator)

(a) The same procedure was followed for this participant, the TVEI coordinator, as for the Headteacher.

(b) The repertory grid was completed while the participant was based at the post-16 institution (p 64).

(c) The elements and clusters were elicited and the data again processed using FOCUS.

(d) The FOCUS printout (p 65) for PS2 showed percentage matching scores between 100-60% for the seven constructs or views and for the eight elements or management groups.

(e) Two clusters and a subcluster were identified within the element tree for PS2. The detailed analysis of this data, as in the previous example (PS1) consisted of comparisons between the different management groups according to the types of constructs expressed (p 66).

(f) The analysis of the construct tree for PS2 was again completed later to determine the prejudice shown by the participant (p 141).
## Management of TVEI via Committees & Working Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant: PS2 (TVEI Coordinator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case study example: A1 (11-18 School, Hampshire)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees &amp; Working Parties</th>
<th>ITW</th>
<th>PSE</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ROA</th>
<th>HOD</th>
<th>HOY</th>
<th>PRG</th>
<th>GB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time not on resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-curricular issues not directly involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam-based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM directly involved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI evolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory role for PRG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- ITW/EO: ITW (Institutional Time Working) / EO (Examiner Officers)
- PSE: Participation in the Study
- IT: Interaction with Teachers
- ROA: Resource Organisation and Allocation
- HOD: Head of Department
- HOY: Head of Year
- PRG: Professional Responsibility Group
- GB: General Balance

**Time not on resources**
- Not cross-curricular issues
- Not directly involved
- Not exam-based
- SM not directly involved
- Not TVEI evolved
- Non-advisory role for PRG
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: PS2 (TVEI coordinator)

Key:

Subcluster (a)  Cluster (c)

Cluster (b)
Level 1 Analysis

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: PS2 (TVEI coordinator)

(1) A subcluster (a) was identified and consisted of the following:

- ITW/EO (Insights into work and equal opportunities working party)
- ROA (Record of Achievement working party)
- IT.WP (Information Technology working party)

(2) The three groups in subcluster (a) were closely-related since they were all viewed as cross-curricular groups, involved the TVEI coordinator directly, were not significantly exam-based, evolved primarily from TVEI and had an advisory role for the PRG (Policy Review Group). ITW.EO was marginally different from the other two groups because it did not directly involve senior management. IT.WP was different because much time was spent on discussing resources during the meetings.

(3) Subcluster (a) was linked to three other groups to form cluster (b). The three groups were:

- HOY'S (Heads of Year Committee)
- HOD'S (Heads of Department Committee)
- PSE/WP (Personal and Social Education working party)

The three additional groups located in cluster (b) were relatively similar since they did not spend time on resources, were involved in some cross-curricular issues and had an advisory role for the PRG.

(4) HOY'S was different from the other two groups due to the perception that it did not involve the TVEI coordinator directly and was not exam-based. PSE/WP was considered to be TVEI-evolved, unlike HOY'S and HOD'S.

(5) Cluster (c) was only very loosely-linked to cluster (b). Cluster (c) was formed from two groups; PRG and GB (Governing Body). These two groups spent some time on resources (but not as much as IT.WP), considered some cross-curricular issues, were not significantly exam-based, directly involved senior management, were not TVEI-evolved and did not 'advise' PRG.

(6) The only significant difference between PRG and GB was that the TVEI coordinator was directly involved in PRG but not in GB.
4. Level 1 Summary

The analysis of the repertory grid data for each participant at the 'first level' was therefore based on the element trees constructed using FOCUS. Clusters of management groups were identified according to the degree of commonality found through construct analysis.

The following section within this chapter provides a summary of the comparison between the two participants in each case study i.e. the Senior Manager and TVEI coordinator. As in this section, case study A1 was used as an example and all other analyses were located in an appendix (Appendix 8).
D2. LEVEL 2 - A COMPARISON OF TVEI COORDINATOR AND SENIOR MANAGER PERCEPTIONS (WITHIN EACH CASE STUDY)
LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

1. Presentation

The perceptions of the TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager within each case study were compared using the following approach:

(a) SPECIFIC ANALYSIS

1. GROUPS - types of management groups identified
2. CONSTRUCTS - types of constructs or views of management expressed
3. CLUSTERING - similarities and differences of perceptions about the management structure and clustering of groups.
4. ISOLATED GROUPS - those groups with low degrees of commonality in relation to other groups identified.

(b) SUPPORTING DATA - the type of management structure perceived using the concept map, with particular reference to the 'position' of the participant within the structure i.e. pivotal (a central position) or linear (along a line-management route). Evidence was also gleaned from interview notes.

(c) SUMMARY

1. NOTES - a series of numbered points to be used within level 3 analysis
2. CHECKLIST - a brief statement of comparison in the context of constructs, clusters, isolated groups and position (within the concept map), again used later in the level 3 analysis.

2. A case study example: A1 (11-18 School, Hampshire)

As in the previous section, case study A1 was used to demonstrate the approach followed. The data from the two participants, in this case the Headteacher and TVEI coordinator, was compared using the presentation described above. The repertory grids and Level 1 analyses for the two participants were utilised together with the respective concept maps and interview notes (p 72-75).

The Level 2 analyses for all other case studies were located in Appendix 8.
Level 2 Analysis: 11-18 Schools

Case study: A1 (participants PS1 and PS2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - five of the groups elicited by the Headteacher and TVEI coordinator were the same. The Headteacher did not refer to the Governing body whereas the TVEI coordinator did not include the Senior Management Team (SMT) within the grid.

2. CONSTRUCTS - the constructs used by the Headteacher were primarily operational eg. 'direction' and 'policy-forming' and also considered personal involvement. Constructs relating to personal feelings were not used by the Headteacher. This was also the case for the TVEI coordinator. The coordinator tended to refer to curricular matters, TVEI-relevance and time spent during meetings.

3. CLUSTERING - with the exception of three groups, the groups identified by the coordinator were not as closely clustered as those of the Headteacher. The Headteacher appeared to have a similar view of the SMT as for the two pastoral groups ie. the Heads of Year Group (HOY'S) and Record of Achievement group (ROA). The Heads of Department group (HOD'S) was, however, more closely linked to the Policy Review Group (PRG).

The ROA was related to the ITW/EO and IT.WP by the coordinator and the HOD'S were not closely linked to the PRG.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - the curriculum-based cross-curriculum working parties (CC.WP'S) were relatively isolated by the Headteacher. They were not linked closely to the HOD'S, SMT or PRG. The coordinator did not identify a particularly isolated group but the PRG and GB (Governing body) were separated from the other six groups elicited.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - at the time of the coordinator's interview the coordinator was not a member of the SMT. This could account for the absence of this group from the repertory grid constructed by the coordinator. The coordinator's concept map (p 73) also lacked the SMT. The concept map could be best described as pivotal with all groups operating around the central position of the coordinator.

The Headteacher's appointment (3 months prior to the interview) had corrected the absence of the coordinator.
on the SMT. The concept map (p 72) drawn by the Headteacher was more 'reflective' of teamwork and cooperation than that of the coordinator. The SMT shared a central position along with the Headteacher and coordinator. The Headteacher and coordinator were observed to share common areas such as curriculum and INSET but had independent foci such as governors and the management panel for the Headteacher and TVEI-based curriculum support groups (CSG'S) and school working parties for the coordinator.

The deputy Headteacher was not identified by the Headteacher on the concept map whereas the coordinator's map showed frequent meetings with the deputy Headteacher (perhaps to accommodate for the absence of the coordinator on the SMT, at the time of the interview).

3. INTERVIEWS - the interview notes indicated that the Headteacher had made a positive move towards integrating the work of the coordinator into the management structure. Personal involvement with many of the groups had become a prime target for the Headteacher during the 'induction period' on taking up the post at the school.

The coordinator was conscious of the temporary nature of the post and had progressed from a middle-management post of Head of Science. The appointment of the new Headteacher was hoped to provide the sort of access to the SMT that had eventually been achieved. The coordinator's length of employment at the school was considered to strengthen the relationships with colleagues required for the introduction of an initiative such as TVEI. The interview also indicated that the HOY'S was an important part of the management structure and the concept map showed that this group was another point of access for the coordinator to the PRG.

(c) Summary

NOTES :

1. The membership of the coordinator on the SMT was a critical factor, corrected by the appointment of a new Headteacher. The initial link between the coordinator and the SMT via the deputy Headteacher had been apparently removed due to greater direct access.

2. The Headteacher and coordinator both adopted an operational view of management and tended not to focus on personal feelings.

3. A strong link between pastoral groups and the SMT was identified by the Headteacher. The Headteacher was not fully conversant with the operation of the HOD'S and the CC.WP'S at the time of the interview and completing the repertory grid.
4. The Headteacher had a more 'global' view of the management structure whereas the coordinator tended to be self-focused. This could reflect a lack of certainty or confidence for the coordinator, as indicated by the awareness of the temporary post and the need to gain the 'support' of the HOY'S (viewed as a strong force within the management structure).

CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Policy Review group/Governing body</td>
<td>Cross-curriculum working parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study: 11-18 School (A1)
Participant: Headteacher (code PS1)

Curriculum Sub-committee & governors

INSET/PSE (Deputy Headteacher)

Headteacher & PRG

Management Panel & Manager (plus careers service)

Curriculum, Timetable & LMS (Deputy Headteacher)

Key: 1 fortnightly, open and lively
2 when necessary, mainly administrative
3 very supportive
4 supportive
5 mutually supportive
6 good working relationship
7 three times per term
8 cannot get to grips as yet
9 daily, dynamic and fun
10 supportive
11 sound and supportive
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code PS2)

Key: 1 if needed at governor's meetings
2 frequently, daily
3 three times per week, planning timetable, informal
4 once every three weeks
5 informal, as and when each week
6 via representatives and coordinator's panel (weekly)
7 monthly
8 informal, following formal meetings
9 weekly, TVEI coord. also Head of Science
10 frequent
11 via coordinator's panel & when adviser visits
12 as and when eg. publicity, INSET etc.
13 weekly, informal meetings
14 weekly, Departmental meetings
15 industry links, EO working parties etc.
PS1 - INTERVIEW NOTES

School/college - type: 11-18 School (Hampshire)
              size: 630 students
              TVEI: 2 years

Interviewee - type: Headteacher
              TVEI: 0.25 years

Consortium - four 11-18 Schools, one Technical College

(a) The Headteacher was newly-appointed i.e. 3 months

(b) The Headteacher promptly made the TVEI coordinator a
    member of the Senior Management Team. This had therefore
    changed the circumstances of the coordinator since the
    time of the coordinator's interview. The team was
    observed to function with significant input from the
    coordinator.

(c) Many of the groups elicited were attended personally
    by the Headteacher.

(d) A direct relationship had already been established
    with the coordinator.

(e) There was some concern about including 'everybody' in
    the concept map but the Headteacher was pleased to
    discuss the map further with colleagues.

(f) The information model was found to be too restrictive
    due to the nature of the 'imposed' concepts.
(a) The TVEI coordinator had received a temporary
appointment at scale E, having been previously appointed
as a Head of Science (scale D) at the same school.

(b) A very good relationship was established with the
Headteacher. A new appointment for the Headteacher post
was planned in the near future (interviewed later as
PS1). It was hoped that the new Headteacher would allow
more 'access' to the management system for the
coordinator.

(c) The coordinator had been at the school for
approximately 4 years and the new post as coordinator was
assisted by a sound working relationship already
established with colleagues.

(d) The Heads of Year group was considered as powerful
and worthy of gaining their support.

(e) The coordinator felt under pressure with a range of
external and internal meetings to attend.
3. Level 2 Summary

A comparison of the perceptions of the TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager (within each case study) was therefore carried out within the second level of analysis. The personal constructs expressed via repertory grids were analysed in the previous section (Level 1) and the conclusions were then consolidated within Level 2, in the light of supporting data. Such data also provided another perspective to the comparison ie. 'position' of each participant within the respective management structure.

In the example of the 'checklist' generated within case study A1 various similarities and differences were observed. The types of constructs used by both participants were operational and they both considered themselves to have a pivotal position within the management structure. The degree of clustering of management groups was, however, different and the groups 'isolated' were not similar ie. Policy Review Group/Governing body by the coordinator and Cross-curriculum working parties by the Senior Manager.

This checklist and those of the other case studies (Appendix 8) were then used, together with transformed data and that of the information models, to complete a more detailed comparison of case studies in Level 3 analysis.
D3. LEVEL 3 - A COMPARISON OF TVEI COORDINATOR AND
SENIOR MANAGER PERCEPTIONS (BETWEEN THE
FOUR TYPES OF POST-16 INSTITUTIONS)
LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

1. Basic approach

This third level of analysis provided a comparison between case studies within each of the four types of post-16 institutions. The analysis can be summarised as follows:

Key: A1 to D3 = case studies

The summaries of the previous analyses were based on repertory grid data supported by observations extracted from interview notes and concept maps. Level 3 continued to refer to such data in more detail and also utilised data from the information models completed by the various participants.

2. Use of Information Models

(i) Information models (Appendix 10) were produced by each participant following the completion of an interview, a concept map and a repertory grid. In fact, the elements or management groups of the information model were taken directly from those elicited by the participant, when completing the repertory grid. Unlike the repertory grid, the concepts (as opposed to constructs) and subconcepts/attributes were not elicited by the participant but imposed to provide uniformity (p 43). The relevance or value of the information model as a research tool was considered later (p 174).

(ii) The 'free choice' of elements or groups by the participant from the particular management structure resulted in a wide variety of groups eg. SMT and Academic Boards to Heads of Section and Equal Opportunities groups. Participants within the same institution were sometimes found to give a different name or abbreviation for the same group. The data was therefore modified to focus on seven 'types' of groups as shown below;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'TYPE' OF GROUP</th>
<th>KEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management Team (SMT)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-based TVEI Group</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board or Policy Group</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Group eg. Heads of Year or Senior Tutor (pastoral) Groups</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum eg. Heads of Department /Faculty Groups</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Liaison eg. Local Headteachers, TVEI consortium Group</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors or related Board/Group</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This modification limited the data but enabled some comparison to be made between individuals and institutions. It was concluded that any particular group not listed in the above table, and yet considered to be particularly relevant by the participant, would appear within the 'FOCUSed' repertory grid data analysed at Level 1 and 2 eg. isolated groups.

(iii) The five concepts of the information models (p 43) were used to support one or more of the three foci of the research programme. The concepts can be summarised as follows:

C1 Written communication
C2 Verbal communication
C3 Attendance
C4 Involvement
C5 Decision-making

The models constructed from the information model grids were referred to later in the Level 4 analysis (p 159) as 'models of reality'. They were used to consider the strength of communication in relation to particular types of groups within management structures and to highlight 'isolated' concepts eg. verbal communication.
3. Format adopted

The format adopted for Level 3 analysis was based on the three foci of the study and associated factors (p 44-45).

(a) Environment and management structure:

A summary table (p 82-85) was constructed for each of the four groups of post-16 institutions based on data from interview notes, concept maps and repertory grids. Data related to the size of each institution, the period of TVEI experience (of the institution) and the composition of the associated TVEI consortium was obtained from the interview notes (Appendix 3).

Concept maps (Appendix 4) were used to characterise the form of management model as mixed, vertical or matrix and to identify external agencies linked to the model. Finally repertory grid data (Appendix 7) was examined to indicate the presence or absence of the seven group 'types' described earlier (p 78).

A diagrammatic summary of the various factors analysed within focus (a) was constructed and used as a prefix to the summary tables for each group of post-16 institutions (p 81).

(b) Perceptions of participants (TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager) in relation to the management structure:

As in focus (a), interview notes, concept maps and repertory grid data contributed to the analysis of focus (b) in the form of four summary tables (p 87-94). Information model data was also utilised.

Interview notes (Appendix 3) were used to identify the degree of personal power for each participant eg. low or high, the location of power within the institution, status of the participant, specific relationships within the management structure, the nature of the support available within the institution, TVEI issues and the success of the participant's role.

Concept maps (Appendix 4) contributed to the analysis of the location of power, the position of each participant and 'superior' groups or individuals within the management structure, specific relationships between groups and individuals and TVEI issues.

Repertory grid data (Appendix 7) provided some evidence towards the understanding of relationships across the
management model (of 'key' groups), the degree of personal power and major decision-making groups.

Finally, the information model data (Appendix 11) was used to determine the attendance of Senior Management Team (SMT) meetings by the participants and their involvement with the SMT, relationships of key groups across the management model and the major decision-making groups.

A diagrammatic summary of the factors analysed within focus (b) was constructed and used as a prefix to the summary tables for each group of post-16 institutions (p 86).

(c) Routes of communication across the management structure:

All four sources of data were again used to analyse focus (c). The analysis was summarised on four tables (p 96-99).

Interview notes (Appendix 3) and concept maps (Appendix 4) provided some information about the links between TVEI-based and other groups within each management structure and barriers to communication within the institution.

Repertory grid data (Appendix 7) was used to identify isolated groups. Whereas, the data obtained from the information models (Appendix 11) contributed to the analysis of communication via written and/or verbal routes.

As with foci (a) and (b), a diagrammatic summary of the factors analysed within focus (c) was constructed and used as a prefix to the summary tables for each group of post-16 institutions (p 95).
LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

FOCUS (a) ENVIRONMENT AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Factors considered in relation to sources of data:

Key used for the following tables - p 82-85:

(1) TVEI consortium - 11-16 = 11-16 school
11-18 = 11-18 school
SFC = Sixth Form College
Tech = Technical College

(2) TVEI coordinator - curric. = Curriculum

(3) Senior Manager - .. ..

(4) Management 'model' - Vert. = Vertical

(5) Group types - (S) to (G) = as described earlier, p 78

(6) High - high profile group ie. 4 or more out of 6 participants referred to the group
Mid - mid profile group ie. 3 out of 6 participants referred to the group
Low - low profile group ie. 1 or 2 participants referred to the group
# 11-18 SCHOOLS - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

## Focus (a) Environment and management structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (number of students)</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI experience (years at time of interview)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI consortium</td>
<td>4 x 11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI coordinator</td>
<td>Head of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(finance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group types</td>
<td>High (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1 = Careers service  
2 = TVEI Management Panel & Careers service  
3 = Contract/Buildings  
4 = Federal Sixth Form, Consortium Heads group, TVEI, CPVE and EO groups
## SIXTH FORM COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

### Focus (a) Environment and management structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (number of students)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI experience (years at time of interview)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI consortium</td>
<td>12 x 11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x SFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI coordinator</td>
<td>Senior Tutor (pastoral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Vice Principal (curric. &amp; INSET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group types</td>
<td>High (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

1 = Industrial liaison  
2 = Curriculum Support Groups (CSG's)
## TERTIARY COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

### Focus (a) Environment and management structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (number of students)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI experience (years at time of interview)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0 (including pilot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI consortium</td>
<td>5 x 11-16</td>
<td>4 x 11-16</td>
<td>eg. 8 x 11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x 11-18</td>
<td>1 Tech.</td>
<td>2 x 11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI coordinator</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>4 Senior Lecturers (Directors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Vice Principal (curric.)</td>
<td>Vice Principal (curric.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group types</td>
<td>High (S)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (T)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (A)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (P)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (C)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (E)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (G)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (O)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**: 1 = Industrial liaison  
2 = Cluster Coordinator's group & Cluster Management group
**TECHNICAL COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS**

**Focus (a) Environment and management structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (number of students)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI experience (year at time of interview)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI consortium</td>
<td>1 x 11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x SFC's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI coordinator</td>
<td>2 Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Vice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group types</td>
<td>High (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
1 = Area Headteacher's post-16 group & pre-16 group
2 = TVEI coordinator's consortium group, Head's Management group and Regional Post-16 group
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LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

FOCUS (b) PERCEPTIONS OF PARTICIPANTS

Factors considered in relation to sources of data:

RELATIONSHIPS OF 'KEY' GROUPS
[Repertory grids & information models]

ATTENDANCE/INVOLVEMENT
[Information models]

SPECIFIC RELATIONSHIPS
[Interview notes & concept maps]

SUPPORT
[Interview notes]

PERCEPTIONS OF PARTICIPANTS

PERSONAL POWER
[Interview notes & repertory grids]

LOCATION OF POWER
[Interview notes & concept maps]

MAJOR DECISION-MAKING GROUPS
[Repertory grids & information models]

SUCCESS
[Interview notes]

STATUS
[Interview notes]

POSITION
[Concept maps]

 ISSUES (TVEI)
[Interview notes & concept maps]

Key used for the following tables - p 87-94

(1) Attendance/involvement - neutral etc. = see p 43
(2) Relationships (key groups) - (S) to (G) = see p 78
(3) Major decision-making groups (S) to (G) = see p 78
(4) Position ('Superior') = as described in level 1 analysis (Appendix 7)
### 11-18 SCHOOLS - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

**Focus (b) Perceptions of participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of SMT meetings</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>invited</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>coopted</td>
<td>invited ?</td>
<td>coopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with SMT</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>convenor</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>convenor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships across the management model ('Key groups')</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P C E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>C P C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C E S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power - personal location</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major decision-making groups</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S A G</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>S A P</td>
<td>S E G</td>
<td>S P C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>lack of certainty</td>
<td>autonomy/curriculum leader</td>
<td>head of sixth form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>new to post</td>
<td>autonomy/financial matters</td>
<td>'leader' /changed structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position - Self</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>pivotal</td>
<td>pivotal</td>
<td>pivotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>pivotal/linear</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Superior'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Governors</td>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>PSE/HOY's</td>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

87
Focus (b) Perceptions of participants (11-18 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Summary Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial link with deputy headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specific)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Made the coordinator a member of SMT - supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linked to TVEI.SG and Primary liaison groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key member of Admin. group but no finance link with TVEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMT and HOD's identified with a narrow perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMT and HOD's identified but outward-looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eventually from new head teacher, needed support from the HOY's group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>none identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial support via TVEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>From teams rather than individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain since role of coordinator had been 'passed around'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little support due to having ultimate responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked with reps on CSG's and on coord's panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TVEI)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good working relationship with local TVEI manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Termly meeting with TVEI Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended SMT meetings with coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended various TVEI groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only worked with coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked well with colleagues but under pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapped curriculum work, TVEI= day to day curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication helped by dual role, local TVEI under 'control' of TVEI manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed new postholders due to TVEI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SIXTH FORM COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

#### Focus (b) Perceptions of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of SMT meetings</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with SMT</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>coopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships across the management model ('Key' groups)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E  C  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S  C  S  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major decision-making groups</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T  A  P  C  E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>S  A  G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Status                        | T    | long-serving member of staff
|                               | SM   | newly appointed officer to governors, member of Head's grp.
|                               |      | not yet fully involved in curric. | much control over events |
| Position                      | T    | pivotal     | pivotal    | pivotal    |
| self                          | SM   | pivotal     | pivotal    | linear     |
| 'Superior'                    | T    | Principal/VP | SMT        | Principal  |
| SM                            |      | Principal   | Teachers ?  | Principal  |
### Focus (b) Perceptions of participants (Sixth Form Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Summary Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Attended many groups eg. EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specific)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aware of management systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Strong relationship with other DP (the TVEI coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As for T but relationship with HOD's without 'direction'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-college links and worked with College Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Aware of personal feelings, supported by TVEI group but under pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good informal meetings with Principal and other VP's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Frustrated by system, little support from HOD's although a member of their group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As for T, but support obtained from TVEI manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>From College Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From Governors, DOS (TVEI coord.), 4 committees etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong> (TVEI)</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Students with TVEI background not yet arrived at the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good informal meetings with TVEI coord., previous TVEI involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>EO issues raised due to TVEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed curriculum issues in CSG meetings, TVEI 'held' in the Cross-Curriculum group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Other activities had higher profile but TVEI = finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial limitations for curriculum not eased by TVEI, therefore unsure of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success</strong></td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI 'oiled' the works, source of funding, avenue to LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Advantage to have TVEI manager based at college, TVEI = curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Losing TVEI within curriculum but too many initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job well done by coordinator but local TVEI contacts were limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TERTIARY COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

**Focus (b) Perceptions of participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance of SMT meetings</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>coopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement with SMT</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across the management model</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('Key' groups)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>rel. high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- personal</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- location</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Principal (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Principal (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- major decision-making groups</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>opportunity for postholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>curriculum leader with TVEI-link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>pivotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 'Superior'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AB/SMT/DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Principal/ DOS/HOD's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Focus (b) Perceptions of participants (Tertiary Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Summary Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong> (Specific)</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Attended many CSG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Weak link with DOS but strong with HOD's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Presented TVEI papers to AB from the TVEI Standing Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Unclear rel. with DP (Senior tutor) but positive rel. with VP and HOF's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Outside agencies, TVEI groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Attended TVEI Director (coord) meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Very supportive SMT group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>HOD's and SMT group supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Hoped for more from new Principal but INSET coord. was supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Governors, VP supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Other coords. and VP (TVEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong> (TVEI)</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Staff suspicious of coord. attending meetings, Principal concerned about TVEI factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Low status, detached label but supportive of curriculum dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Established 15 cross-college groups due to TVEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Impact on college was slightly financial but SMT threatened by TVEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>TVEI enhancement coord. in post to aid progression from pilot but complex consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Change from pilot to extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success</strong></td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Problems due to other applicants for TVEI post still at college but good for dev. rel. with partner schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Improved liaison with schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>TVEI moved from cross-college management to limits of SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Strengthened links with external agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>TVEI integrated within management model, improving liaison with schools following problems with 'link courses'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TECHNICAL COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

### Focus (b) Perceptions of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of SMT meetings</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>coopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with SMT</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships across the</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management model ('Key' groups)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>O O P T S S S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>C O O E C O A S A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>rel. high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Principal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Principal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major decision-making groups</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S P S T A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>S T C A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>was an HOD, 'middle-man' with normal view as SMT/teachers lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>questioned link with an HOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position -Self</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>pivotal/linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Superior'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AB/Govs. RoA group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Focus (b) Perceptions of participants (Technical Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>T/SM</th>
<th>Summary Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Link other TVEI (careers) coord., weak link between Principal and VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Worked with curriculum-based groups but unsure of rel. with coord. and Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked with other coords, but developments filtered to SMT only via the DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Personal involvement with the TVEI coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked alongside other TVEI coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Bridge between coords/SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development officer, course leaders supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>From coord. and SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other coords and DOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>HOD's via their committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disolutioned, little support from the DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>SMT and coords. supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI related to careers and staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TVEI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>TVEI committees &amp; Area Heads group gave link between TVEI and the SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex consortia therefore working rel. with SMT was seen to be critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Opportunity to do 'things'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI decisions at SM level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>TVEI status was crucial but required time and staff dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>A1 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI/curric. closely linked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Improved liaison with partner schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tension between Area Head's and TVEI Management groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>RoA &amp; 'Insights into Work' promoted by TVEI but within context of large college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adversely affected by shift of TVEI management to SMT (as seen in partner schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>TVEI integrated within core curriculum of college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

FOCUS (c) ROUTES OF COMMUNICATION

Factors considered in relation to sources of data:

1. Written communication - group types (S) to (G) [see p 78]
2. Verbal communication - as for (1)
3. TVEI links - various abbreviations for group names [see repertory grid summaries (Appendix 7)]
4. Barriers - as for (3)
5. Isolated groups - as for (3)

Key used for the following tables - p 96-99
### 11-18 SCHOOLS - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

**Focus (c) Routes of communication**

**Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) a a a b b n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T) - - a - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) a a - - - n -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) n a - - - a b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) a b a a a b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) - a n n a -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) b - - - n -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Verbal** |    |    |    |
| (S) a a a a n a |    |    |    |
| (T) - - a - - - |    |    |    |
| (A) a a - - - b - |    |    |    |
| (P) n a - - - a a |    |    |    |
| (C) a b a b a a |    |    |    |
| (E) - b b a b - |    |    |    |
| (G) b - - - a - |    |    |    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TVEI links</strong></th>
<th>t1</th>
<th>t2</th>
<th>t3</th>
<th>t4</th>
<th>t5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Barriers</strong></th>
<th>b1</th>
<th>b2</th>
<th>b3</th>
<th>b4</th>
<th>b5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Isolated groups</strong></th>
<th>PRG/GB</th>
<th>Head/CC.WP's</th>
<th>Prim.L Admin.</th>
<th>SPC SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Key:**
- a = central to participant's role
- b = peripheral to participant's role
- c = not affecting participant's role

- t1 = CSG's/TVEI coordinator's group
- t2 = Management panel/headteacher, TVEI manager/TVEI coordinator and CSG's/TVEI coordinator
- t3 = TVEI Steering group/TVEI coordinator & profiling coordinator
- t4 = Consortium TVEI coordinator's group/TVEI coordinator & Consortium TVEI Management group/TVEI coordinator
- b1 = TVEI coordinator/SMT (removed later)
- b2 = ...
- b3 = SMT/TVEI Steering group via TVEI coordinator
- b4 = MMT/SMT via Admin. meeting
- b5 = TVEI coordinator/Federal Sixth Form via headteacher
SIXTH FORM COLLEGES - LEVEL 3 ANALYSIS

Focus (c) Routes of communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Group types     |            |          |          |          |          |
| Written         |            |          |          |          |          |
| (S)             | n          | b        | a        | b        | a        |
| (T)             | a          | a        | -        | -        | b        | -        |
| (A)             | b          | a        | -        | -        | a        | n        |
| (P)             | a          | -        | b        | a        | a        | -        |
| (C)             | b          | a        | b        | a        | a        | a        |
| (E)             | a          | -        | n        | b        | -        | a        |
| (G)             | -          | n        | n        | a        | -        | a        |

| Verbal          |            |          |          |          |          |
| (S)             | a          | a        | a        | b        | a        |
| (T)             | a          | a        | -        | -        | b        | -        |
| (A)             | b          | n        | -        | -        | a        | a        |
| (P)             | a          | -        | a        | -        | n        |
| (C)             | b          | a        | a        | n        | a        | n        |
| (E)             | a          | -        | a        | a        | -        | n        |
| (G)             | -          | n        | -        | n        | -        | a        |

| TVEI links      |            |          |          |          |          |
| t1              | -          | t2       | t3       | t4       | -        |

| Barriers        |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                | b1         | b2       | b3       | b4       | b5       | b6       |

| Isolated groups |            |          |          |          |          |
| SMT             | INSET/     | ITOW     |          |          |          |
|                 | GOV.C      |          |          |          |          |

Key: 
- a = central to participant's role 
- b = peripheral to participant's role 
- n = not affecting participant's role 
- t1 = TVEI group/TVEI coordinator & various working group chairmen/TVEI group 
- t2 = TVEI coordinator/TVEI college working parties 
- t3 = Curriculum Support Groups(CSG's)/DP (curric.) 
- t4 = TVEI pilot Director/TVEI coordinator & TVEI Management group/TVEI coordinator 
- b1 = TVEI coord./HOD's via Directors of Divisions, TVEI coord./Principal via VP(curric.) & Heads of Division/Principal via VP(curric.) 
- b2 = VP(curric.)/Staff via Head or Directors of Div 
- b3 = HOD's/SMT via TVEI coord., IT group/TVEI coord. via cross-curriculum group. & Science etc./TVEI coord. via cross-curriculum group 
- b4 = DP(curric.)/teachers via HOD's & HOD's/SMT via DP(curric.) 
- b5 = TVEI pilot Director/Principal via TVEI coord. & HOF's/Principal via TVEI coords and DOS 
- b6 = SMT/working parties eg.TVEI & HOF's and Senior Tutors/Principal via Directors or VP's 
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# Tertiary Colleges - Level 3 Analysis

**Focus (c) Routes of Communication**

**Factor**  
Case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C1</th>
<th></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th></th>
<th>C3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group types**

- **Written**
  - (S) a a a a a a
  - (T) - - - - a a
  - (A) a a a - - -
  - (P) a b - - - -
  - (C) b a a a a n
  - (E) - - a b a a
  - (G) - - - a - -

- **Verbal**
  - (S) a a a a a a
  - (T) - - - - a a
  - (A) a a a - - -
  - (P) a b - - - -
  - (C) b a a a a a
  - (E) - - a b a a
  - (G) - - - a - -

- **TVEI links**
  - - - - - t1 t2

- **Barriers**
  - b1 b2 b3 b4 b5 b6

- **Isolated groups**
  - GWP - EO - D.TVEI D.TVEI

**Key:**
- **a** = central to participant's role
- **b** = peripheral to participant's role
- **n** = not affecting participant's role

- **t1** = TVEI coord./TVEI Cluster Coordinator's group & TVEI Coordinator's group/TVEI coord.
- **t2** = VP(curriculum & TVEI)/TVEI group in college
- **b1** = DOS meeting/AB via TVEI coord.? & DOS meeting/Principalate group via TVEI coord.?
- **b2** = Teachers & tutors/Principal via HOS/HOD's and DOS team
- **b3** = TVEI coord./EO Committee via INSET coord. & HOF's/EO Committee via AB
- **b4** = Teacher & tutors/Principal via HOD's/HOF's and Senior Tutors & Support Staff/Principal via College Secretary
- **b5** = TVEI pilot group/TVEI coords. via staff in Sci.& Tech.Dept. & Teachers/SMT via TVEI group
- **b6** = VP/Curr.Dev.Support group via Director of Student Services or TVEI enhancement coord. & Teachers/VP via Curric.Dev. Support group 98
## Technical Colleges - Level 3 Analysis

### Focus (c) Routes of Communication

#### Factor Case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group types</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>TVEI links</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Isolated groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSM TSM TSM</td>
<td>TSM TSM TSM</td>
<td>TSM TSM TSM</td>
<td>TSM TSM TSM</td>
<td>b1 b2 b3 b4 b5 b6</td>
<td>TVEI.C TVEI. TVEI. MG CCM C/SHM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key:
- a = central to participant’s role
- b = peripheral to participant’s role
- n = not affecting participant’s role

#### TVEI coord./Ad.Hoc:
- TVEI(INSET) committee
- TVEI coord./Regional post-16 TVEI coords.group
- TVEI coord./Local Coord. group
- TVEI coord./Principal via TVEI Comm./VP(pers.) & TVEI coord./SMT via TVEI Comm./VP(pers.)
- TVEI coord./Principal via VP(pers.) & TVEI coord./SMT via DOS, HOD's/TVEI coords. via DOS
- Ext. TVEI Manager/DAP via TVEI coord.?
- TVEI coord./Principal via DAP & TVEI coord./Course Tutors via DAP
D4. LEVEL 4 - AN OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS IN THE
CONTEXT OF THE SIX RESEARCH QUESTIONS
LEVEL 4 ANALYSIS

1. Summary of previous analyses

   Level 1 - repertory grid analyses using the computer programme, FOCUS were carried out. The perceptions of individual TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers were considered in isolation, as a base line for later comparisons. It was found that the data related to all three research foci.

   Level 2 - an extension of the initial analysis was achieved but, in this case, comparing the perceptions of the TVEI coordinator and Senior Manager within each case study. Other data, in addition to the repertory grid data considered at level 1 analysis, were utilised in this comparison. The results of the analyses were summarised in note-form and as a checklist for use later.

   Level 3 - a more complex analysis in which the three representative case studies (2 Hampshire and one 'distant') for each type of post-16 institution were compared in relation to the initial three foci of the research programme i.e. environment/management structure, perceptions of participants and routes of communication. Areas of commonality and differences were considered for each group of institutions.

2. Level 4 and the research questions

   The analyses completed at level 3 were summarised in a tabular form for each factor within the three foci. The observations were both varied and extensive. They therefore required some form of consolidation within level 4 so that the overall conclusions would be meaningful and of use to colleagues within post-16 institutions.

   Each of the six research questions was answered in relation to data analysed at levels 1-3. A summary and answer section was written in the context of each of the different types of post-16 institutions. Furthermore, the final step i.e. the proposition of a 'post-16 model', was then completed (as an extension of research question 6).

   Although the research questions were not arranged in a chronological order, it was realised that it would be of use to list some 'points to consider in later research questions' at the end a summary section where needed. Such 'points' were seen to assist with discussions in relation to the other research questions.
LEVEL 4 - RESEARCH QUESTION 1.

QUESTION - 'How was the post of the TVEI coordinator integrated within the management structure of the respective post-16 institution?'

11-18 Schools

(i) Environment/Involvement - It was initially assumed that the TVEI coordinators within such post-16 institutions would already be well-integrated within the respective management structures since they had other relatively high-profile roles and had middle or senior management positions (focus [a]). On historical grounds, it could have been concluded that the selection of such staff as TVEI coordinators would be a distinct advantage. However, two out of the three coordinators were not members of the Senior Management Team (SMT) and all three had a relatively narrow perspective of relationships across the management structure (focus [b]). This observation would not support a high degree of integration within the structure.

(ii) Power - The coordinators were not only less-integrated than the Senior Managers within the management structures but perceived that 'power' was held within the SMT and/or by the Headteacher (focus [b]). The location of power in this way was not unexpected but lack of access by the coordinator to such power would presumably affect the degree of success achieved in relation to the implementation of an externally-imposed initiative such as TVEI. The perceptions of the participants about the level of TVEI-success was varied and inconclusive.

(iii) Status/Position - All three coordinators viewed their respective roles as 'pivotal' within the management structure. There was, therefore, some contradiction between integration within the structure and the perception of how the role operated within the same structure. Two out of the three Senior Managers did not share the perception that the TVEI role was pivotal. A more hierarchical approach was understood by the Senior Managers.

With the exception of one coordinator concerned about the temporary nature of the post, the coordinators perceived that their roles were autonomous (focus [b]). The Senior Managers were clearly autonomous with a strong leadership profile.

(iv) Communication - Although the coordinators were not members of the SMT, and therefore not fully integrated within the structure, they did perceive that obtaining information by talking (verbal communication routes - focus [c]) to those members of staff attending meetings of the SMT was central to their roles as coordinators.
It was clearly a necessity of the coordinator's role that the coordinators demonstrated strong links with external TVEI-based groups. It could be concluded that the Senior Managers were somewhat distanced from this level of operation since they did not have this link (focus [c]). Some form of communication was presumably established between the two participants in each case study. No clear barriers to communication had been identified in this respect.

ANSWER - Perceptions differed between the TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers and varied according to other personal responsibilities. However, there did appear to be a low level of integration. The coordinators were not members of the powerful SMT (with the exception of one case study in which this barrier was later removed) and operated with autonomy. Experience of other responsibilities at the middle-senior management level had presumably enabled the coordinators to function with minimal support or line-management.

Sixth Form Colleges

(i) Environment/Involvement - As in the case of the 11-18 Schools, the TVEI coordinators had already been established within the management structure at the middle-senior level. Two of the coordinators were appointed at the current 'senior teacher' level, the third being appointed as a Deputy Principal (focus [a]). On the basis of such information it was again assumed that such coordinators would be well-integrated within the structure.

The situation within the Sixth Form Colleges was different to the 11-18 Schools since two of the three coordinators were members of the SMT. The coordinators were all potentially involved with the operation of this significant management group but none of them were convenors of the SMT, unlike the Senior Managers (focus [b]). The perspective of relationships across the structure varied from one coordinator to another but did reflect the other responsibilities carried out. All three appeared to be relatively well-integrated since they attended a range of cross-college groups eg. EO, RoA and/or were fully aware of the cross-college dimension of TVEI.

(ii) Power - Two of the coordinators were clearly perceived to have much power within their respective management structures (focus [b]). The third coordinator was not seen to be as powerful since the appointment may well have been related to long-service than to some other more appropriate prerequisite. As with the 11-18 Schools, the SMT was again recognised as the 'powerhouse' of the
management structure. One case study did, however, seem to have such power located with the Head of Department (HOD's) group and with the governors.

Unlike the 11-18 Schools, the coordinators therefore had access to the power driving the management structure. It could be assumed that this would be much more advantageous in relation to the success of TVEI-implementation. Success was achieved to a certain degree since two of the three coordinators viewed the initiative to be well-housed, if not hidden, within the college curriculum (focus [b]). This level of success did not seem to be fully supported by the Senior Managers.

(iii) Status/Position - The coordinators were assumed to have a pivotal role within the structure. This was also the case for two out of three Senior Managers (focus [b]). This position of the coordinators did not contradict other evidence about integration but reflected their status and degree of power.

Two out of three coordinators had autonomous roles. This may indicate that, although the individuals concerned were seen to be fully integrated, TVEI was somewhat marginalised. The reality of TVEI-implementation in the context of the integration of a coordinator could well be questioned in relation to the status of one Senior Manager (a Principal) with 'control over all college matters'.

(iv) Communication - The Senior Managers had greater degrees of communication with the SMT than did the coordinators (focus [c]). Furthermore, the coordinators tended to consider paperwork related to the SMT (written communication routes) to be only peripheral to their roles. Presumably many management issues other than TVEI appeared on the agenda of SMT meetings.

As with the 11-18 Schools, the coordinators had strong links with external TVEI-based groups whereas two out of three Senior Managers did not perceive such links (focus [c]). However, unlike the situation in the 11-18 Schools, the coordinators did have direct access to the Senior Managers and would therefore have the opportunity to keep them informed of key TVEI developments. Neither the coordinators or Senior Managers identified barriers with each other (although many other barriers were thought to exist across the various management structures).

ANSWER - In general, the perceptions of the TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers in the context of 'integration of the coordinator' were similar ie. the coordinators were well-integrated. The high profile of the coordinators, due to other more prominent responsibilities eg. Deputy Principal (Curriculum), was seen to be an advantage. The coordinators were members of
the powerful SMT and had access to the Principal. The apparent autonomy of the coordinator's role did, however, imply that although each coordinator was well-integrated within the management structure of each college TVEI was marginalised. Line-management was apparently with the Principal and yet some frustration was demonstrated, most strongly in relation to the lack of support given by the HOD's and to the overall workload.

**Tertiary Colleges**

(i) Environment/Involvement - Two out of the three TVEI coordinators were appointed as lecturers and were therefore not necessarily perceived as being positioned at the middle-senior management level (focus [a]). In relation to the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges with their respective coordinators with other responsibilities, it could be initially assumed that the coordinators within the Tertiary Colleges would be less integrated.

The two coordinators appointed as lecturers were also not members of the SMT, similar to those in the 11-18 Schools but different to those in the Sixth Form Colleges (focus [b]). The third group of coordinators were based at a large Tertiary College (distant case study C3), were appointed at the middle-management level as 'Directors of TVEI' and were also members of the SMT. The environment of the particular Tertiary College therefore directly affected the degree of integration of the coordinator(s), according to the level of appointment. This variation in the degree of integration was also apparently related to the perspective of the coordinators in the context of relationships across the management structure. However, there was some indication that the coordinators tended to have a narrower perspective than their Senior Manager counterparts and tended to focus on personal relationships with TVEI groups (internal and/or external), rather than with other groups across the management structure. This would again imply that TVEI was marginalised, as in the case of the Sixth Form Colleges.

(ii) Power - The power of each coordinator varied from high to relatively low, according to other responsibilities. The degree of power expressed by the coordinators in the Sixth Form Colleges was not evident in the Tertiary Colleges. The Senior Managers were, however, all seen to be powerful (focus [b]). The location of power was again with the SMT (but also with the 'Director's' group in case study C3).

The relatively low-power profile of the coordinators would be expected to relate to reduced success for TVEI-
implementation. In this context, the coordinators failed to consider the success of TVEI in relation to factors such as its value to the college curriculum but considered it as a way of improving relationships with external agencies. The Senior Managers provided a more diverse response, ranging from a tendency to reduce the profile of TVEI to integrating it more fully within the senior management level.

(iii) Status/Position - The coordinators all perceived their roles to be very different to those of the Senior Managers. The coordinators had a pivotal position, whereas the Senior Managers perceived the management structure to be much more hierarchical, with themselves at the 'top'. This difference in perception or reality would clearly affect the implementation of an initiative such as TVEI. The Senior Managers would appear to be either distanced from the initiative or to view the coordinators at the operational rather than strategic level. The reduced degree of integration of the coordinators would seem to be supported by this observation (including case study C3).

The coordinators in case studies C1 and C2 considered their roles to be a relatively low status or viewed their roles as an opportunity for more involvement within the management structure (focus [b]). The four coordinators in case study C3, however, perceived themselves as key figures. The Senior Managers did not support or necessarily contradict such views but also perceived themselves as key figures within the management structure.

(iv) Communication - Although the coordinators were not all members of the SMT, they did consider that the paperwork generated by, and discussions held with, members of the SMT to be central to their role (focus [c]). This was the same situation as in the 11-18 Schools.

It is of interest that two coordinators did not identify TVEI links as part of their respective concept maps. Presumably such links were also central to their role as coordinators. The coordinators in case study C3, however, identified many links with external and internal TVEI-based groups. The complexity of the management of TVEI within this particular case study placed greater emphasis on a strong network to support developments across the college and across the four different TVEI consortia. The Senior Managers tended to communicate directly with the coordinators in all three case studies, rather than with the various TVEI groups. As with the 11-18 Schools, some form of communication route must have been established between the two participants (or more) in each case study. Again, no clear barriers to communication had been identified in this respect (although many other barriers across the management structure were observed).
ANSWER - The situation within the Tertiary Colleges was similar to that in the 11-18 Schools since the coordinators did not appear to be well-integrated in the management structure. However, the possible reasons for this low degree of integration were different. The coordinators were generally not holders of high-profile responsibilities prior to becoming coordinators. As lecturers, they were not part of the SMT (with the exception of the distant case study C3, which was different in many respects due to its size and complexity). The perceptions of TVEI shown by the coordinators and Senior Managers were different and based on very different levels of involvement within the initiative. Nonetheless, the coordinators were thought to have some form of contact with the Principal in each case study so that TVEI developments could be disseminated. Line-management was unclear for the coordinators. Unlike the Senior Managers, the coordinators were unable to rely on powerful figures or groups across the management structure eg. HOD's, governors and the SMT.

Technical Colleges

(i) Environment/Involvement - The 'pattern' found in the Tertiary Colleges was expected to be similar to that in the Technical Colleges because the coordinators were all lecturers with no additional responsibilities at the middle-senior management level (focus [a]). The integration of such coordinators would initially seem to be limited and TVEI-implementation correspondingly disadvantaged.

None of the coordinators were members of the SMT but one was invited on occasion to attend meetings (focus [b]). The Senior Managers (of similar status to each other ie. Deputy or Vice Principals) were coopted members of the SMT but the convening role was that of the Principal. Access to the SMT was therefore open to the Senior Managers but not to the coordinators.

Each coordinator involved with the research programme worked alongside one or more other coordinators within the same institution. The perspective of such coordinators in the context of 'relationships across the structure' was relatively narrow, based mainly on links with their counterparts (focus [[b]]. Only one of the three coordinators recognised a link with the Senior Manager, whereas the Senior Managers clearly linked their work to that of the coordinators. The Senior Managers appeared to adopt a much broader view of various relationships than the coordinators and considered themselves to be the line-managers of the coordinators.

(ii) Power - Two out of three coordinators considered themselves to have some power, but not as much as the three Senior Managers. The power of one coordinator was
significantly reduced at the time of the research (focus [b]). The coordinators perceived that the power was held both by the SMT and the Principal. The Senior Manager, acting as line-manager for one coordinator, was also seen to be in a powerful position. The Senior Managers, like the coordinators, considered that the power was with the SMT but also with other individuals/groups eg. the HOD's.

The lack of access by the coordinators to the position of power in the Technical Colleges was similar to that of the 11-18 Schools and Tertiary Colleges. Again, this was assumed to affect the success of TVEI-implementation. Two out of the three coordinators considered that the success had been reduced by the tensions associated with shifting the management of TVEI from the coordinators to the SMT. The Senior Managers were much more positive about the level of success and linked the initiative to other initiatives such as RoA and to TVEI integration within the curriculum.

(iii) Status/Position - Only the two coordinators based at one case study (D3) clearly viewed the role as pivotal. The other two placed themselves within a relatively complex hierarchical structure with the Senior Manager, Principal and/or SMT at a 'higher' position (focus [b]). The Senior Managers all viewed the structure to be hierarchical but two did perceive themselves to have a pivotal role with direct links to the coordinator(s). The coordinators were therefore not apparently well-integrated within the management structure but their respective Senior Managers, as line-managers, were fully-integrated.

The two coordinators based at one case study (D3) considered that they had been 'demoted' with the shift of TVEI management into the SMT (focus [b]). The other two coordinators viewed the role as a promotion (one was currently expecting to be promoted from lecturer to senior lecturer). The different perceptions of status would likely affect the perceptions of integration within the management structure. The status of the Senior Managers was also variable but there was an indication of autonomy.

(iv) Communication - There was no clear pattern in relation to the routes of communication but there was generally an understanding that the coordinators needed to receive paperwork from, and to have discussions with, the members of the SMT (focus [c]). Since the coordinators were clearly not members of the SMT but all Senior Managers were coopted members, the function of the Senior Managers as line-managers for the coordinators would seem to be particularly relevant. The Senior Managers were effectively acting as an 'interface'
between the coordinators and the SMT/Principal. The coordinators all considered that communication with the SMT was either central or at least peripheral to their respective roles. Unlike the 11-18 Schools and Tertiary Colleges, the coordinators within the Technical Colleges had little opportunity to have access to the Principal.

The links between the coordinators and TVEI-based groups (either internal or external) were not clear. TVEI links were not even considered in some instances. The lack of integration of the coordinators within the management structure led to a somewhat 'grey area' in relation to the responsibility for such links. Were they the responsibility of the coordinator or the line-manager (the Senior Manager)?

Barriers to communication were found between the coordinators and the SMT, Academic Board and/or Principal in all three case studies. This gap in communication was a reflection of the lack of integration of the coordinators and indicated that the Principal of each college was significantly distanced from the implementation of TVEI. In each case study, the barrier to communication was to seen to be 'bridged' by the Senior Manager. This role was apparently critical to the success of TVEI within such a hierarchical structure.

**ANSWER** - The coordinators were not integrated within the management structure. The relatively 'low' status of the coordinators (although possibly viewed as a promotional opportunity) did affect the success of TVEI-implementation. The Senior Managers were similar to each other as Deputy or Vice Principals and were considered to be critical to the management of TVEI as line-managers for the coordinators (more than one in each case study) and as the interface between the operational level of TVEI and the powerful SMT/Principal. The low level of integration of the coordinators was similar to that in the 11-18 Schools and Tertiary Colleges but the size and complexity of the Technical Colleges had led to the need for a second tier of management to enable the initiative to 'filter' through to the most senior management level.

**SUMMARY**: **RESEARCH QUESTION 1.**

The degree of integration of each coordinator was affected by the type of institution in which they were located and by other responsibilities (with a higher profile).

The coordinators based in the 11-18 Schools were already positioned at the middle-senior management level but their apparent lack of involvement with the powerful SMT led to a low degree of integration within the structure. The various high-profile responsibilities, other than TVEI, had enabled the coordinators to have autonomy of role and little or no support (or line-management).
The coordinators based in the Sixth Form Colleges also had other high-profile responsibilities. In this case, this appeared to be particularly advantageous since the coordinators were also members of the SMT and had direct access to the Principal. Line-management with the Principal was available to such coordinators but they tended to be autonomous. It was concluded that TVEI was somewhat marginalised even though the coordinators were fully-integrated within the structure. Nonetheless, it was apparent that the situation in the Sixth Form Colleges was more likely to lead to integration of the initiative in relation to that observed in the other three types of institution.

The Tertiary Colleges were varied in size and complexity. The distant case study (C3) was significantly larger than the other two (C1 & C2) and the involvement of this college in four TVEI consortia led to the appointment of four coordinators. A relatively low degree of integration was observed. With the exception of the coordinators based at case study C3, the low status of the coordinators (as lecturers) and the lack of involvement within the SMT almost led to the isolation of TVEI within such colleges. The coordinators had little access to the Principal and did not have clear line-managers.

The Technical Colleges were generally much larger than the other types of post-16 institutions studied. Teams of two or more coordinators were appointed to manage the various TVEI consortia. The coordinators were not well-integrated within the respective management structures and had a relatively low profile. They lacked direct access to the very powerful SMT and to the equally-powerful Principal. The related Senior Managers acted as line-managers for the teams of coordinators and were seen as critical components of the management structure. TVEI developments were effectively only filtered through to the SMT/Principal via the Senior Managers interviewed. TVEI was therefore not only marginalised in such institutions but it also had a relatively low status.

POINTS TO CONSIDER IN LATER RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. The individual responsibility for the liaison with various TVEI-based groups seemed to vary between institutions and was unclear in some cases.

2. Some TVEI coordinators had an autonomous role whereas others were supported by line-managers. Such line-managers appeared to have greater access to different parts of the management structure than did the coordinators.

3. Although power was clearly located with the SMT and/or the Principal or Headteacher, there was some indication
that the Heads of Department (HOD's) were a particularly strong force.

4. The perceptions of the coordinators and Senior Managers differed and reflected the level of involvement within the initiative.

5. Barriers to communication existed in many cases, sometimes 'bridged' by line-managers.
LEVEL 4 - RESEARCH QUESTION 2.

QUESTION - 'Was there a link between the type/size of the post-16 institution and the type of management 'model' identified?'

11-18 Schools

(i) 'Model' shape

The 11-18 Schools had numbers of students ranging from 400 to 985. There was therefore a great variation in the size of such schools. Although not all students were involved in TVEI, since students within the 11-14 age range were also included in the total number, the number could be assumed to indicate the size and complexity of the management model required to support the student 'body'.

There was a possibility that the size of the school may have been related to the size of the local TVEI consortium in which the school was positioned and thus have some effect on the complexity of the school management model. There did, however, not appear to be a clear pattern in this respect eg. one school with 400 students was located in a consortium with nine 11-16 Schools plus one Technical College, whereas a second school with 985 students was involved with a consortium containing only one Technical College and one Sixth Form College.

There was no clear pattern in relation to the 'shape' of the model and the size of the respective school. A mixed model was identified by both the coordinator and Senior Manager in a school with 630 students (A1). In comparison, the two participants in a different school (A2) with 985 students viewed the model as vertical. The third school (A3) with the least number of students ie. 400 was perceived to have a mixed model by the coordinator and a vertical model by the Senior Manager. The different perceptions could, in this case, reflect the 'position' of each participant within the model rather than the reality of its operation.

Another group of coordinators within Hampshire completed concept maps only (without further data). The coordinators were not interviewed and had received a written request to complete a concept map. Three coordinators from 11-18 Schools responded to the request (Appendix 5) and constructed their respective concept maps. Two of the coordinators viewed the management model as vertical and one as mixed. Again, as in the data obtained from the three case studies, there did not appear to be a clear pattern.
(ii) Key groups

A second way in which the type of model could be determined was in the identification of key groups. Seven different 'types' of groups had already been recognised (p 78) and were placed into one of three categories (high, mid and low profiles) within the level 3 analysis [focus (a), p 82].

Using the collective data from the repertory grids of the coordinators and Senior Managers (p 82), the groups with the highest profile were seen to be the SMT (S), pastoral or tutorial (P) and curricular (C) groups. The mid profile groups were those of the Academic Board or Policy-forming (A) and external (E) groups. The lowest profiles were associated with the governors (G), other (O) and TVEI (T) groups. It is of interest that the TVEI groups received the lowest profile within the 11-18 Schools.

(iii) Superior positions

Those individuals or groups perceived to have a 'top' position within the management model were considered to have a 'superior position'. The models (represented by concept maps) for three out of the six case studies had the SMT in such a position, reflecting the powerful status of this group (as described in level 4 - question 1). One case study (A3) was seen to have the Headteacher in a superior position, identified by the Senior Manager (Headteacher).

The final case study (A1) was perceived by the Senior Manager (also the Headteacher) to have a pastoral group in the superior position. This reinforced the high profile of this type of management group within the 11-18 Schools, as stated above.

SUMMARY - The 11-18 Schools did not appear to have a clear relationship between the size of the school and the shape of management model. The models were, however, all perceived to be either vertical or mixed. There was an indication that the relative 'position' of the coordinator or Senior Manager within the model may have affected the shape of model perceived.

The key groups with the highest profile were the SMT, Pastoral and Curricular groups. The TVEI groups were amongst those with the lowest profiles.

The SMT had a superior position within a number of concept maps. The school governors had a low profile and yet were recognised to have a superior position by one coordinator. The high profile of the Pastoral groups was supported further by a superior position within the model constructed for one case study.
Sixth Form Colleges

(i) 'Model' shape

With the exception of one case study (B3), the Sixth Form Colleges were much larger than the 11-18 Schools. Although the size range of 600-1200 overlapped with that of the schools (400-985) it is of significance that all students within the Sixth Form Colleges were affected by the management of TVEI-implementation. The size and complexity of the management model was therefore expected to be different.

Four of the concept maps constructed by the participants within the Sixth Form Colleges were vertical and two were mixed. As in the case of the 11-18 Schools, there was no clear correlation between the size of the institution and the shape of the model since the two types of model were perceived within the same colleges (B2 and B3). The coordinator and Senior Manager within the largest college (B1) did, however, both identify a vertical model. Was there some form of relationship between the increased size of a college and the adoption of a vertical model?

There was no relationship between the type of model perceived and the 'position' of the participant since five out of the six participants viewed themselves to have a pivotal role. The nature of the TVEI consortium in which the institution was based also appeared not to be related to the size of the institution or to have an effect on the shape of the model. All Sixth Form Colleges were, however, associated with TVEI consortia containing one Technical College.

Only one coordinator based in a Sixth Form College (other than those involved in the case studies) responded to the written request to construct a concept map, as described above (p 111). This coordinator also perceived the management model to be vertical.

(ii) Key groups

As with the 11-18 Schools, the key groups with the highest profiles were the SMT (S) and curricular (C) groups. The situation within the Sixth Form Colleges was perceived to be somewhat different because the pastoral (P) groups had a slightly lower profile and some other (O) groups eg. INSET had a higher profile.

The TVEI (T) groups were again perceived as having one of the lowest profiles.

(iii) Superior positions

Five out of the six participants within the case studies identified the Principal and/or the SMT to have a superior position within the concept maps drawn to
represent the management models. The college Principals were seen to have a powerful position, as described earlier (level 4 - question 1). One Senior Manager based within case study B2 viewed the 'teachers in the departments' as the holders of the superior position. It is of interest that the Heads of Department (HOD's) were also perceived to be more superior to the SMT. This curricular group, described above as having a high profile (ii) could be considered as a relatively powerful force within this particular case study. This observation had been made earlier as an extension of the answer to research question 1 (p 110).

SUMMARY - The Sixth Form Colleges were generally much larger than the 11-18 Schools. Although both vertical and mixed models were identified, more participants perceived such models to be vertical. There was an indication that the larger colleges may have adopted a vertical model (the data was not conclusive in this respect). There did not appear to be a relationship between the position of the coordinator or Senior Manager within the model and the perceived shape of the model.

Like the 11-18 Schools, the groups with the highest profiles were the SMT and Curricular groups. The TVEI groups were also viewed as having one of the lowest profiles. The high profile of the pastoral groups, seen in the 11-18 Schools, was not apparent within the models of the Sixth Form Colleges.

The Principals were seen to be powerful figures and occupied superior positions along with the SMT in most models. Only, in one case study were the teachers and the HOD's seen to have such a position. This observation supported the high profile of curricular groups identified within the other Sixth Form Colleges.

Tertiary Colleges

(i) 'Model' shape

The Tertiary Colleges were larger than the 11-18 Schools and similar in size to the Sixth Form Colleges. One case study (C3) was particularly large with 1400 students. On the basis of size alone it was therefore expected that the type of management model of the Tertiary Colleges would be similar to that of the Sixth Form Colleges.

The size of the respective consortium in which each Tertiary College was located was relatively uniform for two case studies (C1 and C2). They had a similar number of students and were both associated with a single consortium of 4 to 6 schools. However, case study C2 was also linked to a local Technical College. The third, larger college (C3) was very different since it was a member of four different consortia containing 6 to 10 schools (without associated Technical Colleges). The
management model of case study C3 was therefore anticipated to be somewhat different.

There was, however, no clear pattern between the size of Tertiary Colleges, the form of the local TVEI consortia and the perceived shape of the management models. As with the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges, both mixed and vertical models were constructed by the various participants. In fact, both types were perceived within each of the three case studies.

In the case of the Tertiary Colleges, there was a relationship between the location of the participant within the model and the shape of the model perceived. All coordinators viewed themselves to have a pivotal position and constructed mixed models. The Senior Managers had a linear position within their respective vertical models. The shape of the model, as perceived by the Senior Managers, was therefore much more hierarchical than that of the coordinators. It is of interest that the relationship between the increased size of a college and the perceived adoption of a vertical model (observed for Sixth Form Colleges) was not apparent.

The two coordinators responding to the written request to complete a concept map (Appendix 5) viewed the models to be vertical in one case (G1) and mixed in the other (G2). The vertical model was drawn by a coordinator also appointed as a Head of Department. This particular participant could therefore also be considered as a Senior Manager.

(ii) Key groups

The high profile of SMT (S) and curricular (C) groups observed within the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges was repeated in the Tertiary Colleges. The Academic Board (A) and external (E) groups were also considered to have a high profile in the Tertiary Colleges. The Academic Board (or Policy Group) was seen to be a much more integral part of the model in such colleges.

The TVEI (T) groups were again found to have one of the lowest profiles within the management models constructed. The pastoral groups had a high profile in the 11-18 Schools, slightly lower profile in the Sixth Form Colleges but a much lower profile in the Tertiary Colleges.

(iii) Superior positions

Four out of the six case studies had the Principal located in a superior position within the management model. As with the Sixth Form Colleges, the powerful figure of the Principal was apparent. It is of interest that pastoral groups were generally given a low profile and yet one case study (C1) had this type of group in a
superior position. The perception of a local TVEI Management Group within the largest case study (C3), involved with four different TVEI consortia, was not unexpected.

SUMMARY

The Tertiary Colleges were a similar size to the Sixth Form Colleges and were generally not located within TVEI consortia containing Technical Colleges. There was no clear relationship between the size of the college and the shape of the management model.

Almost all TVEI coordinators perceived the models to have a mixed shape whereas the Senior Managers viewed them as vertical. This difference was related to the relative position of each participant within the management model. The coordinators were seen by themselves to have a pivotal role but the Senior Managers had a linear position.

As with the other post-16 institutions considered so far, the SMT and curricular groups had a high profile. The TVEI groups also had one of the lowest profiles (with perhaps the exception of one large college associated with four different TVEI consortia). The situation in the Sixth Form Colleges was seen to develop further in the Tertiary Colleges since the pastoral groups were perceived as having even lower profiles.

The Principals were observed to be powerful figures. They occupied superior positions in many models.

Technical Colleges

(i) 'Model' shape

With the exception of one case study (D2), the Technical Colleges were significantly larger than the Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges. It was anticipated that the shape and associated features of the models in Technical Colleges may be different to the other colleges.

The Technical Colleges were all associated with two or three different TVEI consortia. The size of the college was not related to membership of a particular number of consortia since the largest college was involved with two consortia and the smallest with three consortia. The Hampshire case studies (D1 and D2) were found to have Sixth Form Colleges as partners within the consortia but this was not the situation in the distant case study (D3). There did not appear to be a relationship between the nature of the consortia-clusters and the shape of management model identified within the Technical Colleges.
Three participants perceived the models to be mixed and three viewed them as vertical. Unlike the situation in the Sixth Form Colleges, the position of the coordinator or Senior Manager within the case study models did not correlate with the shape of model perceived.

The three coordinators that responded to the written request to construct a concept map (Appendix 5) all had a pivotal position within the model and viewed the models to have a vertical shape. There was therefore a tendency overall for the Technical Colleges to adopt a vertical model.

(ii) Key groups

The SMT (S) groups had a high profile as in the three other types of post-16 institutions. However, unlike the other institutions, the Technical Colleges had the curricular (C) groups with a slightly lower profile along with the pastoral groups.

The Tertiary and Technical Colleges were similar since the participants perceived the Academic Board or Policy-forming (A) groups to have a high profile. The Technical Colleges, however, also had various other (O) groups eg. Special Needs groups sharing this profile.

The TVEI (T) groups had a higher profile within the Technical Colleges than within the other institutions.

(iii) Superior positions

The three Senior Managers all recognised the Principal to have a superior position within the management model. This supported the pattern already observed in the Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges. The coordinators perceived other individuals or groups to occupy this position. One coordinator referred to the Academic Board (plus governors) in this context, thereby supporting the view that this was a powerful group within such colleges as stated above (ii). A second coordinator perceived the college-based Record of Achievement (RoA) group to have a superior position, whereas the third coordinator referred to the immediate line-manager (the Deputy Assistant Principal) as superior. The coordinators within the case studies may therefore have failed to recognise the Principal as having the greatest power.

Two of the three coordinators responding to the written request to construct a concept map (Appendix 5) also failed to place the Principal at the most superior position. Again, one focused on the Academic Board and the second on the Governing Body.
SUMMARY

The Technical Colleges were generally larger than the other post-16 institutions studied. There was no clear relationship between the size of the college, the membership of various TVEI consortia and the shape of the management model. However, such colleges were all involved in 2 or more consortia.

The data was unclear in the context of model shape but there was a tendency for the model to be perceived as vertical.

The SMT was seen to have one of the highest profiles, as in the case of all other post-16 institutions. However, the participants within the Technical Colleges appeared to view curricular groups at a slightly lower profile along with the pastoral groups. The TVEI groups did have a higher profile than those considered within the other types of institutions. The Academic Board was not a common feature of 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges but had a higher profile in both the Tertiary and Technical Colleges.

The Principal was recognised as a powerful figure within the models constructed by the Senior Managers but was generally not recognised as such by the coordinators.

ANSWER: RESEARCH QUESTION 2.

There was a link between the type/size of the post-16 institution and the type of management model identified. The 'type' of model was divided into three categories; shape, key groups and superior positions.

The shape of model for 11-18 schools was either mixed or vertical with some indication that the position of the coordinator or Senior Manager (within the model) may have had some effect on the perceptions expressed. Both types of models were also identified in Sixth Form Colleges but with a tendency towards the vertical type, particularly in the case of larger colleges. Although the Tertiary Colleges were similar in size to the Sixth Form Colleges, a different pattern of data was obtained. The coordinators perceived the model shape to be mixed whereas the Senior Managers viewed the shape to be vertical. The 'linear' position of such Managers was apparently reflected in an understanding that the model operated in an hierarchical way. It is of interest that many Sixth Form Colleges have tended to stem from 11-18 Schools (and therefore may be expected to have some similarity in relation to management models) but Tertiary Colleges have often had different origins (with the result that the models of such colleges operate in a different way).
The Technical Colleges have not stemmed from other, current post-16 origins and would therefore be expected to be very different from the other institutions. The data was unclear but it was apparent that the larger Technical Colleges studied tended to adopt vertical models.

All post-16 institutions studied demonstrated that the SMT was the most powerful group with the highest profile. Curricular groups, perhaps best considered as the backbone of the management model, were also seen to have a high profile in the institutions with the exception of the Technical Colleges. It was indicated that such colleges allowed other management groups to 'get in the way' of the curricular groups.

The pastoral aspect of the management model was clear within the 11-18 Schools, perhaps relating to the perceived pastoral support needed for the pre-14 age range. The Sixth Form Colleges appeared to recognise the operation of pastoral groups but with a slightly lower profile. This would further support the suggestion that the models of such colleges were a 'carry over' from their school origins. Tertiary Colleges did not appear to view pastoral groups as critical to the operation of the management model and yet they had a slightly higher profile within the Technical Colleges.

The profile of the TVEI groups was of significance. These groups had one of the lowest profiles in 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges. This would not necessarily imply that TVEI had been totally integrated within the management model but that the initiative had been perceived as having a low status. Earlier data had supported this observation (Level 4 - question 1). The involvement of the Technical Colleges within two or more TVEI consortia did result in a more explicit presence of TVEI groups within the models. This had also been observed in a particularly large Tertiary College (C3) involved in four different consortia. The size and complexity of such institutions had resulted in a need for at least some recognition of TVEI management.

The SMT had been seen to occupy a superior position in virtually all institutions. The Principals of the Sixth Form and Tertiary Colleges also occupied this position and were therefore perceived to be powerful figures. It was probably as a result of the size of the Technical Colleges together with the 'distance' apparent between the coordinators and Principals (Level 4 - question 1) that the coordinators tended to view other individuals or groups as superior. It is a reflection of perhaps a lack of 'recognition' of the coordinators, by the Senior Managers and Principals, that such differences in perceptions existed within these colleges.
LEVEL 4 - RESEARCH QUESTION 3.

QUESTION - 'How were the various groups within each management model perceived to relate to each other ?'

11-18 Schools

(i) Strong relationships

The identification of such relationships was based on the links observed as a result of the repertory grid FOCUS analysis. Those specific groups within the arbitrary range of 100-80 'units' of commonality on each element tree were considered and categorised as group 'types'[focus (b)]. The method of determining the type of group was described earlier (p 78).

Within the 11-18 Schools, the coordinators showed strong links between the pastoral (P), curricular (C) and external (E) groups. The SMT (S) groups, of which the coordinators tended not to be members, were only linked to the other three types to a limited degree.

The Senior Managers also identified strong links between the P and C groups, supporting the earlier conclusion about the relevance of these groups within the 11-18 Schools (p 112). Such Managers, however, also found the SMT and other (O) groups to be linked at this high degree of commonality.

(ii) Isolated groups

Those groups not linked to other groups, and therefore not included within the clusters identified on the repertory grid element trees, were described as 'isolated groups' (p 68).

Not all coordinators and Senior Managers identified isolated groups. Two of the coordinators (A1 and A3) isolated the groups from which they were somewhat distanced eg. Policy Review Group and School Policy Committee. The third coordinator considered one group relating to other personal responsibilities ie. Primary Liaison Group and one relating to the autonomy of TVEI management ie. TVEI Steering Group as being isolated.

One Senior Manager (A1) perceived a group of Cross-curricular working parties to be isolated. This isolation appeared to be related to being distanced from the operation of such working parties. A second Senior Manager (A2) isolated an Administration Group. The Manager was directly involved with the operation of this group due to main areas of personal responsibility.
SUMMARY

The curricular and pastoral groups were found to be clearly linked to each other. The SMT groups were also linked to such groups, but only as perceived by the Senior Managers.

Isolated groups were identified by both coordinators and Senior Managers for apparently one of two reasons. Some groups were perceived as being different from others due to their relationship with the personal responsibilities of the participants. Other groups were isolated because the participant was 'distanced' from their operation and was therefore unable to apply personal constructs to the same extent as that for more familiar groups.

Sixth Form Colleges

(i) Strong relationships

The coordinators perceived relatively strong links between the SMT and curricular (C) and/or TVEI (T) groups. Pastoral (P) groups were only linked to the curricular groups to a lesser extent [focus (b)].

The perceptions of the Senior Managers within the Sixth Form Colleges were less clear. There was, however, a tendency for links to be established between SMT and curricular groups as with the coordinators. The TVEI, pastoral and curricular groups were again only linked to a lesser extent.

(ii) Isolated groups

Not all coordinators and Senior Managers isolated groups on the basis of lack of commonality with other groups within the management model. This was the case for both participants based at distant case study B3.

The coordinator in one case study (B1) viewed the Academic Board to be somewhat isolated, due to lack of involvement and the perception that the group was 'ineffective'. A second coordinator (B2) considered a relatively new group, Insights into Work (ITOW) group, to be isolated from the other groups elicited. This was also due to the group being perceived as being ineffective.

Only one Senior Manager viewed some groups to be isolated (B2). The groups were those of the Heads of Department (HOD) and SMT. The Senior Manager considered these groups to be effective and responsible for policy-formation and was very much involved in their operation.

SUMMARY

In comparison to the 11-18 Schools, the participants within the Sixth Form Colleges perceived the SMT and
curricular groups to be clearly linked. Pastoral and TVEI groups were only linked to the curricular groups to a lesser extent.

Isolated groups were identified by the participants within two out of three case studies. One of the common reasons for establishing this isolation was that of effectiveness. The coordinators regarded two very different groups to be isolated because they were perceived to be ineffective and, in one case, because the coordinator was distanced from the operation of the group.

It is of interest that one of the Senior Managers viewed both the HOD and SMT groups to be isolated due to being effective and being responsible for policy-formation. It is likely that the Manager considered personal responsibilities to overlap with such constructs.

Tertiary Colleges

(i) Strong relationships

The coordinators appeared to perceive links between curricular (C) and other groups. There was no clear pattern but the other groups included the TVEI (T) and Academic Board (A) groups [focus (b)].

The results obtained from the Senior Managers were also not clear but involved the curricular groups again. As with the coordinators, the Managers also referred to the TVEI and Academic Board groups in the context of relationships with the curricular groups. Pastoral (P) groups were considered to have some form of link with the curricular groups, but to a lesser extent.

(ii) Isolated groups

Two Senior Managers (C1 and C2) did not consider any of their respective management groups to be isolated from the others elicited via the repertory grid. The third Senior Manager, based at the large distant case study C3, considered an internal Directors/TVEI coordinators meeting (D.TVEI) to be somewhat isolated. This was also the case for the four coordinators based at the institution. The reasons for this view of isolation were varied but one common factor was that of membership and direct involvement.

One coordinator (C1) considered a GCSE Working Party (GWP) to be isolated partly because it was non-financial and also because it was the only group to be TVEI-initiated. Various other constructs were used to isolate the group. A second coordinator (C2) viewed a very different type of group, an Equal Opportunities group (EO), to be isolated also due to its non-financial
status. The coordinator was appointed as a Senior Manager and referred to the construct of 'Senior Management membership' to identify this group further.

**SUMMARY**

The coordinators and Senior Managers focused on the curricular groups in the context of 'strong' relationships with various groups. The other groups involved were those of the Academic Board and TVEI. There was some indication that pastoral groups were related to the others but this was unclear.

Isolated groups were varied. There was a greater tendency for coordinators to isolate groups rather than the Senior Managers. The construct used to isolate groups by two coordinators based at different institutions was that of 'non-financial', together with 'TVEI-initiated' in one case. The four coordinators and Senior Manager based at another institution isolated a TVEI-based group in which they were all directly involved as members.

**Technical Colleges**

(i) **Strong relationships**

No clear pattern was observed for the coordinators based in Technical Colleges. Only one coordinator expressed relationships between groups with a 'high' degree of commonality (i.e. using arbitrary units of 100-80). The links, in this case, were between the Academic Board (A), external (E) and other (O) groups [focus (b)].

Two out of three Senior Managers perceived relatively strong relationships between curricular (C) and other (O) groups but not particularly with the Academic Board, SMT, pastoral or TVEI groups.

(ii) **Isolated groups**

Three out of the four coordinators completing repertory grids (two of which were based at the distant case study D3) did not identify isolated groups. The remaining coordinator (D2) viewed a TVEI-based group with an external function, the TVEI Management Group (TVEI.MG), to be isolated. The constructs used to isolate this group reflected friction within the group, lack of involvement of the coordinator and the perception that the group was ineffective.

Two out of three Senior Managers within the Technical Colleges also isolated TVEI-based groups. The groups both related to an internal-liaison function and consisted of the various institutional coordinators. Various constructs were identified in relation to the groups, including the lack of 'friction' and 'antagonism'.
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SUMMARY

The participants generally failed to identify particularly strong links between the various groups elicited. The coordinators did not have the same view as the Senior Managers. Curricular groups were seen to have some form of link with groups other than the SMT, Academic Board, Pastoral and TVEI groups.

Only one coordinator identified an isolated group. It is of interest that the group was TVEI-based. This was also a feature of the repertory grids completed by two Senior Managers interviewed within the Technical Colleges. The constructs associated with these groups varied but the difference was mostly reflected in the external function of the group identified by the coordinator as having friction, being ineffective and not being personally involved. The Senior Managers, however, both viewed their respective TVEI groups as either 'most cooperative' or 'less antagonistic' than other groups.

ANSWER : RESEARCH QUESTION 3.

The various groups within each of the four types of post-16 institutions did relate to each other to varying degrees. Relationships were not found to be simple and often stemmed from many personal constructs (as seen in the complexity of the level 1 analysis, Appendix 7).

In order to provide an understanding of the range of relationships identified the two extremes, from the groups with 'strong relationships' (those with a high degree of commonality) to 'isolated groups' (those with no or very little commonality with other groups) were examined.

The high profile of the curricular and pastoral groups within the 11-18 Schools discussed earlier (p 112) was reinforced by the strong relationship between these two groups. The Senior Managers within such schools also perceived the SMT groups to be closely linked to the curricular and pastoral groups. Again, the SMT had also been found to have a high profile (p 112). TVEI groups were not closely linked to other groups.

A clear link was also found between the SMT and curricular groups within the Sixth Form Colleges. The 'carry over' of the school management model into the Sixth Form Colleges referred to earlier (p 118) was supported by this link, but the pastoral 'theme' was not apparent. Again, TVEI groups were not strongly linked to the other groups elicited.

The situation in the Tertiary Colleges was different to that in the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges. Although there was a possibility that pastoral groups may be related to the operation of other groups in such
colleges, their significance was unclear. The situation was also unclear in the context of links between the SMT curricular, Academic Board and TVEI groups. Curricular groups were, however, seen to be relatively central to the operation of the various management models.

The participants within the Technical Colleges, as for those in the Tertiary Colleges, generally failed to identify strong links between specific types of groups. Curricular groups were seen to link with groups other than the SMT, pastoral, Academic Board and TVEI groups. The two types of colleges were therefore similar since the constructs identified by the participants tended to lead to low levels of commonality between the management groups. Why was this observation recorded?

One possible answer could relate to the size and complexity of the two types of colleges and to the very extensive curriculum. In comparison to the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges the curriculum found in the Tertiary and Technical Colleges is broad and contains both vocational and academic strands. The management of the vocational courses, in particular, is often predetermined by the validating bodies and is very different to that of the academic courses. The management groups responsible for the vocational provision, eg. Section Team Meetings, would therefore be perceived in a different way to other groups.

In relation to 'isolated groups', the participants based at the 11-18 Schools did not demonstrate the isolation of one particular type of group. The constructs used to isolate groups included personal responsibilities and being 'distanced' from such groups.

As in the 11-18 Schools, the participants in the Sixth Form Colleges failed to isolate the same type of group in more than one case study. Again, the construct of feeling distanced from such groups was the basis of the group isolation. This could reflect a lack of understanding about the operation of groups in which the participants were not actively involved. This seemed to support the conclusion that there was a low degree of integration of the coordinators within the 11-18 Schools, observed earlier (p 102) but contradicts the observation that the coordinators in the Sixth Form Colleges were fully-integrated within the management model (p 109).

The perceived isolation of groups within the Technical Colleges was varied. Two constructs used in this context were 'non-financial' and 'TVEI-initiated'. The financial aspect was of interest since one participant had considered TVEI as a source of funding (p 92) but more interesting was the reference to TVEI as a basis for the isolation of management groups. This point relates to the earlier observation that TVEI was isolated, as an initiative, within this type of college (p 109).
The Technical Colleges had seemingly taken this aspect a stage further than the Tertiary Colleges since those participants that had identified isolated groups had referred solely to TVEI-based groups. The constructs relating to these groups were based on friction/antagonism and cooperation. Although different perspectives were expressed, the working-relations within the TVEI groups were important. The Technical Colleges were therefore seen to marginalise TVEI within the management model, as discussed earlier (p 109).
LEVEL 4 - RESEARCH QUESTION 4.

QUESTION - 'How were the routes of communication perceived to operate across each management model?'

11-18 Schools

(i) Group types

The relevance of communication between the participants and the SMT was discussed earlier (p 108-109) in the context of coordinator-integration within the management model. TVEI links and barriers to communication were also considered in this respect.

The perception of routes of communication across the entire management model must relate to all seven group types identified. The relevance of receiving paperwork generated by such groups (written communication) and of discussing the agenda and outcome of meetings with those present (verbal communication) was therefore considered for the coordinators and Senior Managers.

In the 11-18 Schools, written and verbal communication with most of the groups was considered to be 'central' to the role of both the coordinators and Senior Managers. All participants received paperwork from the curricular groups but two of the Senior Managers considered this communication route to be only 'peripheral' to their roles. Communication with TVEI groups appeared to be limited and there was no clear pattern for the communication routes with the SMT.

There was a greater overall dependence on verbal communication routes for the SMT and pastoral groups.

(ii) Main routes

Not all participants interviewed within the case studies provided details of how frequently they 'communicated' with various groups or the nature of that communication. Such information was included as a 'key' to the links shown on the concept maps. Since the construction of such concept maps was in the form of a free-response, with limited guidance, the use of a key was subject to the participant's own perceptions (Appendix 4).

Five out of the six participants based at the 11-18 Schools attempted to identify the frequency and nature of communication routes across the management model (Appendix 11). There was no clear pattern in relation to the frequency of meetings held with various groups. However, two out of the three coordinators failed to identify communication routes with a number of groups. The third coordinator described frequent meetings with many groups.
Two Senior Managers attended the meetings of many groups within their respective models, one (A3) was seen to keep in contact with various parts of the model by informal meetings. The second of the two Managers (A1) noted a feeling of being somewhat distanced from the operation of the Heads of Department (HOD's) meeting.

SUMMARY

In general, communication with the various 'key groups' was considered to be central to the role of the participants. However, there was an indication that the Senior Managers viewed the communication with curricular groups to be of peripheral importance. TVEI groups were not perceived as being significantly important in terms of overall communication and the links with the SMT group varied greatly.

The coordinators were found to be distanced from the operation of various groups, but this was not always the case. Two Senior Managers attended many meetings and one of them used informal routes of communication to keep informed. This 'informality' related to the greater overall dependence on verbal communication routes described above. There was a suggestion that the Heads of Department group was viewed in a different way to other groups.

Sixth Form Colleges

(i) Group types

As in the 11-18 Schools, the participants based at the Sixth Form Colleges generally considered communication with the majority of group types to be central to their roles. Differences, were observed between the coordinators and Senior Managers in relation to communication with the SMT, pastoral and curricular groups.

The Senior Managers relied much more on written communication with the pastoral and curricular groups than did the coordinators. This may imply that they were somewhat distanced from the operation of such groups. The Senior Managers were also observed to view communication with the college governors to be central to their various responsibilities in some cases.

(ii) Main routes

It was noted earlier that the coordinators within the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges were already well-established at the middle-senior management level at the time of being appointed as coordinators (p 102). However, the coordinators based at the Sixth Form Colleges were much more involved with the operation of various groups across the management model. One coordinator failed to
identify the nature of communication routes within the model (B1) whereas the other two coordinators communicated frequently with many groups, including the powerful groups eg. SMT. The perception of the coordinators being 'distanced' from groups was not apparent in such colleges.

The Heads of Department (HOD's) group was observed as a group that received information from the coordinator but not to reciprocate (B2). This high-profile curriculum group, as in the case of the Heads of Division group based at another college (B1), was also found to be the communication link between the respective Senior Managers and the teaching staff. This type of group was therefore perceived as different from other groups in both 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges.

Two Senior Managers had strong and frequent communication routes with the powerful groups/individuals eg. SMT and Principal. The third Manager did not use a key to show the nature of communication involved within the model (B3) but the links with the other Senior Managers were very clear.

SUMMARY

Although communication with various groups was found to be central to the roles of the participants, different perceptions were expressed for the coordinators in comparison with the Senior Managers. There was a suggestion that the Senior Managers were less directly involved with the operation of pastoral and curricular groups than were the coordinators. The Managers tended to rely more on written than verbal communication for such groups.

The coordinators in the Sixth Form Colleges were similar to those of the 11-18 Schools in many respects (p 102). Indeed, some may well have held similar responsibilities at the middle-senior management level within such schools. The communication routes between the coordinators within the colleges were, however, much more 'open'. They did not seem to be significantly distanced from the operation of the various groups including the powerful SMT group. This observation was recorded earlier in the context of 'integration', of the coordinators (p 109).

The different perceptions relating to the operation of the HOD's group was of interest. This group did seem to be a powerful group and was probably a 'carry over' of a much more significant role within the 11-18 Schools. The lack of a two-way communication route expressed by one coordinator with the HOD's group may even indicate some resistance to TVEI as a curriculum initiative.
The Senior Managers were seen to have a clear communication route with other Senior Managers and their powerful groups.

Tertiary Colleges

(i) Group types

Almost all participants considered verbal communication routes to be of equal importance to written routes. Communication with the SMT, Academic Board and curricular groups was viewed as central to the roles of the coordinators and Senior Managers. With the exception of those participants based at the larger college (C3), communication with the TVEI groups was limited.

Communication routes with the pastoral groups was unclear but did appear to be somewhat limited.

(ii) Main routes

The coordinators were in direct contact with many groups within the management models constructed. There was an indication that only paperwork was received from some groups (C1), often those with much power eg. SMT. Two coordinators from different colleges (C1 and C2) attempted to identify the nature of communication with the main curriculum groups. In one case (C1), the Heads of Faculty only 'received' information from the coordinator thereby preventing a two-way communication route.

The four coordinators based at case study C3 presented different communication routes with the various groups identified. The models appeared to be relatively complex and the communication was via paperwork and informal conversations, rather than via formal meetings. The coordinators tended to 'report to' their line-manager, the Senior Manager interviewed.

The Senior Managers based at two colleges (C1 and C2) were clearly distanced from the teachers/lecturers. The third Manager (C3) also seemed to be distanced from the operation of the teachers but perceived them to represent the key 'path of change'.

One Manager appeared to use the contact with the Heads of Department (HOD's) to 'manage' them, whereas the second Manager liaised with the HOD's only via the Faculty Heads.

SUMMARY

The value of communication between the coordinators or Senior Managers with the SMT, Academic Board and curricular groups was unexpected. Although the three
groups had been seen earlier (p 115) to have a high profile within the Tertiary Colleges the coordinators tended not to be members of them. It is of interest that coordinators viewed the operation of these groups, nonetheless, to be central to their roles.

The main routes of communication available to the coordinators generally reflected their low status within the college hierarchy. One only received paperwork from the powerful SMT group and another gave information to a Heads of Faculty group without feedback. This situation supported earlier observations about the low level of integration of the coordinators within the Tertiary Colleges (p 106). Even within the largest of the three colleges (C3), in which the coordinators appeared to have a higher profile, the coordinators 'reported to' their line-manager.

The Senior Managers were all distanced from the teachers/lecturers but had strong communication routes with other Managers and their groups. The position of the Heads of Department (HOD's) group within the various routes of communication was questionable. As in the case of both the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges, this group seemed to be significant. In one Tertiary College the group was 'managed' by the Senior Manager whereas in another the communication route was 'bridged' via the Heads of Faculty.

Technical Colleges

(i) Group types

The perceptions of communication routes with the SMT and Academic Board groups were varied. No clear pattern emerged from the data for all group types. The Senior Managers did, however, consider both written and verbal communication with the TVEI groups to be central to their respective roles. The views of the coordinators were unclear in relation to communication with such groups.

The coordinators considered that communication with the pastoral groups was relatively important but this was not the case for the Senior Managers. In contrast, the Senior Managers valued communication with curricular groups more highly than did the coordinators.

The perceptions of the routes of communication across the management models within the Technical Colleges were therefore related to the 'type' of participant interviewed.

(ii) Main routes

All participants used keys to identify the nature of the communication routes within their management models.
More than one coordinator was appointed within each of the Technical Colleges studied. Communication between coordinators was observed in each case study and was described as 'regular', 'two way' and 'close'.

The coordinators showed communication routes with many groups across the management models. One (D1) failed to identify a direct link with the Heads of Department (HOD's) group, Principal and Academic Board whereas another (D2) did not communicate directly with the TVEI Management group.

The Senior Managers found communication routes with the Principal to be 'easy' and 'frequent'. Two Managers did not communicate directly with the teachers/lecturers (D1 and D3) and communication with the coordinators was variable. One Manager considered that the institutional coordinators could not be seen as frequently as once per week. This Manager and others interviewed were effectively the line-managers for the coordinators (p 106).

It is of interest that two coordinators (D3) considered the communication route with their line-manager to be one-way and another coordinator (D2) viewed the route to be primarily informal.

**SUMMARY**

The perceptions of the coordinators differed from those of the Senior Managers. The coordinators did not generally consider the communication route with the various TVEI and curricular groups to be as central to their role in comparison to that perceived by the Managers. The Managers did not value communication with pastoral groups to the same extent as did the coordinators.

One of the main routes of communication for each coordinator was with the other coordinator(s) within the same college. This communication route was valued. The coordinators were not found to have a direct link with powerful groups within some management models. Such groups included the Academic Board and Principal but in one case included a TVEI Management group, in which the Principal was invited to attend. This would further reinforce the conclusion that coordinators were somewhat isolated within the management models of Technical Colleges, as discussed earlier (p 108).

The Senior Managers were distanced from the teachers/lecturers in some cases. They were, however, expected to have close links with the coordinators for which they were effectively the line-managers. The
Managers perceived this communication route to be firmly established (although difficult to maintain on a frequent basis) but the coordinators viewed such routes to be either one-way or informal. This difference in perception would presumably greatly affect the line-management function intended to provide support for TVEI and its coordinators.

ANSWER : RESEARCH QUESTION 4.

The routes of communication were complex within many management models and varied greatly. The data from the 'information models' was used to consider the perceived relevance of communication between the participants and the main types of groups. An analysis of the 'concept maps' was observed to be difficult since so many different groups were included and the free-response of the participants led to a spectrum of 'descriptors' for the nature of the communication routes. The main routes between the participants and the groups were therefore used as a point of comparison.

In the context of group types, the situation within the 11-18 Schools was not uniform but communication with the majority of key groups was considered to be central to the role of the participants. Links with the SMT varied from one case study to another, reflecting an earlier observation that involvement with this powerful group was related to 'position' within the management model (p 101). Communication with TVEI groups was not significant and supported the conclusion that TVEI had a low status in such schools (p 112).

Communication with many groups was also found to be of central importance in the Sixth Form Colleges. The differential between the coordinators and Senior Managers was developed further than in the 11-18 Schools. The 'carry over' of pastoral work from the schools within the colleges was apparent within the communication routes but the Senior Managers were less involved in the operation of these groups. It was unexpected to find that the Senior Managers were also less involved than the coordinators with the curricular groups. Perhaps the integration of TVEI within the curriculum in Sixth Form Colleges was more significant than had been first realised (p 114).

The coordinators within the Tertiary Colleges tended not to be members of powerful groups such as the SMT and Academic Board and yet they valued communication with these groups to be central to their roles. The involvement of Senior Managers within this 'power base' of the management model supported other observations (p 104).
The pastoral 'theme' was extended into the Technical Colleges since the coordinators still valued the communication routes with pastoral groups. The Senior Managers did not share this level of communication, presumably reflecting responsibilities in other management areas but supporting further the conclusion that the management of pastoral work had a relatively low status within Technical Colleges (p 117). The Managers did, however, perceive a greater degree of communication with the TVEI and curricular groups than did the coordinators. This did not necessarily imply that the coordinators were distanced from these groups by choice. The Senior Managers acted as line-managers for the coordinators and acted as a bridge between the coordinators and various groups, as described earlier (p 108). This would seem to distance the coordinators from the 'key areas of change' and imply that the Senior Managers had the ultimate responsibility for the management of change related to TVEI (p 107-108).

The coordinators within the 11-18 Schools were distanced from the operation of some groups. This was not unexpected and yet the relatively small size of the schools (p 82), together with informal communication, enabled the Senior Managers to keep informed of relevant developments in almost all areas. This somewhat limited range of communication routes of the coordinators was not observed in the Sixth Form Colleges. Such coordinators seemed to have a greater opportunity to relate to many diverse areas of the management model ie. they were more integrated than the school coordinators (p 101).

In contrast to the Sixth Form Colleges, the coordinators within the Tertiary Colleges had limited communication routes with powerful groups. They sometimes only received paperwork or 'gave' information to these groups. The status of the coordinators was lower than that in the Sixth Form Colleges and perhaps in the 11-18 Schools. The coordinators based at the Technical Colleges had their counterparts (the other coordinators) to communicate with. This was valuable in such large colleges, particularly since the level of communication with the line-managers (Senior Managers) was perceived to be generally one-way. Adequate communication across the management models of Technical Colleges was difficult to achieve for the coordinators.

The Heads of Department (HOD's) group was distinct from many other groups within the management models. The group was viewed in a different way by participants in the 11-18 Schools, seen as a source of resistance to TVEI in the Sixth Form Colleges, 'managed' in a different way to other groups by the Senior Managers of Tertiary Colleges and failed to communicate with the coordinators within one Technical College. The HOD's group had already been
perceived as a powerful force within the institutions (p 110). They did seem to have the ability to affect the work of the TVEI coordinators and possibly the Senior Managers. It was therefore concluded that the 'ideal' model for the implementation of initiatives should at least consider the position of this group in relation to others.
LEVEL 4 - RESEARCH QUESTION 5

QUESTION - 'Did the perceptions or personal constructs of the TVEI coordinators indicate a different 'prejudice' to that of the Senior Managers?'

(i) Construct 'types'

The constructs elicited by the participants had been categorised earlier (p 71 and Appendix 8) as either operational, personal or both. The following table (p 137) summarises the construct types for all participants. No clear pattern was observed to indicate a particular construct type for the TVEI coordinators in relation to the Senior Managers. The use of construct types was also not linked to the type of institution considered.

(ii) Decision-making roles

The perceptions of coordinators and Senior Managers in relation to the 'site' of decision-making within each management model was potentially an indicator of prejudice. For example, did the coordinators view the TVEI-based groups as being major sites of decision-making within the models and the Senior Managers view the SMT as the major site?

The following summary (p 138) of the participant's responses to the concept of decision-making (C5) was constructed as an extension of the information model data. The total number of responses to the three sub-concepts or attributes (major, minor or neutral) was compiled in the context of each of the seven group-types. The table therefore enabled conclusions to be made about the perceptions or prejudice of the coordinators and Senior Managers.

(a) Similarities:

The coordinators and Senior Managers demonstrated similar perceptions in relation to the SMT (S), TVEI-based (T), pastoral (P) and external (E) groups. Most participants considered that the decision-making function of the SMT was major but that of the TVEI-based groups was a mixture of major and minor. It is of interest that the coordinators and Senior Managers showed a similar response to the TVEI-based groups since they had apparently shown different perceptions via the repertory grid data (Appendix 7).

Although the total number of responses in the major/minor category, in the context of pastoral (P) and external (E) groups, were similar for the two types of participants some slight differences were observed. There was an indication that the Senior Managers were more likely to consider pastoral groups to have a less-significant
### SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCT 'TYPES' USED BY TVEI COORDINATORS AND SENIOR MANAGERS : EXTRACTED FROM LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>TVEI Coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-18 Schools</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Colleges</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Colleges</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A SUMMARY OF INFORMATION MODEL DATA : THE RESPONSES OF TVEI COORDINATORS AND SENIOR MANAGERS IN RELATION TO THE DECISION-MAKING ROLE OF SEVEN MANAGEMENT GROUP 'TYPES'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP TYPE</th>
<th>TVEI COORDINATOR</th>
<th>SENIOR MANAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a    b    n</td>
<td>a    b    n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT (S)</td>
<td>8  2   2</td>
<td>10  1   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI-based (T)</td>
<td>2  3   0</td>
<td>2  3   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board/Policy Group (A)</td>
<td>7  2   1</td>
<td>3  4   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral (P)</td>
<td>4  1   2</td>
<td>2  3   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular (C)</td>
<td>5  3   3</td>
<td>3  9   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (E)</td>
<td>3  4   2</td>
<td>1  5   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors (G)</td>
<td>0  1   0</td>
<td>5  0   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 16 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>26 25 5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- a = Major decision-making role
- b = Minor decision-making role
- n = No apparent decision-making role

Note: Summary table based on the collective data from 12 case studies (A1 to D3).
decision-making role in relation to the perceptions of the coordinators. This would seem to support earlier conclusions (p 129 & 133).

The coordinators also tended to value the decision-making function of external groups more than did the Senior Managers. This would appear to be an interesting prejudice since the coordinators had been observed to be less responsible for external-liaison than the Senior Managers.

(b) Differences:

The coordinators clearly viewed the Academic Board or Policy Group (A) to have a major decision-making role, whereas, the Senior Managers varied in their perceptions of this type of group. The coordinators had already been observed to be distanced from such groups (p 108-109) and therefore demonstrated prejudice based on information from colleagues (verbal communication) and/or from the paperwork generated from the meetings of such groups (written communication). The much greater access of the Senior Managers presumably enabled them to experience the reality of decision-making eg. some had viewed the Headteacher or Principal to have significant power in this respect (p 109).

The repertory grid data showed that the Senior Managers in some institutions had perceived the curricular groups to have a lower profile than some other groups [focus(b)]. The coordinators had, however, often viewed such groups to have a much higher profile. Furthermore, the Senior Managers generally considered the curricular groups to have only a minor decision-making role within the management structure (p 138). This perception may have been based on an understanding that these groups were more operational than strategic in function. Some repertory grid data would support this conclusion (Appendix 7). The perceptions of the coordinators were varied in relation to the curricular groups and reflected more directly the environment of the specific institution (see information model database, Appendix 11). Some coordinators even considered that the curricular groups had no decision-making role.

The view of the Senior Managers in the context of Governor groups, ie. all those responding considered them to have a major decision-making role, reflected their direct involvement with the work of the governors. Their perception would again seem to reflect an informed position. Only one coordinator considered the function of the governors. The perception of this coordinator (based at case study A1) was that of a minor decision-making role. The coordinator was also distanced from the operation of this group.
(c) General perceptions:

The Senior Managers viewed almost the same number of groups to have a major decision-making role as those with a minor role. The coordinators, however, perceived many more groups to have a major role than those with a minor role. This observation may indicate that the two types of participants demonstrated different forms of prejudice related to a complex collection of constructs. The data was, however, insufficient to form a significant conclusion. The lack of involvement of the coordinators in certain groups (p 102-108) in comparison to some Senior Managers was expected to lead to some variation in prejudice.

Ten coordinators, as compared with 5 Senior Managers, considered that some group types had no decision-making role. No clear pattern was observed in relation to the specific groups considered but this observation does indicate a prejudice based on an apparent lack of understanding, or at least one that differed from that of the Senior Managers.

(iii) Construct clusters and 'routes'

The most direct way of determining prejudice would seem to be the analysis of the constructs elicited by the coordinators and Senior Managers. The constructs were identified via the use of the repertory grid (Appendix 7) for each participant. Construct trees were formed, as for element trees, using the computer programme FOCUS. Each construct tree demonstrated a pattern of clusters based on the similarities between constructs, in relation to the compared elements (or management groups).

Construct clusters with the greatest degrees of commonality (within each construct tree) were listed for the coordinators and Senior Managers on the following table (p 141-143). A model of construct clusters was drawn (p 144-145) for each of the two types of participants using lines to connect each construct, each line being labelled with the case study code to indicate the source of data. Those constructs associated with a discrete construct cluster were highlighted and used to form construct 'routes' (p 146). The link with TVEI was then identified along each route.

(a) TVEI coordinators

The coordinators elicited a wide variety of constructs. Some constructs were operational eg. external and others were personal eg. friendly. No clear preference for each type of construct was observed (p 137).

The construct route (p 146) contained five constructs. The constructs were not necessarily of equal importance to the coordinators but prejudice could be concluded from
CONSTRUCT CLUSTERS BASED ON THOSE CONSTRUCTS WITH THE GREATEST DEGREE OF COMMONALITY

(Data summarised from 'construct trees', repertory grid FOCUS analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18 Schools</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Time on resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exam-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-curricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Directly-involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not TVEI initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information-giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Colleges</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Control over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSTRUCT CLUSTERS (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Implementing</td>
<td>Policy-forming function</td>
<td>Principal involved in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control over task groups</td>
<td>Recommending governors involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tertiary Colleges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Well-organised</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to deal with</td>
<td>Management of conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open to change</td>
<td>Happy with performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>Direct involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial control</td>
<td>Little conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2</th>
<th>Marketing function</th>
<th>Educational membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>Internal policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal policy</td>
<td>Principal's control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trouble-free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C3</th>
<th>Agenda determined collectively</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>No influence on behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control resources</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective x 2</td>
<td>Consensus-seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Colleges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>Figure heads</th>
<th>Financial control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviews policy</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal not involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antagonistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External liaison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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CONSTRUCT CLUSTERS (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Code</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>TVEI-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involvement</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Financial control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>No power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial control</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not workable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONSTRUCT CLUSTERS (TVEI COORDINATORS) - a model based on the collective data from 12 case studies [A1 to D3]
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CONSTRUCT CLUSTERS (SENIOR MANAGERS) - a model based on the collective data from 12 case studies [A1 to D3]
CONSTRUCT 'ROUTES' - an indicator of prejudice based on construct cluster data

(i) TVEI COORDINATORS

DIRECT INVOLVEMENT

EFFECTIVE

DECISION - MAKING

FINANCE

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

CONTROL

(ii) SENIOR MANAGERS

POLICY

DIRECT INVOLVEMENT

FINANCE

EFFECTIVE

TVEI

EXTERNAL

Note: Each construct within the above models was linked to a discrete construct cluster (based on collective data from 12 case studies).
the nature of the construct-links. For example, the coordinators would seem to view those groups, for which they were directly involved, to be effective. Their involvement would presumably place the coordinators in an informed position about the operation of such groups. However, the observation could also indicate prejudice against those groups for which they were not involved i.e. consider them as being ineffective.

The analysis of coordinator response to the decision-making role of groups, described above (p 139), showed that they had a different prejudice to the Senior Managers. This role was seen to be linked to the effectiveness of management groups and also to the management of conflict in those groups i.e.

(i) The increased significance of the decision-making role, the more effective the group.

(ii) The greater the management of conflict, the increased significance of the decision-making role.

The prejudice concluded from the statements proposed above would appear to be based on power. Decision-making would clearly be linked to power. It had already been observed that the power-base was somewhat distanced from the coordinators (p 129). They were much more likely to be directly involved with groups that were lacking in power and therefore made recommendations to the powerful groups eg. SMT, rather that with groups capable of making decisions.

Conflict would probably be based on a spectrum of constructs, some operational and others personal. Some coordinators were subjected to conflict within the management groups (see FOCUS data, Appendix 7) and were likely to assume that many of the groups for which they were not involved, primarily the powerful groups, were under the 'influence; of the Headteacher/Principal. Conflict between members of such groups was seen to be relatively 'under control' or 'managed'. It could therefore be concluded that the coordinators generally perceived power to be ideally linked to reduced conflict. This management of conflict was also related to the construct of 'control'.

It would seem logical to conclude that all those responsible for an educational initiative (such as TVEI) or some other form of 'change' would prefer to be seen as being in a powerful position, capable of making decisions and also in control. This perception was not necessarily the reality for most coordinators. The prejudice demonstrated by the coordinators via the construct 'routes' would seem to be based on a need to be perceived in this way and yet being frustrated by the lack of opportunity for this to happen.
It is of interest that the construct cluster analysis for the coordinators (p 144) also showed a 'side-branch' linking effectiveness, decision-making and the management of conflict. This branch involved the perception of being friendly with an openness to change. The prejudice shown by the coordinators in this case could well be based on an understanding that without the power of the Senior Managers they were more dependent on a cooperative relationship with colleagues (hence the friendliness) in order to bring about the desired change. The coordinators appeared to have a perception that to be threatening (without power) would only hinder the process of change across the management model/institution.

(b) Senior Managers

The Senior Managers also identified a range of personal constructs via the repertory grid. The shape of the model (p 145) was different to that of the coordinators and therefore consisted of different construct clusters. The model also lacked a side-branch.

Five constructs were again identified within the construct 'route'. Two of the constructs were the same as those elicited for the coordinators i.e. 'direct involvement' and 'effective'. The link between these constructs was, however, different.

The Senior Managers perceived their direct involvement within a group to be related to policy-formation within the institution. They were therefore fully aware of the powerful position that they held. Unlike the coordinators, the Senior Managers were much more likely to be members of the groups representing the powerbase (p 109). The direct involvement of the Senior Managers was not closely linked to the effectiveness of management groups. They perceived those groups with financial implications to be effective. This observation was not unexpected in the light of changes taking place within post-16 institutions in relation to self-management. It would seem probable that the Senior Managers would be primarily involved with groups having some form of financial implication. The demands of self-management, with the various 'limitations' based on finance had apparently affected the prejudice of the Senior Managers so that they perceived those groups without a financial link to be ineffective. Did they simply see such groups as being 'talk shops' with little power and of no direct consequence to their respective roles? More than half of those Senior Managers responding to the concept of 'decision-making' had already been observed to consider groups to have either a minor effect or no effect on their roles (p 138).
The Senior Managers also perceived effectiveness to be linked to groups having an external function. The repertory grid data had given some indication of the Senior Manager's and coordinator's views in this respect (Appendix 7). The Table below summarises their perceptions of 'attendance' (C3) and 'involvement' (C4);

A SUMMARY OF INFORMATION MODEL DATA: THE RESPONSES OF TVEI COORDINATORS AND SENIOR MANAGERS IN RELATION TO THEIR ATTENDANCE AND INVOLVEMENT WITH EXTERNAL-BASED GROUPS (E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCONCEPT</th>
<th>TVEI COORDINATOR</th>
<th>SENIOR MANAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance (C3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement (C4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: For C3 a = coopted attendance, b = invited to attend and n = neutral (no attendance)
For C4 a = convenor, b = member and n = neutral (no involvement)

Note: Summary table based on the collective data from 12 case studies (A1 to D3)

The above data conflicted with earlier conclusions based on concept maps and interview notes in which a number of Senior Managers seemed to view their responsibilities to involve the liaison with external bodies. The information model data, collected as an extension of only those groups elicited as part of the repertory grid construction, indicated that half of the Senior Managers considered that they were not members of external-based groups and were thus not involved in their operation. Attendance and direct involvement may well have been delegated to other colleagues such as the TVEI coordinators.

The construct 'route' showed a link between effectiveness and external-liaison and therefore indicated that the Senior Managers had some confidence in the effectiveness of other colleagues more directly involved with the operation of external groups.
(c) TVEI links

The construct routes for the coordinators and Senior Managers had links with TVEI but the construct of 'TVEI based', for example, was not a close member of these routes. The coordinators perceived TVEI to be only linked to the construct of decision-making via that of 'financial control' (p 148). It had been observed earlier that some coordinators clearly viewed TVEI as a source of finance. The prejudice of the coordinators may also have been affected by the financial implications of self-management referred to above (p 148). It could be concluded that their frustration of being distanced from the powerbase and therefore the decision-making areas of the management model would be 'bridged' by being responsible (if only in part) for an initiative with some financial weight.

The Senior Managers, however, did not perceive the construct of being 'TVEI-led' to be directly linked with financial implications. It had been noted earlier that they tended to have a much broader view of the management model, with associated responsibilities (p 134), in comparison to the narrower perspective of the coordinators. The Senior Managers in three case studies (A2, D1 and D2) perceived the operation of TVEI to be related to cooperation as well as to effectiveness. This paralleled the understanding of the coordinators in the context of effectiveness, friendliness and being open to change (p 148). In this case, however, the perception of the Senior Managers was likely not to be based on a 'powerless' position but based on the reality that an initiative with a relatively insignificant source of funding would only achieve change with the cooperation of colleagues.

ANSWER : RESEARCH QUESTION 5.

The perceptions or personal constructs of the TVEI coordinators indicated a different 'prejudice' to that of the Senior Managers.

The type of construct demonstrated by the coordinators did not differ significantly from that of the Senior Managers but the clustering of the constructs to form a 'construct route' did indicate a different prejudice, based on a variety of data.

The perceptions of the coordinators in the context of the concept 'decision-making' revealed that they viewed pastoral and external-based groups to have a more significant role than did the Senior Managers. The nature of prejudice related to the external groups will be discussed later.
The prejudice of the coordinators indicated that they did not have an 'informed' standpoint. For example, they viewed the Academic Board and Policy groups to have much more of a decision-making function than did the Senior Managers and yet they were not as directly involved with the operation of such groups. This prejudice based on a somewhat 'distanced' position was also observed, to a lesser extent, when considering the role of the governors.

The overall analysis of coordinator vs Senior Manager perceptions (in the context of decision-making) indicated that the different forms of prejudice were based on a complex collection of constructs.

This aspect was pursued further through the analysis of construct clusters and 'routes'. Only two of the five constructs determined along the construct route for the coordinators were the same as those of the Senior Managers. The links between the various constructs indicated a very different form of prejudice.

The coordinators tended to view their personal involvement with a group to be linked to its effectiveness. They did not appear to have the same breadth of experience or understanding of the management model in relation to the Senior Managers. Their distance from the powerbase, and thus the decision-making areas of the model, seemed to be linked to a focus on 'power' and being in control. The coordinators appeared to be frustrated in this respect since, although they would seem to prefer to be in a powerful position, the reality of their position within the management model was different (p 108-109).

The lack of power perceived by the coordinators, however, led to the reality that they were capable of being effective and bringing about change, subject to the cooperation (expressed as friendliness) of colleagues.

The analysis of construct clusters based on the responses of Senior Managers indicated that they were aware of their powerful position within the management model, together with the ability to make decisions. They were apparently prejudiced towards those management groups with financial implications since such groups were perceived to be effective. There may have been a link between the low status of, for example, pastoral groups (as generally perceived by the Senior Managers) with a lack of financial implications.

The awareness of financial matters demonstrated by the Senior Managers seemed to enable them to view the relevance of TVEI in financial terms. The link between TVEI and the construct route of the Senior Managers did not reflect the construct of 'finance'. The Senior Managers tended to view the operation of TVEI through the
cooperation of colleagues since they appeared to understand that TVEI funding was relatively insignificant.

It is of interest that the coordinators linked TVEI to their respective construct route via the construct of 'financial control'. It was concluded that the coordinators may well have considered that their apparent distance from the powerbase of the management model could have been 'bridged' by the perceived financial implications of TVEI.

In the context of external groups, the Senior Managers clearly perceived the operation of these groups to be linked to the construct of 'effectiveness'. The Senior Managers were generally not members of such groups and were therefore not involved with their operation. They apparently based their prejudice in favour of external-liaison due to their confidence in those colleagues more directly involved (such as the TVEI coordinators).
LEVEL 4 - RESEARCH QUESTION 6.

QUESTION - 'Would it be possible to devise a management 'model' capable of supporting the implementation of TVEI and future initiatives (such as 'incorporation') for all post-16 institutions?'

(i) Evidence from other research questions

(1) Research question 1

It would seem to be essential to establish a management model capable of integrating the coordinator responsible for a particular initiative eg. TVEI as fully as possible within the structure. What are the factors affecting this integration?

The following factors were those extracted from the data analysed for research question 1:

(a) Environment/involvement - the personnel responsible for initiatives should already have or be given a 'high profile' within the structure. It would appear to be more appropriate for such individuals to have a senior management position to maximise 'networking' across the structure. The development of a broad perspective of relationships within the institution was seen to be advantageous.

(b) Power - the individual(s) responsible for the initiative should also be perceived by themselves and others to be in a powerful position. The coordinator(s) would appear to be more effective if given access to the powerbase eg. member of the Senior Management Team (SMT).

(c) Status/Position - the perceptions of position, eg. pivotal vs linear, within the management model were related to the status of individuals and their colleagues. Senior Managers were sometimes observed to be in a powerful position whilst recognising that they were within a vertical model and in a linear position ie. they had direct line-management with the Headteacher/Principal. This line-management was later seen to be an essential route for information and support. Coordinators of initiatives would benefit greatly from this form of line-management, not necessarily with the Headteacher/Principal.

(d) Communication - it would seem logical that coordinators of initiatives across institutions must possess sound communication skills. The communication routes across the management model must enable those skills to be exercised, to promote the initiative concerned. Many participants expressed the perception that communication (either written or verbal) with, for example the SMT, was central to their respective roles.
(2) Research question 2

Factors to be considered from this part of the data included the following:

(a) Shape of model - mixed and vertical models were identified by both TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers. Does the 'shape' of a management model have any effect on the way in which an initiative is implemented? The Senior Managers within the larger colleges tended to view the model shape to be vertical, based on an hierarchical structure. Since they appeared to have a broader perspective than the coordinators, it could be assumed that this vertical model was nearer to reality than that of the coordinators. The shape found within the Sixth Form Colleges was observed to be related to the 'carry over' from school-origins. Will this become an important factor when such colleges develop along very different routes after 'incorporation' in April 1993?

(b) Key groups - the SMT was generally perceived to be the most powerful group within the management models studied. The high profile of curricular groups was seen to be related to their status as the backbone of the structure. It could therefore be assumed that direct involvement with both key groups would be essential for the coordinators of initiatives. Involvement with groups such as the pastoral groups would also be desirable according to the emphasis placed on such groups within the institution eg. high profile within the current Sixth Form College structure. Groups established to 'steer' a particular development or initiative within the institution over time should ideally be convened by the coordinator responsible for the initiative and be given a high profile. Such Task groups were seen, in the case of TVEI, to be particularly important within very large colleges involved in more than one consortium.

(c) Superior positions - again, the SMT was observed to have a superior position within the management models, often alongside the Headteacher/Principal. The TVEI coordinators tended to perceive that they were 'distanced' from this superior position and yet the Senior Managers did not necessarily share this perception. It would therefore seem to be essential that colleagues have a mutual understanding of relationships and related responsibilities when embarking on such initiatives. The basis of this understanding must be the construction of clear job descriptions for all colleagues involved.

(3) Research question 3

Factors developed from research question 3 included:

(a) Strong relationships - coordinators of initiatives should have access to those groups that are perceived to
have strong working relationships with each other. Although it is appreciated that individuals cannot be members of all groups, it would be inefficient for a coordinator to be an active member of one group having some overlap with the operation of a particular initiative and yet have no access with a similar, and equally-important, group. The work of initiative-based task groups, eg. TVEI groups considered in the current research, should relate to other groups within the management model. Results frequently showed that the TVEI groups were not linked to other key groups identified by coordinators and Senior Managers. Observations made for Tertiary and Technical colleges also indicated that clear relationships were difficult to find between the various management groups within the models.

(b) Isolated groups - data related to those groups perceived to be 'isolated' was variable. The TVEI groups were not generally isolated within the management models of 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges but were seen to be marginalised within the Tertiary and Technical Colleges. Although a variety of personal constructs were used to isolate the TVEI groups in this way, there was an indication that it was based on the lack of integration of the coordinators within the management model.

(4) Research Question 4

Factors considered for this research question included the following:

(a) Group types - adequate communication (whether written or verbal) was generally considered to be central to the role of TVEI coordinators. The data obtained from the different case studies often reflected other factors such as the power and status of a particular group type. Senior Managers were sometimes found to have greater access to groups than did the coordinators eg. for TVEI and curricular groups within the Technical Colleges. Barriers to communication should be removed where possible to ensure that developments related to specific initiatives can be supported. It would seem highly desirable for the routes of communication to be established at the time of appointing a member of staff responsible for an initiative. The routes should not only relate to the coordinator but also to the 'named' line-manager. In addition, there should be an opportunity to review the success of the initiative in the context of communication routes so that adjustments can be made over a period of time.

(b) Main routes - coordinators within the 11-18 Schools were found to have a variety of other responsibilities in addition to that of TVEI-management. This should not necessarily present a problem if sufficient time is given for such responsibilities to be carried out. The main routes of communication were found
to be limited for individuals with many responsibilities and also maintained at the middle-management level. Not all staff can become Senior Managers but some form of understanding (in the context of 'workload' and efficiency) would seem to be required to support initiatives. The 'giving' of information without the 'receiving' of support and information was seen to be the product of inadequate communication routes within the larger colleges. The data also indicated that the relationship between coordinators and the long-established groups such as the Heads of Department group (HOD's) should be made clear at the time of introducing a new coordinator-role within a management model.

(5) Research question 5

This research question was treated in a different way to the four previous questions. Research question 5 focused on the relationship between perceptions and prejudice and the factors extracted include the following:

(a) Construct 'types' - participants interviewed within the various case studies used both personal and operational constructs. The function of a management model should be considered in relation to the observation that individuals will view the 'success' and 'relevance' of such a model in very different ways according to their own constructs. The eventual evaluation of management models must therefore be based on criteria which are as objective as possible.

(b) Decision-making roles - the decision-making role of each group should be considered in the context of the whole management model. It was not unexpected to observe that most participants found the SMT groups to have a major responsibility for this role and to affect the work of both coordinators and Senior Managers. However, some form of clarity about the relevance of task groups, eg. TVEI-based groups and external groups should be established in relation to the role of decision-making. Initiatives such as TVEI and major changes such as 'incorporation' inevitably have an external function. The nature of the link with external bodies ie. via the Principal, Vice Principal or others must be determined to ensure both high-profile for such initiatives/changes and adequate communication for the coordinator.

(c) Construct clusters and 'routes' - the analysis of construct clusters for the coordinators indicated that their perceptions were often not based on an 'informed' position. Clearly, the construction of a management model capable of supporting initiatives and associated change should avoid, where possible, this form of prejudice. The prejudice was observed to reflect the feeling of isolation of the coordinators and their frustration. The construct 'routes' for the coordinators were quite different to those of the Senior Managers. Again, the
Senior Managers seemed to be in a much more confident position without the need for the prejudice that initiatives, such as TVEI, are to be identified with a source of funding. The Senior Managers, unlike the coordinators, were more aware of the limited financial implications of TVEI in relation to the global income available to the respective institution. This particular financial aspect will, no doubt, become even more significant for 'incorporation' in relation to the Further Education Funding Councils (FEFC, 1992). The notion of 'cooperation' and the confidence of colleagues, in the context of initiative management, would seem to be a much more positive way forward than financial reward.

(ii) Key factors to be considered

[Based on the evidence from other research questions - highlighted in section (i) above]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS AFFECTING MODEL STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of SMT/HOD's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear communication routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-management routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic job descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of task groups in relation to other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General relationship of groups in context of decision-making function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation between colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of pressures/constraints of 'incorporation'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS AFFECTING INITIATIVE-COORDINATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of SMT &amp; links with HOD/curricular groups etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific communication routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Named' line-manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific job descriptions in relation to that of line-manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenor of initiative-based task group(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of role in relation to decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration within management model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High profile and time available to support coordinator role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANAGEMENT MODEL FOR POST-16 INSTITUTIONS
(iii) Models of 'reality'

Seven management group 'types' were identified earlier (p 78). The groups were labelled to simplify the varied repertory grid data, to enable comparisons to be made between the various case studies (levels 3 and 4). The information model data was analysed using the group types with the aid of a computer programme provided by Hobrough and Kontiainen (1992). The programme provided a statement for each group type (eg. SMT, pastoral etc.) in relation to five imposed concepts (Appendix 11). Each statement indicated the 'connections' to be made between the five concepts so that an information model could be constructed (Appendix 10). What is the value of such information models in the context of a post-16 management model?

Hobrough (1992) described information models as 'models of reality'. The data used to complete the information model grids (Appendix 10) were based on groups elicited using the repertory grid technique. The 'starting point' was therefore that of the reality of perceptions expressed by the participants but the use of imposed concepts may well have distracted from this point. The relevance of the various research tools will be discussed later (p 169).

The five concepts and sub-concepts (attributes) were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>SUB-CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Written communication</td>
<td>1a Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1n Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b Peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Verbal communication</td>
<td>2a Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2n Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b Peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Attendance</td>
<td>3a Coopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3n Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Involvement</td>
<td>4a Convenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4n Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Decision-making</td>
<td>5a Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5n Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5b Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list of key factors described above (ii) for the construction of a management model included those factors affecting the initiative-coordinator (p 157). The following list represents the factors relating to the information model data:

(a) Member of SMT and links with HOD/curricular groups etc.

(b) Convenor of initiative-based task groups (eg. TVEI)

(c) An understanding of role in relation to decision-making

The 'models of reality' for the various participants would therefore ideally include selected sub-concepts related to the following specific group types:

A review of the information model data (Appendix 11) showed that only a limited number of case studies viewed the three types of groups in this 'ideal' way. The model for the SMT groups was found only within the Tertiary Colleges (case study C1 [Senior Manager] and case study C3 [coordinators and Senior Manager]).

None of the case studies generated the 'ideal' information models for curricular groups. However, the models for the TVEI groups within a Sixth Form College (case study B1 [coordinator]), Tertiary College (case study C3 [Senior Manager]) and Technical College (case
study D2 [coordinator]) were the same as the ideal type shown above. It should be noted that only those models relating to the TVEI coordinators were of significance in this analysis.

The construction of a management model for post-16 institutions should consider the ways in which the information models generated could be modified to become the desired models of 'reality'. The data obtained from the information models would therefore be of use as a 'template' for adjustment. How could this approach be followed?

The following example is used to suggest the approach to be adopted in order to achieve the desired change to the management model;

EXAMPLE - CASE STUDY B3 (a 'distant' Sixth Form College)

Information models generated by the TVEI coordinator included the following -

SMT group

HOD/Curricular group

TVEI group

SMT group - In order to modify the management model to achieve the desired relationship between concepts for the SMT group both the written and verbal communication routes should be improved (ie. to make them 'major' and therefore more relevant to the role of the coordinator). The decision-making role of the group should also be made more relevant to the work of the coordinator (ie. so that it is perceived to have a 'major' rather than 'minor' affect).
Curricular group - The information model for the curricular group differed from the 'ideal' in the context of the involvement of the coordinator and in the perceived decision-making role. In this example the coordinator was the convenor of the group rather than a member. The convenorship was related to other responsibilities and could well have distracted from the TVEI-role. This difference in the level of involvement would not appear to be critical but should at least be considered at the time of constructing a management model designed to support initiatives such as TVEI. The coordinator considered the curricular group to lack a decision-making role. The ideal model refers to this role as 'major'. The relationship between this particular group and the powerbase of the management model (presumably the SMT group) would need to be considered in some depth to enable the function of the group to be valued and to operate effectively.

TVEI group - Again, both written and verbal communication routes should be improved for this group, in relation to the work of the coordinator. Although the coordinator was coopted to attend the group, the group was convened by another member of staff. This would seem to be an ineffective way of promoting the desired status of the coordinator and would require adjustment.

ANSWER : RESEARCH QUESTION 6

It would be possible to devise a management 'model' capable of supporting the implementation of TVEI and future initiatives (such as 'incorporation') for all post-16 institutions.

Evidence from the data (in the form of answers to the five previous research questions) led to the formation of a list of 'factors' affecting both model structure eg. location of SMT/HOD's, and the initiative-coordinator eg. member of SMT. It was realised that the proposition of a management model was subject to the recognition of the various factors. Not all factors could necessarily be satisfied for all institutions but their consideration would seem to be worthwhile since the process would enable members of staff to share their perceptions in the context of the externally-imposed initiative/change.

The factor of 'adjustment' was seen to be required as a consequence of periodic review. Management models should be consistent over time but not inflexible. The review of such models should be based on objective criteria, where possible. One approach that could be used would be to adjust the current management model of an institution (as perceived through the use of the information model technique) to achieve the desired model of 'reality'. This approach was considered to be relevant, particularly if the information models were based on an agreed matrix.
(produced as a result of some form of collaborative training exercise within the institution) rather than being based on an imposed matrix (Appendix 10). Such collaborative exercises have been described by Hobrough and Kontiainen (1992) for other aspects of staff development.

The production of a management model would therefore not seem to be a straightforward task. Such models cannot be imposed from an external source but generated from within the institution as a result of extensive consultation between colleagues. A post-16 management model is proposed in the following section of the thesis as a 'starting point' for discussion within post-16 institutions in relation to the various factors described above. The model should not be viewed as the 'answer to all problems'.
E. PROPOSITION - THE POST-16 MODEL
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A variety of organizational charts and/or management models have been produced for post-16 institutions. Indeed, the current developments leading to 'incorporation' of colleges include references to such models (Coopers & Lybrand, 1992).

This chapter is based on a proposed management model for post-16 institutions, stemming from the range of 'factors' described earlier (p 157). The operation of the model is considered and supports the view of the model as a 'living system', in the context of membership, function and communication routes. The suitability of the model is also reviewed in relation to the factors listed earlier (p 157) for 'model structure' and 'initiative coordinator'. The chapter is therefore divided into three sections:

E.1 Proposed management model for post-16 institutions

E.2 Operation of proposed management model

E.3 Suitability of proposed management model
A model for those institutions also adopting a corporate status as from April 1993 (ie. not including 11-18 Schools)

Note: The 'consultation area' represents an opportunity to ensure that each part of the management model can relate to other parts. It is not intended that all staff within an area can have the same 'level' of consultation with staff in another area but access to information should be available, as required. The membership/representation, function and communication routes for each area must be understood by all staff.
E.2 OPERATION of Proposed Management Model

The five 'areas' of the model are as follows:

1. Teaching/tutorial and ancillary staff
2. Departmental (Faculty)/cross-curricular and initiative-task groups eg. RoA, TVEI etc.
3. Academic Board
4. Senior Management Team (SMT)
5. Policy Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Membership/representation</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Communication routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>All staff</td>
<td>Operational, 'day to day' matters</td>
<td>Staff and tutorial meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Specific staff within each group</td>
<td>Operational and tactical matters</td>
<td>Department, cross-curriculum and initiative-task group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Representative members from area (1), nominated HOD's (or Heads of Faculty) and coopted task group convenors eg. TVEI coord.</td>
<td>Tactical and strategic matters</td>
<td>Academic Board meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Representative members from the Academic Board, together with task group convenors* as required, Principal and Vice Principals</td>
<td>Tactical but primarily strategic matters</td>
<td>SMT meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Principal, Vice Principals and Senior Governor(s)</td>
<td>Strategic matters</td>
<td>Policy Group meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Task group convenors refer to individuals responsible for facilitating discussions within task groups, such as team leaders or coordinators.
E.3 SUITABILITY of Proposed Management Model

The 'answer' to question 6 included a list of factors affecting both the structure of management models and the function of initiative-coordinators eg. TVEI coordinators (p 157).

The management model (p 164) was proposed in the light of such factors. The relevance of each factor can be considered as follows;

(a) MODEL STRUCTURE

Location of SMT/HOD's - the SMT retains the high profile as observed in many case studies (p 119) but the membership is not restricted only to the most Senior members of staff. The group is opened to other representatives from the more-tactical Academic Board and to task group convenors* (eg. TVEI coordinators) as determined by priorities identified within the College Development Plan.

It would seem logical to assume that the size of a management group should be sufficiently large to enable a spectrum of opinion and yet not too large to restrict discussion. The position of the SMT between the Academic Board (where a broad spectrum of experience and opinion would be available) and the Policy Group (with a much more restricted membership and purely strategic role) would enable the group to function effectively and to promote communication.

The position of the HOD's group, found to be almost too powerful in some case studies (p 110), is paralleled by that of the various cross-curricular groups eg. careers and information technology groups and the initiative-task groups eg. TVEI group. This would presumably place the perceived role of initiative coordinators to be equal and yet different to that of the Heads of Department. The numerous Heads of Department could be represented by Heads of Faculty on the Academic Board and/or the SMT. This would raise the profile of the initiative coordinators further if they were also seen to be active members of such groups.

Clear communication routes - the consultation area of the model indicates the extent of communication routes open to all parts of the institution. Many participants expressed complex and detailed routes of communication on their respective concept maps (Appendix 4). It is anticipated that these will continue to vary from one institution to the next, even following 'incorporation' in April 1993. As observed earlier, the history and curriculum-provision of an institution will greatly affect the way in which it operates (p 5). The adjustment referred to earlier (p 155) in the context of the review process would affect the level of consultation occurring
within the model. For example, it would seem appropriate for specific management tasks, with clear deadlines and therefore periods of operation, to be allocated to individual coordinators eg. TVEI. Such coordinators would not only convene the respective initiative-task group but would be coopted during the duration of the task onto groups such as the SMT. This cooption should be planned and incorporated into the 'job description' of the coordinator at the outset.

**Line-management routes** - the management model does not indicate the routes of line-management open to various individuals. Such routes would be particularly important if it was not possible for initiative-coordinators to be members of the high-profile groups eg. Academic Board and SMT. Indeed, this might often be the case if the plethora of initiatives described earlier (p 23) continues to grow. The additional responsibilities associated with 'incorporation' will undoubtedly place an increased burden on the efficient operation of a management model. Not all staff responsible for an initiative or part of the new management developments could be members of the SMT. The group would become too large to operate. Nominated line-managers eg. Vice Principal (for curriculum) should therefore be identified early in the introduction of such initiatives or developments.

**Generic job descriptions** - job descriptions for all staff should be available within an 'open' document eg. Staff Handbook (McCann, 1992). This would only seem to be achieved by a long process since many colleges will currently employ staff without a clear job description. Although the use of such descriptions has been encouraged for some time (eg. Cambridgeshire Local Education Authority, 1992) and is expected to be a statutory requirement of 'incorporation' (Touche-Ross, 1992), much is still to be done in this area. The appointment of all new staff will presumably be accompanied by generic/specific job descriptions.

**Location of task groups in relation to other groups** - see discussion above in the context of SMT/HOD's groups.

**General relationship of groups in context of decision-making function** - decision-making was perceived to be an area of management related to the particular groups and individuals involved (p 138). The ability to make decisions was closely-related to the construct of 'power'. The proposed management model retains a powerbase associated with strategic rather than operational matters. This powerbase, the Policy Group, is seen to involve the Senior Governor(s) as well as the Principal and Vice Principals. Decisions should not be agreed within this group from an ill-informed standpoint. The information should be available from the SMT (in the form of recommendations) and the Academic Board (perhaps in the form of 'Proposal/discussion' documents). These
groups, in turn, would base their contributions on those channelled through from various other groups eg. initiative-task groups, Staff meetings. The important factor is that of 'being valued'. The operational and tactical matters carried out by many colleagues throughout the model should be valued and yet it is essential that all staff are aware of the location of decision-making and policy-formation within the model (ie. the 'central' area of the proposed model).

Cooperation between colleagues - this aspect of the management model is included, again, within the consultation area. The cooperation of staff was observed to be an important factor affecting the success of initiatives such as TVEI (p 148 & 150) and presumably new developments such as 'incorporation'. This can be supported through the process of full and planned consultation, throughout the management model.

Consideration of pressures/constraints of 'incorporation' - the full effect of this major change is still not apparent but it is understood that the construction of an efficient management model is a 'key factor', requiring careful planning over a period of time (Touche-Ross, 1992 and Coopers & Lybrand, 1992). It has been recommended that significant areas such as personnel, premises and finance should be the responsibility of Senior Managers, supported by the College Administrator/Secretary and related ancillary staff. The latter should have access to information to the same degree (if not more in certain areas) as that received by teaching/tutorial staff, as shown in the proposed model.

(b) INITIATIVE-COORDINATOR

Almost all of the factors considered to affect the initiative coordinator (p 157) have been discussed within the various factors reviewed above. One factor was not covered;

Integration within management model - does the proposed management model deal with the problems of 'lack of integration' observed within various case studies (p 108)? The opportunity is available within the model for full-integration to occur, even in the presence of many initiative-coordinators in one institution. The reality is dependent on the value of such initiatives in relation to other management issues (in the context of time available to support the work involved and the financial situation). This aspect of the model is critical to the success of initiatives and the process of change. The way forward is the identification of clear developments within an annually-reviewed College Development Plan. The nature of the review should be as objective as possible and to consider the 'weight' of developments in relation to other aspects of college management eg. investment in long-term marketing and the response to varied external pressures.
F. RESEARCH TOOL ANALYSIS
F. RESEARCH TOOL ANALYSIS

1. Purpose

Four different research tools were used in the current study:

- Interview (semi-structured)
- Concept map
- Repertory grid
- Information model

The way in which the research tools or sections were used was described earlier as part of the chapter on the 'design of the study' (p 42-44). The relationship between the research tools and the foci of the study was also considered (p 45) and summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCI</th>
<th>RESEARCH TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Environment and management of the institution</td>
<td>(a) Brief interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Perceptions of management</td>
<td>(b) Concept map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Routes of communication</td>
<td>(c) Repertory grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Information model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was observed that the design involved the analysis of each focus using all four research tools.

The foci were developed throughout the four 'levels' of analysis in order to address the original research questions. Level 4 was based on the six research questions and provided a holistic view of the data. Level 3 was presented in the form of three foci tables for each of the institution-types. The source of data used was summarised diagramatically as a prefix to each set of tables (p 81, 86 & 95).

The purpose of this research tool analysis was to determine the relevant contribution made by each of the research tools to the current study in comparison to their application within other research work.
2. 'Key words' and research tools

The thesis title 'Management of post-16 institutions: perceptions based on the implementation of TVEI (extension)' presents various key words.

2.1 Management (of post-16 institutions)

2.2 Perceptions

2.3 TVEI

Much educational research has been based on or related to the three words (abbreviations). As in all aspects of research, it is not expected that one method or research tool will provide the answer. Often, a combination of 'trial and error' and the modification of research tools devised from other sources leads to the desired outcome. The following three sub-sections briefly consider the approach followed by some other researchers.

2.1 Management

Various textbooks have been written on educational management and related disciplines. There has been a tendency for such texts to focus on the management of schools rather than post-16 institutions (Sayer, 1989 and Davies, 1990). Evidence of research into the management of post-16 institutions is sparse.

What sort of approach and selection of research tools has been adopted by those researchers investigating educational management within the post-16 sector? There has been a tendency for relatively large-scale surveys to be carried out during the 1980's. However, Brannen (1981) considered the management of an individual Further Education (FE) College in relation to the 'feelings' of staff. Brannen's research focused on departmental organisation and was not a comparative study.

Harding and Scott (1982) adopted a different approach to that of Brannen (1981) since they used a questionnaire in order to determine the 'forms of management control' in 54 different FE colleges in the North West of England. The study was clearly comparative and generated quantitative data.

The generation of quantitative data using this survey-approach has been criticised by other researchers (Shiels, 1991) in the context of their use as 'significant indicators'. The value of quantitative vs qualitative data is to be considered later (p 174).

Following the earlier work of Harding and Scott (1982), Tansley (1989) and Janes (1989b) carried out surveys of educational management (ie.organisational structures) for the NFER and FESC respectively. Both surveys were again...
based on questionnaires, that of Tansley (1989) involving 144 colleges and that of Janes (1989b) 327 colleges. What was the relevance of this relatively large-scale questionnaire approach as a research tool?

The answer must relate to the original aims of each survey. In each case, predetermined criteria ie. the presence of a 'departmental vs. non-departmental structure' were introduced to the participants. The survey did not rely heavily on the perceptions or personal constructs of the participants. They did, however, provide useful 'trends' based on statistical comparisons. Personal comments of participants were also gleaned in the context of prescribed factors such as 'responsiveness' and 'efficiency'. Some evidence of cross-college links and roles was also obtained in Tansley's (1989) survey.

Who were the participants involved in the completion of questionnaires? The earlier work of Brannen (1981) considered the responses from various staff within a single college, whereas, the survey work that followed (Harding and Scott, 1982 etc.) was based on the responses of Senior Managers, notably the college Principals.

One of the most recent surveys of educational management within the post-16 sector is that of Sheils (1991). This particular survey focused on the agricultural sector, a sector not encompassed by earlier work. The research tool used was again that of a questionnaire completed by 'Managers'. Sheils (1991) referrred primarily to college Principals as the respondents and the data was statistically analysed as a point of comparison with data from other surveys (Sheils, p. 74).

Questionnaires have therefore been frequently used within this aspect of educational research. They have provided mainly quantitative data in order to demonstrate trends over time. Have other forms of research tools been used to determine the personal feelings or constructs of different members of staff?

Gartside (1990) carried out a case study based at an FE college for the FESC in the context of managing flexible college structures. Nineteen members of staff, including the Principal, were interviewed about the new college structure and their roles. An attempt was made to determine the 'views' of the people involved (Gartside, 1990; p 178). The views obtained were varied and reflected different perceptions of the 'activity managers' and others interviewed. The personal constructs of the participants in relation to specific (operational) aspects of the college management structure were not apparent.

The FESC also involved a number of Principals (and other Senior Managers) as contributors to a report on managing
colleges into the next century (Andrews, 1990). The information available about strategic planning issues was clearly valuable and of use to others involved with such issues. However, the reports were not based on the views of various staff in the context of future plans but seemed to reflect the personal views of the Principals. Collectively, the reports presented a comparative study but the approach followed was very different for each contributor, thereby preventing some form of structured comparison.

The case study carried out by Ratcliffe (1987) was based on the responses of all members of staff. A questionnaire consisting of 9 questions was issued and revealed a wide variety of comment and suggestions for improving the functioning of the college (Ratcliffe, 1987; p 30). The approach followed did enable staff to express personal feelings but their analysis did not show a comparative approach. The aim of the questionnaire was apparently to obtain 'ideas' for consideration by the 'senior management'.

A comparative study of different post-16 institutions, based on the personal constructs of staff, does not seem to have been carried out until the present study. PCP (personal construct psychology) has been used widely in the context of educational research, but not in the area of 'perceptions of management'.

2.2 Perceptions

PCP (personal construct psychology) has been used for many years within the field of educational research. Pope (1982, p 4) observed that PCP valued the personal meanings of individuals but also focused on the personal construction of formal knowledge. PCP has also been seen to lend theoretical support to the shift in focus of enquiry in educational research towards the study of personal meanings (Pope & Denicolo, 1989; p 5).

How does this 'shift' in focus relate to the current study? The approach followed, through the use of the four different research tools (p 42-44), was driven by the personal feelings or constructs of the participants. The study was not based on the responses of participants to a series of predetermined questions but stemmed from their own perceptions. As discussed earlier (p 33), this approach was considered to be useful since the ways in which staff perceive the operation and relationships of a management structure will directly affect the reality of its function.

The interview technique, as described in the previous section, has been very well used to determine the feelings of participants. It is essential that the
dialogue between the researcher and the participant should be recorded accurately. The verified reporting technique described earlier (p 47) was considered to be useful since it enabled the participants to read the notes obtained and to confirm that they were accurate representations of the interview.

One useful extension of this approach is to enable the participant to reflect on earlier comments and to modify them accordingly. This was not carried out because the interview notes were treated as records of perceptions at the time of completing the other research tools. The notes were used to support the results of the repertory grid and concept map etc. so that the conclusions were meaningful.

The use of concept maps to express personal feelings has also been wide. Novak & Gowin (1984, p 15) showed that concept mapping provided an analysis of the information obtained about a subject's perception. The format of such maps was seen to vary from the highly flexible to the highly standardized (Novak & Gowin, 1984; p 120). The maps provide a two-dimensional representation of concepts and propositions. In the current study this enabled the participants to consider the management groups and key individuals (including themselves) as 'concepts' in the context of relationships, communication, power etc. as 'propositions'.

Unlike the organisational charts drawn frequently as management models (Staff College, 1992; p 2), the concept maps used in the current study were seen as 'living' models, representing the feelings of staff. The maps were flexible rather than standardized since they were based on the perceptions of the participant and not on a preconceived structure (with the exception of the few participants that chose to use a prepared organisational chart). As described earlier (p 43), the concepts (as management groups) were then used as the 'elements' for the third research tool, the repertory grid. This provided a direct link between the research tools and enabled the data from one to support the other. Similar to the 'playing each method off against the other' approach described by Zubir & Pope (1984, p 7) but using different methods or research tools.

The repertory grid has been seen to have a wide application as a 'hard tool for soft psychologists' (Shaw, 1990; p 9). Pope & Keen (1981, p 98) have viewed its use as a forcing technique in encouraging respondents to think more carefully about the way they construe the world around them. Was this technique applied in the current study and what sort of 'world' was perceived by the participants?

The repertory grid was used in the current study as a 'backbone'. It gave shape and strength to the approach
followed. The results of the FOCUSed grids were analysed first as 'level 1' (Appendix 7) and were then substantiated by other findings from the interview notes and concept maps (Appendix 8). The element trees became the building blocks for the foci of the study, whereas the construct trees were treated separately during the analysis of prejudice shown by the participants (p 140). The 'world' of the participants was thus that of the management model, in which they were significant members.

The use of the repertory grid in the current study was modified to allow the results and conclusions to be meaningful. The elements or management groups were 'typed' so that the transformed data could be compared between individuals, case studies and institution-types. The transformed data also enabled the fourth research tool, the information model, to add another perspective to the results established.

The results of the FOCUSed grids were not 'fed back' to the participants (Shaw, 1980; p 23) in the current study since the grids were not treated 'alone' but, as in the case of the interview notes, formed part of the data generated from various research tools applied at one time. Access to a number of the case studies was also limited, particularly for the Senior Managers and the participants based at the 'distant' sites.

The fourth research tool was the information model. This tool has been referred to in some literature as 'concept mapping' but the recent term of 'information model' (Hobrough, 1992) was used in the current study to avoid confusion with the concept map technique used (after Novak & Gowin, 1984).

Wilson (1991) showed that interview data may require an:

'obligation for guidance and facilitation on the interviewer'

(p 92).

It was considered that 'key concepts' could provide the guidance needed (Wilson, 1991; p 92) and that such concepts, when provided by the researcher, would be quantitatively acceptable and convey the qualitative nature of the information.

The current study also used predetermined concepts (Appendix 10) as a basis for the information model. This enabled the data to be compared between participants and for certain trends eg. location of 'decision-making' (p 138) to be concluded. In addition, the data was applied to the notion of 'models of reality'. The construction of
a management model was seen to be aided by the use of information models as a starting point for further staff consultation i.e. ideal models were compared with perceived models for individual concepts (p 159-160). This approach was developed as an adaptation of earlier work in the field of the information model technique (Kontiainen & Hobrough, 1991).

2.3 TVEI

Much research has been carried out on the implementation of TVEI since it was launched in 1983. Local evaluation has taken place, directed by the then Training Agency (previously MSC), with a focus on consortium management and LEA structure. The Training Agency also commissioned an NFER project team, led by Stoney, to carry out National surveys for the pilot schemes and later the extension schemes (Stoney, 1990; NFER, 1991). Were the research tools used in these studies similar to those of the current study?

Local evaluation schemes used a combination of questionnaires with interviews (Sumner, 1988). The approach adopted by these schemes and the later surveys was apparently followed to obtain an understanding of TVEI implementation in its widest sense. This therefore encompassed curriculum change, student retention rates, issues of transition at 16+, consortium organisation etc. Although Sumner's (1988) evaluation used the combined data from two case studies, a comparative approach was not developed and the data was not driven by personal perception.

The NFER surveys have used a variety of techniques. The most recent survey operated at the LEA, consortium and individual institution levels (NFER, 1991; p 11). A large scale questionnaire was used (10 percent of all TVEI coordinators were sampled) together with interviews within case studies in a small number of LEA's. One of the main conclusions was that every institution was different and that the use of an institutional structure in the context of 'change' was a complex issue.

As with earlier studies (FEU, 1985; Stoney, 1986), the views of staff within institutions were obtained in the recent NFER survey (NFER, 1991; p 11) but the approach was not based on personal constructs. In particular, the perception of 'position' within the management model was not considered in the context of TVEI implementation. Communication routes were, however, considered in relation to decision-making (Stoney, 1991; section 6) but not in relation to factors such as status and line-management etc.

The organizational structure of colleges was investigated by Stoney et al. within the NFER survey (Stoney, 1991;
section 6) in terms of TVEI 'accommodation' but the operation of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers within such structures was not reported. The concept of the departmental/faculty structure was compared with that of the matrix system but the source of such concepts was unclear, it did not seem to stem from the participants themselves.

Research into TVEI issues has therefore been varied. A complete review of all research programmes has not been attempted in this section but representative studies were chosen to demonstrate the 'common' and recent approaches. It is apparent that the approach followed in the current study (based on PCP) has not been pursued within this area of educational development.

3. Summary

The current study was seen to be different from other work in the three areas discussed in the previous section (i.e. management, perceptions and TVEI). It represented a combination of four different research tools each with a particular contribution to make.

The interviews were semi-structured and were supported by a verified reporting technique. They presented data and concepts for further analysis using the other research tools. The notes obtained were also used to verify conclusions made from other sources eg. repertory grids.

The concept maps provided the study with a two-dimensional representation of a 'living' management model, involving the participants as members and containing propositions such as power, status and frequency of communication. The concepts were varied but the management models identified were also used within the repertory grids, thereby providing a direct link between the two sources of data.

The repertory grids were seen as the backbone of the study, giving shape and strength. The element trees were formalised using 'types' of management groups (also identified within the information models) to enable a comparative approach to be followed between individuals and case studies. The construct trees were modified to form 'construct routes' associated with prejudice.

Information models (sometimes termed concept maps) were based on predetermined concepts. The predetermined nature of the concepts allowed direct comparisons to be made between the participants so that trends could be identified. The models were also used to construct the proposed management model. It was shown that they could be adapted as an aid to consultation within the process of discussing the management model.
Although the repertory grid was clearly the basis for many of the conclusions stemming from the use of PCP within the current study, the data from this grid was verified using the other sources of data. Each research tool had a contribution to make and the relationship between them (p 169) became clear throughout the analysis of the results obtained.
G. OVERALL PERSPECTIVE AND CONCLUSIONS
G. OVERALL PERSPECTIVE AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this chapter is to consider the various observations and conclusions of the current study in the context of other work. This 'overall perspective' will be completed with a statement of:

G.1 CONTRIBUTIONS made by the current study

G.2 APPLICATIONS of the research findings

The 'answers' to the six research questions, together with the proposed post-16 management model, represent the observations and conclusions made for the study. The answers were obtained as a result of different 'levels' of analysis, leading to an overall view of the data for the 12 case studies in level 3 and a detailed analysis in level 4. What is the relevance of the findings in relation to observations made by other workers?

Integration of TVEI coordinators:

The summary for question 1 (p 108) indicated that the degree of integration of each coordinator was affected by the type of institution in which they were located and by other responsibilities (with a higher profile). Although earlier investigations into the implementation of TVEI (DES, 1985; DES, 1986) had reviewed the contribution made by TVEI coordinators, they did not indicate the degree of integration of such coordinators within institutions.

It had, however, been noted that the success of TVEI implementation was based on;

'allocating staff of the appropriate seniority and experience to the (TVEI) planning groups'

(FEU, 1985 p186)

The concept of coordinator seniority in relation to effectiveness and integration was therefore apparent, often summarised by the view that the institutional coordinators should be given sufficient 'clout' (NFER, 1985). The importance of the 'position' of the coordinator in the institutional hierarchy was, on the other hand, considered by Holman (1990) to be less important than the personal support received from senior colleagues (ie. line-management).
Evidence for such varied arguments has been incomplete. The NFER survey (Stoney, 1986) carried out in the mid 1980's involved exploratory interviews in schools and local authorities, together with questionnaires for TVEI managers, headteachers and school coordinators. This survey was extensive but only considered the operation of TVEI within the post-16 sector in the context of school-FE links (p 13) and did not observe the status or degree of integration of college coordinators.

The NFER recently carried out another National Evaluation of TVEI (Stoney, 1990). This survey, unlike earlier work, had the opportunity to evaluate the integration and operation of coordinators within post-16 colleges, as well as schools. A case study approach was followed, based on interviews, the analysis of local documents and questionnaires. The approach followed was therefore quite different to that of the current study but the 'status' of the coordinator was seen to be important (Stoney, 1991; section 6).

The findings of the current study showed that one of the main factors affecting the integration of coordinators, even those with an established middle-senior position, was access to the powerful Senior Management Team (SMT) and/or Principal. The notion of support and line-management also differed according to the type of post-16 institution considered. Can such observations be supported from other work?

In the context of TVEI, Stoney (1986, p 71) had concluded that the coordinators within 11-16 schools were effectively middle-managers and that they were 'crucial' to successful implementation. It was noted, however, that they had an ill-defined managerial role. This did seem to be the case in the 11-18 schools participating in the current study, but what was the situation in the post-16 colleges?

The then Training Agency (TVEI, 1989 b) considered TVEI in post-16 colleges as a catalyst for change. The perceptions of college staff were described but the method of obtaining such perceptions was unclear. Nonetheless, some coordinators expressed concern as to whether their 'status' was high enough to allow effective cross curricular developments of TVEI. It was concluded that;

'presumably this was less of a problem where the Vice Principal took on the role of college coordinator (as happened in some cases).'

(p 1)
None of the coordinators were Vice Principals in the current study. The coordinators within the Tertiary and Technical Colleges generally had a 'low' status and were not fully integrated within the management structure (again due to lack of access to the SMT and Principal). The plight of the coordinators within such colleges was further complicated by the assumption that line-managers were being supportive and yet the coordinators perceived that they either lacked line-management or that the line-managers were unsupportive.

Can evidence from research findings, other than those focused on TVEI, give further support of the current findings for post-16 colleges? In a survey of organisational structures within FE colleges Janes (1989 a) reviewed the work of 'additional appointments' within such colleges. These appointments were varied but included the role of TVEI coordinators. The 'seniority' of the appointments varied from the upper part of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer. The 'line management' was also found to vary, being usually to the Principal, Vice Principal or third-tier post. The 'function' of the appointments appeared to be advisory or monitory and it was not clear how much 'clout' the posts carried. These conclusions generally agreed with those of the current study. However, none of the participating coordinators had line management with the Principal and their appointments were primarily those of Lecturer.

The current observations made in the case of the Sixth Form Colleges ie. high-profile of the coordinators and access to the SMT and Principal, would seem to be the answer to the concerns stated above. The other research described does not provide evidence about such colleges. It could be concluded from the current study that the situation in the Sixth Form Colleges was more likely to lead to integration of the coordinator but it was clear that the initiative was marginalised (p 109).

None of the case studies investigated therefore gave the 'perfect answer' to the question of integration (related to status and access). Could the way forward be to adopt the 'flexible college' approach described by Gartside (1990)? This approach involved the appointment of temporary 'activity managers' (often with a 2 year duration) for the implementation of initiatives such as TVEI. This secondment scheme will be considered later (p 188) but it is worth noting at this stage that the line-management was seen to involve the coordinators 'reporting regularly to' a member of the college Principalship. The 'direction' of this line-management is, however, questioned by the current research findings since this 'reporting' was seen as a reflection of lower status for the coordinators and would therefore be a continuation of the problems outlined when answering research question 1.
'Types' of management models:

The second research question was based on the relationship between the type/size of the post-16 institution and the type of management model identified. Using descriptors of model shape, key groups and superior positions, it was concluded that there was a link between institution and model types.

Organisational models or structures have been the subject of significant national surveys within the FE and school sectors. There has been a tendency, again, for the Sixth Form Colleges to be almost overlooked. The main focus of the FE surveys has been based on the departmental vs non-departmental models (Brannen, 1981; Harding & Scott, 1982; Janes, 1989; Tansley, 1989; and Shiels, 1991). The approach of the current study ie. to consider the perceptions of participants in the light of 'key groups' and 'superior positions' has not been followed by other workers.

The Training Agency report of 1989 (TVEI, 1989 b), refered to earlier, noted that the vertical (traditionally-departmental) models held the danger that barriers would be created between both departments and subjects. Barriers to the operation of TVEI coordinators within such models were found to be unclear in a relatively recent NFER survey (Stoney, 1991; section 6). On the other hand, matrix (non-departmental) models were thought to have been designed to break down such barriers and to;

'facilitate the introduction of ... cross-curricular initiatives'

(TVEI, 1989b; p 1).

How do these observations relate to those of the current study? The data obtained from the case studies indicated that various 'shapes' of model were found in the four different types of post-16 institution. The combined use of concept maps and interview notes (not found in other work), showed that there was a tendency to adopt a more vertical (hierarchical) model within larger institutions, almost irrespective of institution type. If this was the case, did the coordinators in such large institutions experience more 'barriers'?

The coordinators within the Technical Colleges (ie. the larger institutions) certainly experienced problems of lack of adequate communication(p 132) and were generally positioned within vertical models. However, in answering research question 4 (p 134) it was concluded that the coordinators within the Sixth Form Colleges experienced
greater opportunities to communicate with other individuals and groups across the management model than did the coordinators in other institutions. Since the Sixth Form Colleges had both 'vertical' and 'mixed' models, it would seem that the relationship described above is not necessarily as clear as may have been implied by other workers (TVEI, 1989 b). The 'design' of a model does not automatically imply that the reality of its 'operation' can be controlled.

In relation to key groups, the current study clearly showed that the SMT was the most powerful group within each management model and also occupied a 'superior position' in virtually all institutions. The operation and constitution of this particular management group has been difficult to avoid within other investigations of educational management. The relatively recent FESC survey of FE colleges (Janes, 1989 b) described the SMT of one case study as being the concern of a number of staff in relation to its size and the fact that outside it the Heads of Department (HOD's) had no obvious cross-college role. The major concern was that the group was seen as a two-tier group with the real decisions being made by a small 'inner caucus'. This particular aspect is to be discussed later but it is relevant to note at this point that the current study supported the observations of this particular survey.

It was not surprising to find in the current study that many college Principals (and headteachers in the 11-18 schools) also occupied a 'superior position' within the institutional management models. Cuthbert et al (1987) studied the locally-based management development of FE colleges and observed that membership of the management team normally included the principal, vice-principal(s), Heads of Department, chief administration officer and sometimes the college librarian.

The role and thus the power of the Principal, however, goes well beyond that of the other members of the SMT. In fact, the constructs used by more than one coordinator (in the current study) to 'view' the various management groups included the perception of 'Principal-involvement'. Such observations were seen to support the view of Turner (1979) that;

"the principal is very much in charge, and normally wields very great influence over the college."

(p 50)

The current study considered the perceptions of coordinators and Senior Managers in a different perspective or 'angle' to other work. For example, it was
possible to link the superior position of the Principal with an apparent perception of 'distance' between the coordinators and Principals. This would seem to contradict the earlier observation (TVEI, 1989b; p 1) that TVEI coordinators, when interviewed about their work, considered that they were the 'link' between the senior management (including the Principal) and the lecturers within FE colleges. Is it possible that, when interviewed as part of a national survey, as opposed to being given the opportunity to express their perceptions 'freely' (through concept maps and repertory grids) as in the current study, that the 'answers' given were sometimes those that were expected to be 'correct'.

Did the observation that TVEI groups had a low status in many case studies receive support from other work? The NFER survey of FE colleges in 1986-88 (TVEI, 1989a; p 1) clearly noted that the key challenges identified from the study of TVEI pilot schemes were the lack of staff motivation and collaboration between staff. This apparent lack of interest must reflect the low status of the initiative at that time. The current work does, unfortunately, continue this theme through the perceptions of the participants. Only in the Technical Colleges did there seem to be a recognition of TVEI groups, related to the size and complexity of such institutions. The lessons learned from the pilot schemes were considered to include; staff consultation, effective management and good communication (TVEI, 1989a; p 1). These and related matters are to be considered later (p 186).

**Relationships between management groups**:

The third research question investigated the relationship between the various groups within each management model. It was found that the groups did relate to each other but to varying degrees. The nature of such relationships was relatively complex and was very much the reflection of the personal constructs of the individual participants. 'Strong relationships' and 'isolated groups' were considered to aid the analysis.

In relation to those groups with strong relationships the pattern of groups led to a division between the four types of post-16 institution to form two clusters.

First cluster : 11-18 Schools
Sixth Form Colleges

Second cluster : Tertiary Colleges
Technical Colleges

The 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges were similar in the context of their strong relationship between the SMT.
and curricular groups. The curricular groups included the Heads of Department group, a group noted earlier (p 110) to be relatively powerful. Sixth Form Colleges have generally evolved from 11-18 Schools and their 'striking' success over the post 20 years' referred to by Kelly (1991, p1) has often been linked to their academic/school-based image. With the retention of many of the 'original teachers' and the location of such colleges within the Secondary School's regulations it was not surprising to find that the participants in the Sixth Form Colleges shared similar constructs to those of the 11-18 Schools.

Strong relationships were not found between the various groups in the second cluster. The size and complexity of the two types of college were considered to be possible explanations for the rather 'muddled' view described. The Tertiary Colleges are located within the FE system, along with the Technical Colleges and are also on the other side of the academic/vocational divide from the other group of post-16 institutions. The observations of the current study, in the context of relationships between management groups, had therefore demonstrated further the extent of this divide. The vocationally-based management groups of the Tertiary and Technical Colleges were apparently viewed in a different way to management groups within the Schools and Sixth Form Colleges. The observations supported those of Hodkinson (1989), in particular the concept that the divide is;

'more than structural. It is deeply rooted in history, and supported by different ideologies.'

(p 369)

Did the current observations of 'isolated groups' give further evidence for the continued management of this division within post-16 education? The perceptions of participants within the 11-18 Schools and Sixth Form Colleges failed to identify one particular 'type' of group to be 'isolated' but such perceptions were, nonetheless, based on being distanced from specific groups.

Participants within the Tertiary Colleges used TVEI as one of the ways to isolate the operation of management groups. Those in the Technical Colleges took this perception a step further and considered the TVEI groups to be isolated from the other types of groups. Nonetheless, this second group of institutions did seem to be different to the first. Is it therefore feasible to conclude that the academic/vocational divide noted earlier had directly affected the management of TVEI within post-16 institutions?
Hodkinson (1989) had anticipated that TVEI was an attempt to change the academic/vocational divide. This attempt was, however, questioned since despite the government sponsorship of TVEI, the related proposals stemming from Higginson (1988) in the context of NCVQ had no real commitment (Hodkinson, 1989 p 371). Reid and Filby (1982) had earlier identified that Sixth Form Colleges were a hopeful breakdown of the 'ideology' and yet they have apparently continued to be on one side of the academic/vocational divide ie. on the same side as the 11-18 Schools.

Since ideology (as well as history) is the basis of this divide, how can the situation be changed so that TVEI provision, with its related objectives, be managed and thus implemented in a uniform way? One way forward is anticipated through the 'incorporation' of colleges (DES, 1991). The Sixth Form Colleges will apparently be 'joining' the other colleges in the FE sector, leaving the 11-18 Schools with their other school partners in the Secondary sector. The management of such colleges has been the subject of review (Coopers and Lybrand, 1992) in an attempt to develop some form of uniformity. However, as Janes (1989 a) observed,

'The reality that faces most principals and their senior management colleagues is that if you change the (management) structure, the people remain the same. They can take their past experience and behaviour with them into the new structure.'

(p 153)

The analysis of question 3 in the current study has therefore indicated that the academic/vocational divide may well continue post-incorporation and that the management of initiatives, such as TVEI, will no doubt continue to be affected in the near future. The relationship between incorporation and the management models of post-16 colleges is the subject of discussion later.

Routes of communication:

It was concluded earlier (p 133) that the routes of communication were complex within many management models and varied greatly. The main routes of communication between the participants and the groups were used as a point of comparison.

The current study and the survey of Stoney (1991) represented investigations into the management of post-16 TVEI (extension) whereas earlier work (TVEI, 1989a) only
had the opportunity to touch this sector through the pilot schemes. One of the lessons learned from those schemes was that TVEI success was related to 'good communication'. Did the data generated by the case studies indicate that there was 'good' communication between the TVEI coordinators (in particular) and the various groups?

Good communication is presumably the opportunity to share ideas and information with colleagues within an institution so that the responsibilities related to a particular role (in this case, that of TVEI implementation) can be performed effectively and efficiently. In the 11-18 Schools, the coordinators perceived that it was valuable (i.e. of 'central importance') to communicate with a wide variety of groups across the management structure. It is of interest that the need to communicate with pastoral groups was extended into the Sixth Form Colleges and even into the Technical Colleges. This supported the view that the management of Sixth Form Colleges was linked in many ways to that of the 11-18 Schools but what about the Technical Colleges?

FE Colleges have long been criticised for their lack of pastoral support. In a detailed study of a Tertiary College, Turner (1979) concluded that the senior management were aware of potential criticism of the inadequacy of the college's 'student welfare' and therefore attempted to remedy the problem. The case studies in the current work clearly showed that pastoral groups were often well-entrenched within the management models but the access to such groups by the coordinators varied greatly.

In general terms, the communication routes open to coordinators within the 11-18 Schools and Tertiary Colleges were somewhat limited in relation to those of the Sixth Form Colleges. As in the case of earlier observations (p 180), had the Sixth Form Colleges got it right? The coordinators in these colleges did not have other coordinators to liaise with, as found in the larger Tertiary Colleges and in the Technical Colleges. They also lacked the complicated line-management routes found to be necessary in the latter colleges. Perhaps the answer would be to maintain a relatively small college (similar to those participating Sixth Form Colleges) but with simple and direct communication routes. The likelihood of this scenario becoming reality is remote in the light of financial pressures imposed by 'incorporation' (Touche-Ross, 1992).

Since large colleges are here to stay the answer for colleges such as that of Milton Keynes College (Limb, 1990), may simply be to improve the system of line-management. Gilchrist (1990) observed that in managing
'the college' into the next century the aims should include the development of;

'effective internal and external communications'

(p 426).

The importance of adequate communication routes within post-16 institutions and the use of line-management systems is to be reconsidered later as part of the proposed management model.

The 'prejudice' of TVEI coordinators in relation to that of Senior Managers:

The analysis of prejudice was based on research tools stemming from the field of personal construct psychology (PCP). A modification of the repertory grid data was carried out (p 78) to provide some point of comparison and yet to avoid the intermingling of construct types described by Shaw (1980 p 32). The formalised data of the current study therefore involved the 'typing' of management groups i.e. elements not constructs. It would have been tempting to have imposed the researcher's own prejudice while trying to evaluate the importance of prejudice on the implementation of TVEI.

An overall analysis of constructs for all coordinators and Senior Managers (irrespective of case study) led to the formation of construct models and 'construct routes' (p 144-146). It is understood that such construct routes have not been presented before the current study. Did the construct routes demonstrate prejudice?

It was concluded that the construct routes of the coordinators demonstrated a different prejudice to that of the Senior Managers. The prejudice of the coordinators was often referred to as being based on an 'uninformed' standpoint. The lack of information about the management structure and its operation reflected the lack of adequate communication routes generally open to the coordinators together with some degree of insecurity (supporting earlier observations, p 151). On the other hand, the Senior Managers seemed to be able to 'standback' and view the structure in a broader perspective. Have other investigations into the management of post-16 institutions revealed this difference?

Various surveys of organisational structures in FE colleges, for example, did not seek the opinions of staff such as TVEI coordinators but tended to focus on the responses of the Principals and other Senior Managers (Tansley, 1989 and Sheils, 1991). In a more detailed case
study of an FE college (Gartside, 1990), however, 19 members of staff were interviewed in relation to a 'flexible college structure'. The results of such interviews indicated that the 'activity managers' (including a TVEI coordinator and assistant TVEI coordinator) were often unsure of the way other staff perceived their status (p 190). There was a general feeling of insecurity, even after an extensive consultation process had apparently been completed. Many of the activity managers were thought to feel isolated in their roles. Presumably this range of perceptions would lead to a prejudice similar to that observed in the current study.

How did coordinators deal with this potential lack of security? The construct route for coordinators (p 146) clearly showed that they perceived the role of decision-making (of which they were not significantly involved) to be linked to TVEI via 'finance'. The coordinators may well have been using the monitory aspect of TVEI management as a way of bridging the gap between them and the powerbase of the institution.

Hollyhock (1982) concluded that middle management (which applied to many coordinators in the current study) implemented policy and even formulated policy in a 'vacuum'. The implementation of policy was apparently the norm. This observation added support to the perceptions noted in the current study. In addition, the conclusion that coordinator prejudice was also based on finance was not surprising in the light of Senior Manager opinion in a National survey i.e. that the function of TVEI coordinators was primarily advisory or 'monitory' (Janes, 1989 a, p 129). Presumably this type of prejudice demonstrated by Senior Managers will encourage coordinators to perceive that the monitory aspect of their roles is significant.

The analysis of construct routes for Senior Managers in the current study suggested that they were fully aware of their power and status and that they had the ability to make decisions. The Training Agency survey of TVEI developments in colleges (TVEI, 1989 b) showed that Senior Managers viewed their role as;

'overseeing the development of TVEI within the college ... (and) for inter-institutional liaison'

(p 1).

The current study supported the view that Senior Managers considered external groups to be important (i.e. linked to the construct of 'effectiveness') and yet they tended not to be directly involved with the operation of such
groups. With relatively few exceptions, the Senior Managers in the case studies relied on other colleagues (including TVEI coordinators) to represent the college interests in this context.

The construct routes for both coordinators and Senior Managers showed an awareness that the cooperation of colleagues was important. The Senior Managers demonstrated an understanding that this was more important than the funding available through the then Training Agency. Hodkinson (1990 p 52) had already concluded that if institutions were to create the sort of climate for TVEI to flourish, management styles should become 'cooperative rather than confrontational'. The constructs of the participants in the current work verified that this perception was widespread, irrespective of the type of post-16 institution.

It would seem logical that to reduce the effect of the type of prejudice discussed some form of staff training is needed, beyond the coordinators and Senior Managers. A management model capable of allowing staff to feel part of initiatives such as TVEI should also be developed. These areas are to be reviewed in the following sections.

Post-16 management model:

The sixth research question related to the formation of a management model for all post-16 institutions. A series of 'factors' affecting both the management model and the role of initiative coordinators (such as TVEI coordinators) was extracted from a review of the answers to the five other research questions.

The factors were eventually tabulated (p 157) and later used to construct the model (p 164). The data obtained from twelve case studies (via four different research tools) in the current study was therefore applied to the proposition of a management model. Can data from other workers be used to support or question the relevance of model-construction in this area of educational management?

It has been observed that, being a simplified 'picture', a model necessarily has limitations (Cryer, 1986 p 73). It was, however, concluded in the current study that the 'process' of building such models (even with their limitations) is of value as a 'starting point' for further consultation within institutions.

Attempts to view the management of post-16 institutions through operational models rather than organisational structures are sparse. In a review of one Hampshire pilot scheme for TVEI (Hampshire TVEI, 1988 b) a 'common management structure' was suggested but the model did not indicate routes of communication or an understanding of
status or function. The source of data used to propose the model, although related to two case studies, was unclear.

Pollard (1982) described a case study of an FE College and considered organisational change through the use of models (p 75) but, although line-management (one of the 'factors' used in the current proposal) was implied, communication routes were not evident. How could such models be viewed as operational? Perhaps Leech (1982) had the answer since it was implied that even though more models can be generated:

'the essence seems to be making work whatever form of structure exists, and making it work well ...'

(p 50).

The notion of a structure 'working well' must imply that an understanding of its operation (perhaps through the use of management models) would be of value. Some workers have used criteria or factors in order to consider the way in which their respective management models operate. It is clear that some form of rationale is required. For example, the rationale used by Gartside (1990 p 177) included an improved 'lateral cooperation' across the organisational structure and 'accessibility to senior management'.

The two criteria stated by Gartside (1990) support two of the 'factors' identified in the current study ie. clear communication routes and membership of the SMT for initiative coordinators (p 157). Increased and more formal communication routes for 'groups of staff' with the senior management have also been considered as suggestions for improving the functioning of colleges by other workers (Ratcliffe, 1987), thereby avoiding the reality of 'tea breaks' being the main routes of communication as observed by others (Amess, 1982).

The factors of communication and membership (of the SMT) described for the proposed management model have therefore been supported by other workers. Have the other factors such as line-management, job descriptions, decision-making and the use of initiative-based task groups also received support?

Line-management was referred to earlier in this 'overall perspective' (p 180) in the context of coordinator-integration within management models. Janes (1989 a) described one of the responsibilities for senior staff within colleges was line or functional management (p 110). However, the nature of this management function was not described. Gartside (1990) was more descriptive and noted that the line management link with the
Principalship (not necessarily directly with the Principal) for activity managers, such as the TVEI coordinator, served to provide support in the relationships with colleagues in the college. How was this to be achieved? One Assistant Principal interviewed in the same case study observed that since the staff in Departments sometimes;

'wish to do their own thing - so I ensure that the Activity Managers have my support'

(p 191)

It would seem that the (threatening) power shown by such Senior Managers is even greater than that perceived by participants in the current study. Is this what is meant by line-management? It was anticipated from the list of 'factors' (p 157) that line-management would at least enable the coordinator to understand how change could be achieved through the management structure with a sound understanding of the decision-making process. It was not suggested that the line-manager would necessarily intervene in the way implied by Gartside (1990).

Clearly the relationship between the coordinator and line-manager is important. The current study showed that the perceptions of this relationship can vary greatly between the participants within one institution (p 132). The use of a specific job description for the initiative-coordinator in relation to that of the line-manager (a 'factor' listed on p 157) would presumably avoid the conflict that has been reported between TVEI coordinators and their nominated line-managers ie. deputy headteachers (Stoney, 1986 p 44).

The application of the approach used in the current study to carry out some form of management development programme may have the potential to improve the operation of line-management systems in an institution. This application is to be discussed later but it is realistic to be aware that differences in opinion about the relevance of line-management systems will probably continue (Gartside, 1990 p199). Initiative coordinators, such as the TVEI coordinators, are still likely to face the credibility problems with the 'barons' described by Hopkins (1990, p136).

As observed earlier, the use of job descriptions is not thought to be available to all staff in all post-16 institutions but this situation is expected to change for those colleges entering 'incorporation' in April 1993 (Coopers and Lybrand, 1992). It was also suggested that such job descriptions should be available to all staff via a college staff handbook (McCann, 1992).
observation was anticipated by Janes (1989a p 109) and described as 'good practice'.

The logical step from this development would be to generate such job descriptions and staff handbooks as a result of full consultation with the staff. This would encourage the 'ownership' of developments (such as TVEI) across the college, as noted by Gilchrist (1990 p 419). However, it was also realised by Gilchrist (1990) that in spite of 'widespread participation' of staff, concern about the college aims etc. may still be detected.

Decision-making was also considered to be another factor affecting the operation of a management model, such as that proposed (p 165). The ability to make decisions was shown to be perceived as a powerful tool within the case studies investigated. Gleeson (1987, p 3) had concluded that the involvement of central government (through initiatives such as TVEI) in the running of schools and colleges has drawn attention to wider changes in 'decision-making processes'. What are these processes and how can they affect the operation of a management model?

The construct routes discussed earlier (p 146) showed that the construct of 'decision-making' was perhaps more evident for the coordinators than for the Senior Managers. It was later considered as a source of prejudice (p 147). The process of decision-making was related to access to information and to the powerful SMT. It would seem to be in the interest of all staff, including initiative coordinators, to take part in this decision-making. Shakleton (1988) observed that;

'college lecturers....need urgently to develop their means of influencing decision-making.'

(p 59)

It is suggested from the current study that the proposed management model (seen as an opportunity to discuss operational aspects of management) would provide an enabling framework for all staff to influence decision-making in some way. It has already been noted (Kedney & Parkes, 1988 p 74) that the 'location', and thus the process of decision-making is linked to managerial effectiveness and efficiency at the institutional level. It was not surprising, therefore, for the management structure of one new Tertiary College to be based on an 'open approach' to decision-making (Ratcliffe, 1987; p 30).

Not all colleges are presumably able or willing to adopt this open approach to decision-making. It is clear, however, that the channels of communication should be
sufficiently well-established to enable the information essential for decision-making to be available to all staff (Stoney, 1991; section 6). The value of involving staff at all levels and in all areas of an institution has already been recognised in the school context (Hargreaves, 1984; p 100).

The final factor to be considered in relation to other work is that of 'the use of initiative-based task groups'. The function of these groups was considered to be basically cross-curricular. It was envisaged, however, that they would be convened by the initiative-coordinator, have a specific role (based on the objectives of the initiative) and have a fixed term of operation. This proposal was similar to that of Gartside (1990) in the context of groups convened by the so-called activity managers. The potential risk with the formation of such groups is that they could become the only location within the management structure in which a particular initiative was discussed. It was observed in the current study that, even with the perceived integration of TVEI coordinators within management structures, the initiative was seen to be 'marginalised' (p 104). How can the operation of initiative-based groups therefore be integrated within the overall coordination of the management structure?

The answer must rest with the Principal and other Senior Managers. It is critical that members of the SMT are responsive to the needs of the initiative coordinators. In a review of the 'Responsive College Programme (RCP)' Bilborough (1988, p655) observed that the Principal was the 'key gateway' for managing change. Furthermore, the NFER survey of 1989-90 (NFER, 1991; p 12) indicated that as a general principle for the management of change (associated with TVEI) strong leadership and vision should be available within an institution. It was widely-perceived, from the findings of the current study, that the Principal was the most powerful figure within the management structure and presumably in a good position to provide the support needed by colleagues such as the initiative coordinators.

Lessons could be learned from the School Management task force (which ended in April 1992) from which it was realised that the values and aims of an institution as expressed via the senior staff will determine the way other staff work and 'organise themselves' into teams (Williams, 1992b; p274). It could therefore be concluded that, subject to the support and guidance of the Principal and other Senior Managers, operational models such as the one proposed in the current study could become a step towards greater effectiveness and efficiency.
G.1 CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY THE CURRENT STUDY

(i) The comparison of four different types of post-16 institutions in relation to the management of TVEI ie. 11-18 Schools plus Sixth Form, Tertiary and Technical Colleges. The study therefore crossed the divide between the current Secondary School and Further Education sectors.

(ii) The use of the initiative, TVEI, as an investigative tool to examine the operation of educational management structures.

(iii) The application of personal construct psychology (PCP) theories and methods to determine the perceptions of participants ie. the use and comparison of the repertory grid with the information model.

(iv) The combined use of four different research tools to demonstrate the perceptions of staff involved within post-16 management models.

(v) An analysis of the perceived degree of integration of TVEI coordinators within post-16 institutions.

(vi) The identification of communication routes across the management model, as perceived by participants.

(vii) The extension of the element trees, generated by the FOCUS programme (repertory grid analysis), to build 'construct routes' to demonstrate the prejudice of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers.

(viii) The identification of 'factors' to be considered when analysing the operation of post-16 management systems.

(ix) The presentation of a management model based on the perceptions of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers (viewed as an operational model rather than an organisational structure).
G.2 APPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The earlier discussions within this chapter on 'overall perspective and conclusions' referred, in part, to the possible application of the current work to staff or management development systems (p 191). If the findings of the current work are to be of value, as the product of an active research programme, it is in their application to the area of staff development (including the related management development).

Much data has been generated as a result of semi-structured interviews and questionnaires in the context of educational management systems (as discussed earlier, p 171). The FE system has been the subject of this approach, together with the investigation of some case studies. The question that relates to the application of this and the current work is as follows.

'How can the results and their analysis be used by colleagues in post-16 institutions?'

One of the contributions made by the current study is the use of personal construct psychology (PCP) to determine the perceptions of staff in the context of post-16 management. The 'support' that should be provided by the Principal and Senior Managers (discussed earlier, p 193) for staff such as initiative coordinators can only be of use if the feelings or perceptions of the staff are appreciated. If this approach is taken a step further it would seem logical to assume that the 'staff' would only feel confident to express their perceptions fully when they were aware of the perceptions of the Principal and other Senior Managers. Perhaps some form of joint staff development programme would be needed.

It is of interest to note that in the current study the Senior Manager of one case study (A1) indicated that the 'sharing' of concept maps between colleagues would be of use (p 74). The joint discussion of repertory grid and concept map data was also seen to be valuable by the team of coordinators in another case study (C3).

The concept of staff development is not a new phenomenon. Indeed, the introduction of TRIST (TVEI-Related In Service Training Scheme) in April 1985 is evidence of the value of such staff development. The impact of TRIST was found to vary but in some cases it was observed to enable participation in decision-making within institutions (Evans, 1990; p 113).

A summary of The National Evaluation Report of TRIST management (Battle et.al, 1988) resulted in the emergence of several 'key issues', one of which being that;
'The 'process' of identifying needs seemed to be as important as the 'product' or intended outcome of the exercise. It was an important learning experience, a valid and valuable INSET activity in its own right.'

(p 5)

The effective identification of the 'needs' referred to by Battle (1988) stemmed from genuine dialogue, a framework, consultation and negotiation etc. Although the evaluation was related to the use of potential trainees and 'those assisting', it could be envisaged that the staff themselves could become both the trainers and trainees.

The production of a 'living' management model, driven by the feelings or constructs of the various participants, can only be based on the dialogue referred to above. The dialogue should not only occur on one occasion but should be a common feature of planned staff development programmes. Pressman & Wildavsky (1981, p 256) noted that implementation of an innovation (such as TVEI) is a process over many years. Furthermore, it was suggested that the baseline objectives were likely to be 'resculptured' at the very scene of implementation. This view supports the factor of 'adjustment' considered as part of the proposed management model (p 155).

How should the effective dialogue be achieved? Much research data in the context of management/organisational structures has been generated from the use of interviews and questionnaires. Do these research tools lend themselves to staff development programmes?

Cuthbert (1987, p 27) observed that management development is more likely to be seen to be relevant and effective if it is 'locally-based'. If this local approach is used, how would the interviews and questionnaires be completed within an institution? The use of these investigative tools, in their simplest form, would imply that some individuals (presumably the Senior Managers) are receiving information and the other staff are giving information. This would not seem to lead to effective dialogue and may only reinforce the 'distance' between colleagues observed in the current study.

The locally-based college management development programme described by Cuthbert (1987) indicated the use of questionnaires (to provide the SMT with a set of searching questions), a confidential self-assessment exercise and an external consultant. The combined use of such tools would, no doubt, generate much data about staff opinion but the planning of the management-operation would still seem to be with the SMT. It is concluded that the production of a representative
management model could be more effectively achieved through the use of the PCP techniques described in the current study. This would avoid the construction of detailed management models (with description of roles, line-management etc.) apparently in the absence of staff perceptions (Janes, 1989 p 139).

What does PCP have to offer? Denzin (1978, p 304) described the use of FOCUSed repertory grids as the opportunity to obtain a deep understanding of the connections made by participants in their thoughts. Since;

'people may construe their environment in an infinite number of ways.'

(Pope, 1982 p 5)

it would seem logical to use some form of investigative tool, such as the repertory grid, to identify those constructs that are considered to directly affect the operation of management systems within institutions.

Post-16 institutions are unlikely to have direct access to the computerised programmes (Shaw, 1980) needed to analyse the data generated by repertory grids. How could such grids be used without this facility?

The researcher has carried out two independent training exercises with staff within one Sixth Form College (McCann, 1992 - undocumented). The exercises involved the completion of repertory grids by the participants, in relation to a set of mutually-agreed elements i.e. management groups (p 43). The participants were given the opportunity to refer to their own constructs and then to share their perceptions (via a five point score) with colleagues. The exercise was simple, relatively brief (1.0 hr duration), did not involve the use of computer analysis and was seen as a 'starting point' for further discussion about roles, relationships and team-building within the management model. As Pope and Denicolo (1989) observed,

'in team building or dyadic relationships eg. teaching, research counselling, Kelly's social corollary (the basis of PCP) is highly significant.'

(p 10)

How could the 'information model' be used to achieve an effective staff development programme? The use of this technique to generate models of reality was discussed
earlier (p 159-160). It was observed that the ideal relationships between concepts, seen to be relevant to the operation of a model, can be compared with the perceptions of the various participants. This comparison could then be used to identify the possible changes needed to shift from the situation determined at the time of the exercise to the desired model. The 'team-building' aspect described above is relevant in the use of the information model if the concepts are jointly-agreed as a product of consultation (Kontiainen, 1988; Kontiainen & Hobrough, 1991). This 'joint-activity' is perhaps more relevant in the context of staff development than the use of imposed concepts found in the current study (p 174) and that of Wilson (1991).

The third research tool considered to have further potential for staff development programmes is the 'concept map'. Novak and Gowin (1984, p 15) considered that concept mapping provided an analysis of participant's perceptions. The links between concepts (described as propositions) in concept maps were seen to guide the use of 'auxiliary materials or tasks' for questions within the interview-setting (Novak and Gowin, 1984; p 123). The current study modified this approach so that the management groups identified within concept maps, drawn by each participant, effectively became the elements of the repertory grid (p 42-43). Furthermore, some of the links or propositions also became the 'views' or constructs used in the repertory grid. Concept maps were therefore not only observed to give a two-dimensional representation of the perceptions of participants (in the context of the operation of the management model) but were also a useful step into the more detailed repertory grid technique.

In relation to educational research, the use of a combination of research tools has been seen to give enhanced credibility of the findings (Zubir & Pope, 1984) and;

'involve a complex process of playing each method off against the other so as to maximise the validity of field efforts.'

(p 7)

In the context of staff development, the 'validity' could be interpreted as 'relevance' and 'field efforts' as the investment in time and effort in the planning and running of the staff development programme. The application of
the current research findings is therefore to combine the following research tools within a staff development programme;

Exercise 1 - construction of CONCEPT MAPS using an agreed approach, based on key groups and individuals (connected by propositions such as the mode of communication, line-management etc.)

Exercise 2 - completion of REPERTORY GRIDS to identify staff perceptions/personal constructs in the context of an agreed set of management groups (extracted from the concept maps), and to share such perceptions with colleagues

Exercise 3 - joint review of a proposed management model (operational not organisational) in relation to INFORMATION MODELS based on mutually-agreed concepts, with the opportunity to adjust current operations to achieve the desired model.

As stated earlier (p 193), support and guidance provided by the Principal and other Senior Managers are essential to the success of teamwork across institutions. Any form of staff development programme, such as that indicated above, will only achieve desired targets if all staff involved are empowered to make recommendations based on the results of the programme. The location of strategic planning within the Senior Management Team should not be 'threatened' by the recommendations. The conclusions related to the current study indicate that the Senior Managers involved should be capable of managing change and to value the opportunity to 'adjust' plans, such as the operation of the management model, in support of staff perceptions.
JOB DESCRIPTION : COLLEGE COORDINATOR (TVEI)

Coordinator's responsibilities will include the following insofar as they relate to TVEI and in consultation with appropriate colleagues:

1. the implementation and monitoring of the scheme in the institution, providing termly reports and other information to the Manager as required;

2. communications between staff and Manager and with other coordinators;

3. promoting cross-curricular developments;

4. ensuring that student's records are properly maintained;

5. advising the Principal on the management of TVEI funds, producing regular accounts;

6. advising the Principal and Manager on INSET needs.

The coordinator will be responsible to the Principal, on whose behalf (s)he will be accountable to the Consortium Manager and through the Manager to the TVEI Directorate.

The appointed College Coordinator will have the opportunity to be responsible for the management of the Consortium for a period of twelve months and will be able to express preference as to the school year in which (s)he would wish to undertake the Consortium Management responsibilities.

This Job Description is common to all Coordinators (within the East Hants TVEI consortium)

Reference: Hampshire Education Committee (1987)
Dear ...............,

please find enclosed an interview report form completed as a result of the interview that I had with you on ................. . You will remember that I came to your School/College and talked to you about the management of TVEI, asking you to complete a concept map to represent the related management structure and filling in a repertory grid to summarise your views of management.

One important aspect of my work has been the absence of audio tapes for interview transcripts and yet I still require some confirmation that I did hold such an interview with you and that the brief notes represent a summary of the points raised. The other parts of the work, including the concept map drawn by you require no further evidence.

Could you please sign the report form enclosed and forward it to me using the envelope provided?

Yours sincerely,

Dr. John McCann
INTERVIEW REPORT

Institution name : .....................(Confidential)
Institution code : ..........
Interviewee : ....................(Confidential)
Title/job description : ................................

School with Sixth Form Tertiary Technical
Sixth Form College College College

Date of interview : / /
Size of School/College : ............(Student nos.)
Time involved with TVEI (personal) : ..........years

(institution) : ..........years

Composition of TVEI Consortium : .......... 11-16 Schools

.......... 11-18 Schools

.......... Sixth Form Colleges

.......... Tertiary Colleges

.......... Technical Colleges

Summary of comments :
Dear Mr. Coles,

with reference to my recent telephone conversation with your secretary, Miss. Margaret Cohen, I would like to thank you for agreeing to the use of the name Hampshire Education Authority within my PhD Research thesis soon to be submitted at the University of Surrey. The 'name' will be used as a source of case studies. The case studies are only labelled by codes and are therefore confidential. The research basically investigates the type of management structures in place within post-16 institutions.

To clarify my position with the University of Surrey I would be grateful if you could sign and return the attached statement.

Thankyou for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. John McCann
Head of Personnel & Staff Development
RESEARCH THESIS: The Management of Post-16 Institutions - Perceptions of TVEI Implementation.

RESEARCHER: Dr. John McCann

It is understood that Dr. McCann carried out active research within some post-16 institutions in Hampshire as part of the above-mentioned research programme. The identity of the institutions will remain confidential (via the use of code-names) but the name 'Hampshire Education Authority' will be used.

Signed .........

Mr. P. Coles
(Chief Education Officer)
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY A1

School/college - type: 11-18 School (Hampshire)
size: 630 students
TVEI: 2 years

Consortium - four 11-18 Schools, one Technical College

Interviewee - type: Headteacher (PS1)
TVEI: 0.25 years

(a) The Headteacher was newly-appointed ie. 3 months

(b) The Headteacher promptly made the TVEI coordinator a member of the Senior Management Team. This had therefore changed the circumstances of the coordinator since the time of the coordinator's interview. The team was observed to function with significant input from the coordinator.

(c) Many of the groups elicited were attended personally by the Headteacher.

(d) A direct relationship had already been established with the coordinator.

(e) There was some concern about including 'everybody' in the concept map but the Headteacher was pleased to discuss the map further with colleagues.

(f) The information model was found to be too restrictive due to the nature of the 'imposed' concepts.

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (PS2)
TVEI: 2 years

(a) The TVEI coordinator had received a temporary appointment at scale E, having been previously appointed as a Head of Science (scale D) at the same school.

(b) A very good relationship was established with the Headteacher. A new appointment for the Headteacher post was planned in the near future (interviewed later as PS1). It was hoped that the new Headteacher would allow more 'access' to the management system for the coordinator.

(c) The coordinator had been at the school for approximately 4 years and the new post as coordinator was assisted by a sound working relationship already established with colleagues.

(d) The Heads of Year group was considered as powerful and worthy of gaining their support.

(e) The coordinator felt under pressure with a range of external and internal meeting to attend.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY A2

School/college - type: 11-18 school (Hampshire)
size: 985 students
TVEI: 2 years

Consortium - one Sixth Form College, one Technical College

Interviewee - type: Deputy Headteacher (AHS1)
TVEI: 2 years

(a) The DH (Deputy Headteacher) was responsible for plant, site, LMS (Local Management of Schools), finances and ancillary/administration staff.

(b) The DH worked very much as a member of a team eg. with the TVEI coordinator (also a DH) for timetable issues.

(c) The post held had a teaching commitment of five 70 minute sessions (out of 20 sessions).

(d) The school had undergone a change from a pyramid to a plateau management structure with the middle management consisting of Heads of Year (HOY), Heads of Department (HOD) and the bursar. Classroom managers were the teachers.

(e) It was considered that the administration staff should not be separated from the teaching staff. The DH had a significant managerial role that had changed with the introduction of LMS.

(f) Other management duties of the DH included lettings and contracts, with a responsibility for resource allocation (but not the TVEI budget).

(g) The appointment of 15 HOD's reflected the collaborative approach to management. A task-orientated approach had been followed eg. the capitation working part (with various HOD's involved) had ended when the specific task was complete.

(h) The DH felt that 'doing the right things' was effective whereas 'doing things right' was efficient.

(i) The two recently-held weekends of SMT training had been intensive and well-convened. The weekly meetings of this particular group lacked an agenda.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY A2 (CONT.)

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator and Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for curriculum (AHS2)

TVEI: 2 years

(a) The coordinator had observed an overlap between the work required as a coordinator for TVEI and that as the Deputy Headteacher (DH) for curriculum.

(b) TVEI had been integrated within the day to day running of the curriculum;

\[ \text{GCSE} \quad \text{National Curriculum} \]

\[ \text{TVEI} \]

(c) It was observed that the curriculum needs of the school were supported in general by TVEI with little conflict.

(d) The staffing plans for the school were likely to be affected by TVEI. The recently-created Technology and Profiling coordinator posts were related to TVEI issues and were to be advertised internally.

(e) The cross-curricular issues were convened by the coordinator and involved primarily the curriculum working party (with meetings held about 2 to 3 times per term).

(f) The coordinator had a teaching commitment similar to that of the other DH and was appointed as a Physics teacher.

(g) The post of Head of Technology was viewed by the coordinator as an industrial/liaison role. It was considered that all staff should feel the need to be part of TVEI, for this and other posts.

(h) It was concluded that an effective managerial system was based on outcome rather than on personalities.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY A3

School/college - type: 11-18 school outside Hampshire (distant case study)
size: 400 students
TVEI: 2.2 years

Consortium - nine 11-16 Schools, one Technical College

Interviewee - type: Headteacher (SBS1)
TVEI: 2.2 years

(a) At the time of the interview the headteacher had been in post for two and a half years. During that period the headteacher had been personally involved with the appointment of 'task' postholders. TVEI was introduced to the school a few months after the appointment of the headteacher; thereby enabling some change to occur in the management structure.

(b) The TVEI coordinator was the Deputy headteacher (pastoral) but the responsibility was then passed on to the second deputy headteacher (curriculum) and finally on to a third member of staff.

(c) The current TVEI coordinator was also the Head of Sixth Form. The coordinator was identified by the headteacher as a 'non-Scientist' but with the extension of TVEI it was considered to be much more logical for the Head of Sixth Form to hold the post, rather than the deputy headteacher (curriculum).

(d) The policy of the school was for the staff meeting agenda to be 'open' for one week before the meeting. This was designed to enable all staff to contribute to the management of the school by raising various issues etc.

(e) The ideas of the headteacher were expressed during the senior management team meetings and were sometimes 'generated' by such meetings.

(f) The deputy headteacher (curriculum) was the convenor of the Heads of Department (HOD) meeting. This was considered to be an important and significant role. The departmental and pastoral meetings were allowed to make recommendations to the senior management team meetings for consideration.

(g) The overall management of the post-16 provision was somewhat complicated since the sixth form was shared with the adjacent state-maintained school. The sixth form had 220 students.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY A3 (CONT.)

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (and Head of Sixth Form) [SBS2]
TVEI: 1.0 years

(a) The communication routes required for the extension of TVEI into the post-16 phase were thought to have been aided by the 'dual role' of the coordinator.

(b) The coordinator attended various meetings with the headteacher eg. Consortium TVEI Management Group and the Joint Sixth Form Board Meetings. The headteacher and coordinator briefed each other prior to attending such meetings.

(c) The ultimate control of TVEI was held with the headteacher eg. financial and staffing matters, whereas the curriculum aims and development were the responsibility of the coordinator.

(d) The coordinator had a good relationship with the headteacher. The headteacher had a sound understanding of the various issues involved due to this working pattern.

(e) The local TVEI consortium consisted of the shared sixth form and local Technical College plus 9 other schools. Many of the schools had previously operated within the consortium due to CPVE (Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education). The technical college was also a member of three other local TVEI consortia.

(f) Policy was generated by the headteacher via the policy committee ie. the headteacher, deputy headteachers and TVEI coordinator. It was considered to be essential for the coordinator to be party to this level of management in the school.

(g) The local decision-making aspect of TVEI-implementation was under the 'tight control' of the area TVEI manager.
(a) It was felt that the pressure of being a senior tutor as well as the TVEI coordinator was great.

(b) The Vice Principal was involved with the Local Management of Schools (LMS) etc. and the post of TVEI coordinator was seen to be a move towards the curriculum aspect of college management for the post-holder.

(c) A new Principal and two new Vice Principals had been appointed with the introduction of a revised management structure. The structure had already been established at a nearby Sixth Form College which had been involved in the TVEI pilot scheme.

(d) The management team were considered to be much more aware of the importance of understanding management systems and their operation than had been the case before the new appointments.

(e) The college was a member of a TVEI consortium within the second phase of TVEI extension in the county. The students with a background of TVEI at the 14-16 year old phase had yet to arrive at the college.

(f) The coordinator was one of nine senior tutors in the management system. Many meetings of the various working parties were attended, when possible eg. Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) and Equal Opportunities (EO) groups.

(g) The college had grown significantly in size since the changeover from a Grammar School in 1975, when the coordinator was still in post as a senior tutor.
(a) The VP had previously been appointed as a Head of a Sixth Form Centre in Essex, involving two 11-18 schools, one of which was a pilot TVEI school.

(b) It was observed that curriculum development was already in a particular direction but that TVEI 'oiled' the works eg. access to county staff and staff development provision had been increased for the college. The VP was very much part of TVEI-implementation and was a member of the TVEI management group.

(c) Current links with TVEI were developing due to the support of the TVEI coordinator. The attitudes of many colleagues were often negative and yet interesting developments had taken place.

(d) The speed of TVEI-impact varied according to the particular department involved. Although major curriculum changes were taking place across the college, some departments were anticipating events with forward planning.

(e) Four divisions had been established in the management structure eg. Science, Mathematics etc. The TVEI coordinator was observed to meet once every two weeks with the Heads of Division to manage TVEI-implementation.

(f) TVEI was seen as a source of funding but more importantly as an avenue of access to LEA staff support and training required to bring about curriculum change.

(g) The VP taught six out of 20 hours each week.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY B2

School/college - type: Sixth Form College (Hampshire)
size: 1150 students
TVEI: 4 years

Consortium - six 11-16 Schools, one Technical College

Interviewee - type: Deputy Principal for Curriculum (PSC1)
TVEI: 4 years

(a) The concept map was drawn with the perception of the Deputy Principal's own role within curriculum provision and the various relationships of management.

(b) A close working operation had been established between the two Deputy Principal's (DP's). The VP was responsible for INSET and changes in routine and systems of management.

(c) The other DP (also appointed as the TVEI coordinator) was seen to be responsible for student guidance and ran a guidance team of four senior tutors and one college careers officer.

(d) The main role of the DP for curriculum was to work closely with the Heads of Department, of which there were 16. A meeting was arranged to meet all HOD's twice each term. In addition to this management structure a Cross Curriculum Group (CCG) had been formed due to the loss of the original Faculty structure. The CCG met weekly with the DP.

(e) The DP sat on the Insights into Work Group within the college and also received the minutes of all Curriculum Support Groups (CSG's). The DP was sometimes invited to attend the CSG's (consortium curriculum groups established by the TVEI Directorate) to discuss curriculum issues affecting the college.

(f) The governing body had staff involvement according to the specific agenda. The DP was a servicing officer for the curriculum sub-committee of the governing body.

(g) The DP also attended the local Deputy Principal/Headteacher group which met three times per year. This group followed a very 'loose' agenda.

(h) Some frustration was felt due to the feeling of having the 'hands tied' with the changes required in management.

(i) The imposed concepts of the information model were preferred by the DP. The elicitation of constructs for the repertory grid were found to be difficult.
(a) TVEI was seen as a part of the college development plan.

(b) Equal opportunities had become an issue as a result of TVEI-implementation, particularly since a successful INSET training day had been planned in relation to this issue.

(c) The TVEI consortium chairman was the Principal of the college and the consortium manager was also based at the college. It was considered that this was a distinct advantage with an immediate response to questions as required by the coordinator.

(d) The college had been positioned within a second phase consortium and had therefore been involved with TVEI for the first two years without significant funding. The college was already aware of the issues and requirements of TVEI-implementation eg. profiling was already developed across the college. The coordinator considered that this gave the college staff the opportunity to 'think before acting'.

(e) The coordinator had been in post for four years and still felt the need to become more involved in aspects of the curriculum such as Science, Design and Technology etc.

(f) In relation to the current status of TVEI, it was observed that;

- TVEI was integrated within the college
- tended to be called 'curriculum development'
- some staff were hostile but the numbers of such staff were diminished
- government-inspired with the resulting review and change of staff responsibilities
- the Curriculum Support Groups (CSG's) had changed attitudes eg. the shaping of curriculum issues to suit 'own needs'.
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INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY B3

School/college - type: Sixth Form College (distant)
  size: 600 students
  TVEI: 5.0 years

Consortium - three 11-16 Schools, one 11-18 School, one Technical College

Interviewee - type: Principal (CC1)
  TVEI: 5.0 years

(a) Adaptation to change was considered to be an essential feature of a management system. So many imposed factors had to be dealt with eg. LEA, central government, staff budget control and LMS (local management of schools).

(b) The overall purpose of change must be to achieve 'good education at all costs'. This change exists within the context of government legislation. It represents the 'interface' between government and the educational institution.

(c) TVEI was piloted 5 years earlier when the college was smaller ie. 500 students. The staff number had been greatly reduced during that time but there was no link with TVEI-implementation.

(d) The Principal considered the governing body to be very important in the introduction of change but many members were not directly involved eg. those representatives from Universities and those with an historical link with the college. The local contact with TVEI was therefore thought to be limited. This was important in relation to the profile of TVEI.

(e) The TVEI coordinator was known to have many other responsibilities as Director of Studies (curriculum). A separate appointment of a coordinator was not made because the job had been so 'well done' during the pilot by the individual concerned.

(f) Policy-making was based on four committees, covering all aspects of college management. The committees were able to make recommendations to the Senior Staff (SS) meetings and to the management group. The SS meetings were held once per week and good contact was maintained with TVEI since the DOS was a member of the group.

(g) The SS meeting had a very high profile within the management structure. It was viewed as the 'backbone' of the college management with the Principal delegating work for colleagues through the group.
(h) Financial limitations related to curriculum development had not been eased by TVEI. The Principal was unsure of the impact of TVEI but was convinced that its management was in 'good hands'.

(i) The Principal was the interface between the various working parties of the governing body and those of the teaching staff. The opinion of the DOS (not particularly as the coordinator) were considered to be crucial to the successful management of the college. The DOS carried many more responsibilities than the title may have implied.

(j) Perceptions of management should be shared via staff meetings eg. discussing 'things, thoughts paper and people'. 
INTERVIEW NOTES - CASE STUDY B3 (CONT.)

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (and Director of Studies for curriculum) [CC2]
TVEI: 5.0 years

(a) The Senior Management meeting (alternative name for the Senior Staff meeting described by the Principal) was considered by the coordinator as having a high profile in terms of successful management.

(b) It was thought that 'control over' management issues was very important in relation to the coordinator/Director of Studies (DOS) post held.

(c) The impetus of TVEI, in its fifth year at the college, was not as great as for that during the pilot phase. Many coordinators had left the consortium due to promotion and few were left to 'carry the consortium'. The financial aspect had therefore taken priority over curriculum development.

(d) The coordinator usually attended the TVEI coordinator's meetings in the local area but many other college-based activities took higher priority. The exchange of ideas during such meetings did not work in reality since the college 'gave' more than the partner schools so that mutual liaison was not established.

(e) TVEI was certainly seen by the coordinator as a useful source of funding but there was now an attempt to lose TVEI within the college management. It was felt that this was one of the reasons for not appointing a separate TVEI coordinator. One advantage with having the DOS as the coordinator was that TVEI was brought directly into the Senior Management meeting.

(f) The college office was often under-rated. In the management structure established it had equal status to other areas identified in the concept map.

(g) It was considered that too many things were being carried out at the same time. There was a feeling that the college was 'dabbling' in many initiatives and developments without seeing a project through to satisfactory completion. This was leading to some frustration.

(h) The role as coordinator was very much cross-college, mainly as the DOS with daily contact with many members of staff.
(i) The notion of relating TVEI to CPVE within the management structure was stopped in the pilot phase since TVEI was not seen to be related to a cohort of students or to a discrete cluster of subjects, unlike CPVE.

(j) Entitlement curriculum based at the College was available through a programme with certificated courses. This was seen to have an overlap with the curriculum objectives of TVEI but was managed by another member of staff.
(a) The coordinator had previously been appointed as a Lecturer in Biology within the college (for one year) and was then appointed as TVEI coordinator as a result of a very competitive 'round' of internal interviews.

(b) Many of the internal applicants for the post of coordinator were still based at the college. It was felt that this had led to some problems with cooperation in certain areas of the college.

(c) The post of coordinator was seen as a significant opportunity for the holder to develop in terms of management experience and in relation to curriculum development. The coordinator considered that the senior management (in particular the Principalate Group) were very supportive.

(d) The coordinator attended many meetings out of college, including the consortium coordinator meetings (considered as an opportunity to do something worthwhile with colleagues in partner schools) and various curriculum support groups (CSG's). Attendance at such meetings was aided by the coordinator having a teaching timetable which gave the opportunity to attend such meetings during the day and by having a significant reduction in the teaching workload i.e. taught 9 hours out of 20. Colleagues were thought to be highly suspicious of the coordinator attending the various meetings, they were often referred to as 'bun feasts'.

(e) The Principal was seen as a supporter of TVEI-implementation but with strong reservations about committing the college to major training days, particularly if the staff would react unfavourably towards the consortium-led content.

(f) The coordinator considered that the success of the implementation of the initiative was based on good communication skills on the part of the coordinator and the trust of colleagues that changes were well thought-out and worthwhile.
(a) TVEI was seen to have a practical impact on the lives of students at the college. The section meetings and course team meetings were therefore considered to be important within the management of TVEI-implementation.

(b) The HOD meetings were viewed as being effective and important with the current administration role. The Principalate group was considered to be as important in this respect.

(c) The VP was not involved much with the Directorate of Studies team (DOS) but the team were seen to be potentially as important as the other groups described so far. Decisions taken by the HOD meetings were seen to have a real impact on both students and staff but the influence of the DOS was far 'less clear'.

(d) The academic board (AB) was rated as being low in terms of effectiveness on 'student lives' but the working parties or task groups of the AB were thought to be more effective.

(e) Staff development was given high priority by the VP in relation to overall college management.

(f) The status of TVEI was summarised as;

- an overt initiative: not a great deal of status (staff were cynical)
- use to the college: given a detached 'label' but with low status in relation to Technology (leading to change in practice), making a major contribution via the Record of Achievement working party and 'hand in hand' with independent learning
- supporting curriculum development: seen as a routine management across the college via 'processes' eg. special needs provision.

(g) The 'control' of TVEI was evident since it was having an influence over activities within the college. The VP was very much involved with TVEI-implementation, as the curriculum-leader, but was self-critical of problems with 'getting around the college as much as I should'. Corridor conversations were considered to be very important in terms of obtaining staff opinion about this type of initiative.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY C2

School/college - type: Tertiary College (Hampshire)
size: 1134 students
TVEI: 1 year

Consortium - four 11-16 Schools, one Technical College

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (BC1)
TVEI: 1 year

(a) Fifteen cross-college groups had been set up by the coordinator with a liaison function, working with colleagues from partner schools.

(b) The standing committee for TVEI established within the college had to report to the Academic Board (AB) via the coordinator.

(c) During the transition period following the retirement of the Principal the Vice Principal was to act as the Principal. It was anticipated that greater liaison would occur between the coordinator and the new Principal in relation to the somewhat 'distanced' relationship formed with the previous Principal.

(d) Much had already taken place as a result of staff discussions with colleagues in partner schools. It was this aspect of TVEI-implementation that had been recognised as a great breakthrough for the college.

(e) The informal links between the various college lecturers and local school teachers were expected to be strengthened with the formation of curriculum support groups (CSG's).
(a) The general view of TVEI was that the initiative had had an indirect impact on the college and that it had given the opportunity to discuss issues. The impact was primarily financial.

(b) Within the Senior Management team (SMT), of which the Principal was the convenor, there was no indifference towards TVEI but some uncertainty about what was involved for the future. Some members of the team were threatened by TVEI. The TVEI coordinator was not a member of this team.

(c) The Principal described the long term plan for TVEI-implementation within the college. The TVEI committee needed clear goals and should avoid giving too much credit to TVEI for achievements across the college. A contractual approach was involved with clear aims and objectives.

(d) The pastoral care/profiling system was under review and various management posts were to be more function-based than at present. It was felt that it was important to sustain subject specificity and therefore excellence. The Faculty Heads should act as managers of 'cost centres' but the role was currently under review.

(e) The externally-imposed divisional aspect of TVEI management in relation to the LEA responsibilities was in its 'early days' but the financial content was evident. The impact of this management change was expected to affect the role of the governors and adult education was likely to become a more significant part of the college curriculum.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY C3

School/college - type: Tertiary College (distant)
size: 1400 students
TVEI: 6.0 years

Consortium - eight 11-16 Schools, two 11-18 Schools

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (and Vice Principal for curriculum) [SEDC4]
TVEI: 6.0 years

(a) The Senior Management team (SMT) consisted of the Principal, VP and Directors of Study (TVEI coordinators for specific consortia or clusters).

(b) Working parties fed into the SMT. Such groups included IT, Special Needs and Equal Opportunities working parties.

(c) The coordinator (VP) had been involved with TVEI from its introduction six years earlier. The pilot phase had lasted for approximately five years and extension was now developing.

(d) The coordinators or Directors were each based in one of four clusters (partly geographically based). They all reported to the general coordinator, the VP, with overall responsibility for TVEI-implementation.

(e) The various Directors dealt with a variety of schools, some being 11-18, others were 11-16 or special schools. The Directors attended meetings of the local coordinator's groups and represented the college in this capacity.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY C3 (CONT.)

Interviewee - type: Principal (SEDC6)  
TVEI: 3.0 years

(a) The Principal had been in post for 3 years, during which time TVEI had been integrated within the management structure of the college.

(b) The change from TVEI pilot phase to extension was due to occur in each of the four consortia (clusters) linked to the college.

(c) The management of link courses with schools from within the clusters had been reduced. Liaison had continued via TVEI.

(d) Weekly senior management team (SMT) meetings had general and strategic planning aspects.

(e) The Principal felt involved with TVEI and received 'key papers' from the Director's (TVEI coordinator's) meetings together with various TVEI reports.

(f) It was recognised that there was the need for an overview of financial resources and for relevant staff development (related to TVEI aspects).
(a) The management structure of the college had been recently reviewed. The VP used a set of previously-prepared documents to explain the structure and the way in which TVEI 'fitted into' the established structure.

(b) Various key groups were identified as the basis for consultation. Such groups included the Curriculum Management Committee, Curriculum Development and liaison Committee, support groups such as the cross curricular panels and the externally-based County Directorate.

(c) It was observed that the TVEI coordinator had a specific role within the consultation and management structure. The role related to direct line management with the Principal of the college and the membership of the Curriculum Development and Liaison Committee. In terms of curriculum development, it was noted that new 'labels' did not always reflect real development within the college.

(d) The college was located in an area with four providers for the 16-18 age range; the college being studied, a 11-18 school, two schools with a 'federal sixth form' and a sixth form college. The communication between the different providers was thought to have been improved due to the introduction of TVEI as a result of shared experience, expertise and facilities. The VP agreed with this particular aspect with some commitment.

(e) It was apparent that the VP and the TVEI coordinator worked together closely. The VP considered that ample opportunity was given for the coordinator to liaise with the senior management via the VP.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY D1 (CONT.)

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (FC2)
TVEI: 2 years

(a) The coordinator had experienced a significant change in roles as a result of a 'move' from a Head of Department role to that of coordinator. The status of the coordinator had been retained and the opportunity to become involved in cross-college curriculum development was seen to be challenging.

(b) A second TVEI coordinator had also been appointed due to the size of the college and was primarily based within the careers aspect of the 16-18 age group. The coordinator being interviewed had a link with INSET and was currently the convenor of an ad hoc TVEI/INSET group, with a membership including the VP and Staff Development Officer.

(c) The link between the coordinator and the Staff Development Officer was considered to be very important as was that between the VP and Principal. However, the coordinator thought that the VP was not working 'closely' with the Principal since policies often emerged without the VP being aware or sometimes disagreeing with the policies.

(d) The coordinator worked closely with key figures within the curriculum. An information route had been established with the various course leaders in the departments and the coordinator was required to present the Heads of Department with a monthly progress report via their group meetings.

(e) It was clearly observed that the Principal was a very powerful figure within the management structure. The Principal had developed the power to 'control' groups such as the governing body.

(f) The Academic Board included staff representatives and Heads of Department. The agenda was often department-based, rather than cross-college and the coordinator considered this group to be ineffectual.
INTERVIEW NOTES : CASE STUDY D2

School/college - type: Technical College (Hampshire)
size: 1,100 students
TVEI: 2.5 years

Consortium - eight 11-16 Schools, one Sixth Form College

Interviewee - type: TVEI coordinator (SC1)
TVEI: 2.5 years

(a) The management of the college had been reorganised at the start of the academic year. Three coordinators had been appointed, responsible for each of three TVEI consortia involving the college. The number of appointments was thought to reflect the size of the college and the complexity of coping with more than one consortium.

(b) The coordinator had been a member of the teaching staff for 8 years and was very much considered as a member of staff not 'distanced' from colleagues. As a lecturer in Shipbuilding, the coordinator had already had experience of the organisation required for external liaison eg. having previously been responsible for the planning of link courses for schools.

(c) The coordinator was seen as the 'middle man', between the teaching staff and the college management team. The promotion of the coordinator to the present post had been viewed as a natural progression from Department-based work. The promotion had been available in the first instance as higher salary increments and remission from teaching but was soon to be a change in title and status.

(d) There were problems with working as a member of a team due to timetable difficulties but the coordinator did meet regularly with the Director of Studies (DOS), a member of the senior management team. There were further problems experienced with this liaison since the DOS was faced with overwork. Nonetheless, many developments were 'filtered' through the DOS.

(e) The coordinator met with the TVEI consortium manager once every 2 weeks but the DOS only had contact with the manager infrequently. The coordinator did 'stand in' for the DOS at various TVEI meetings.
(f) Seven Heads of Department were members of the senior management team but the DOS, VP and Principal clearly 'steered' management issues. It was considered that the working relationships with these and other colleagues was crucial to the success of implementing an initiative such as TVEI.

(g) The post-16 coordinator's group met at least once per term, for those local coordinators based at post-16 institutions. Friction was detected within the group related to the perceived role of the group. Tension was also detected between the roles of the Area Head's meeting and the TVEI Management Group.
Interview Notes: Case Study D2 (Cont.)

Interviewee - type: Director of Studies (SC2)
TVEI: 2.5 years

(a) The Director of Studies (DOS) considered personal involvement with TVEI as the line manager for the three TVEI coordinators. Cross-college responsibilities included; curriculum review and evaluation, insights into work, accommodation and curriculum development (incorporating personal and social education [PSE]).

(b) The DOS met with the four coordinators individually and as a group on a fairly regular basis.

(c) Having been appointed as member of senior staff for 4 years, the DOS had previously been the Head of Business Studies in the college. The post of Director of Studies was a recent appointment.

(d) The impact of TVEI was seen as an opportunity to do things that were 'right to do anyway'. The Record of Achievement system had developed further due to TVEI and the 'insight into work' programme had been introduced to the General Education ('A' level etc.) students as a result.

(e) The college was considered as a very large institution within the local area, with 1,100 students full time but also with 9,000 to 10,000 students all together. The impact of TVEI for the 16-18 age group had to be put into the context of this broad responsibility in the area.

(f) The TVEI coordinators had been in post before the DOS had been appointed. This was thought to have some effect on the working relationship between the DOS and the coordinators.

(g) The VP was the convener of the Head of Department Committee, not the DOS and the Principal and College Secretary were the Chair and Convenor of the Academic Board respectively.

(h) The Heads of Department constituted a day to day decision-making body within the management structure and were therefore powerful. They had the informal power to veto policy group decisions since they had the knowledge, staffing and resources under their control. The hierarchy between the various HOD's was not obvious but some departments were much bigger than others.
(a) The Deputy Assistant Principal (DAP) was responsible for the tertiary element (16-18 age group) of the college curriculum and had acted as the TVEI coordinator during the four year pilot phase.

(b) The status of the coordinator within the college management structure (which was matrix) was seen to be crucial to the success of the pilot scheme and to extension.

(c) The 'pivotal' role of the coordinator within the system was identified as:

1. the convenor of various curriculum groups, thereby steering the curriculum change towards the TVEI criteria
2. the adviser for staff as well as curriculum development, particularly since the link with finance was used to provide additional credibility
3. member of various course teams, thereby providing an element of TVEI 'within' the courses provided eg. BTEC Business Studies.

(d) Four core elements of the college curriculum were used to enhance the experience of students, irrespective of courses followed. The DAP viewed the elements through the following model:

\[
\text{CPVE} \rightarrow \text{Modular Core (4 elements)} \rightarrow \text{BTEC electronics} \rightarrow \text{BTEC Business Studies}
\]

\_ \_ \_ \_ = Explicit core modules
\_ \_ \_ \_ = Implicit core modules

The implicit use of TVEI core-modules within a particular course was seen by the DAP to be preferable and more relevant than explicit use.
(e) The DAP also noted that this process of introducing a core of TVEI-based modules had a direct effect on college management. The development work required staff training and time to prepare resources. The finance required had been provided by TVEI funds. This had raised the profile of TVEI across the college.

(f) The personal involvement of the DAP within the pilot phase had provided a great insight into the aims of TVEI and the enthusiasm for further development within TVEI.
(a) At the time of the interview a new acting Principal had been appointed. This had led to a significant change in the management structure of the college. The Deputy Assistant Principals (DAP), Assistant Principals, Principal and other senior staff had been organised to form a new senior management group.

(b) The two TVEI coordinators (one for each of two TVEI consortia in the local area) were both dissolved with their respective roles since decisions were being made at senior level i.e. between the local headteachers and the Principal of the college, without consultation.

(c) The coordinators did not receive paperwork from meetings other than as 'normal' lecturers. They often found out about decisions via the staff noticeboard. Meetings were being held about TVEI-issues and they were not invited to attend. The two coordinators had been invited on one occasion to the Academic Board meeting to present a summary paper.

(d) The coordinator interviewed was aware of a move from a management system (matrix model) with a broad level of cross-college coordinators to a position of 'accountability' held by the new Assistant and Deputy Assistant Principals. The DAP for tertiary curriculum (previously responsible for TVEI within the pilot phase) was now felt to be responsible again for TVEI-implementation, thereby reducing the status of the coordinators.

(e) The change in the management structure was considered as a regression because initiatives such as TVEI had now effectively been devolved to subject-based Heads of Department with the 'relevant' experience.

(f) Policy such as subject-closure or introduction was seen to only occur via the Academic Board and eventually sanctioned by the Senior Management group. This pattern of 'power' had already been established before the recent reorganisation. The day to day management of the college was with the Assistant Principals.

(g) The partner schools within the two TVEI consortia were also thought to have 'regressed' to the same management structure as that now observed in the college, in the opinion of the coordinator. The decision-making role of the coordinator was under threat due to the autonomy of the DAP with 'overall responsibility' for TVEI.
Case study: 11-18 School (A1)
Participant: Headteacher (code PS1)

Key:
1. fortnightly, open and lively
2. when necessary, mainly administrative
3. very supportive
4. supportive
5. mutually supportive
6. good working relationship
7. three times per term
8. cannot get to grips as yet
9. daily, dynamic and fun
10. supportive
11. sound and supportive
Case study: 11-18 School (A1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code PS2)

Key:
1 if needed at governor's meetings
2 frequently, daily
3 three times per week, planning timetable, informal
4 once every three weeks
5 informal, as and when each week
6 via representatives and coordinator's panel (weekly)
7 monthly
8 informal, following formal meetings
9 weekly, TVEI coord. also Head of Science
10 frequent
11 via coordinator's panel & when adviser visits
12 as and when eg. publicity, INSET etc.
13 weekly, informal meetings
14 weekly, Departmental meetings
15 industry links, EO working parties etc.
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: 11-18 School (A2)
Participant: Deputy Headteacher for Finance (code AHS1)

Governors/Maintenance → Contract/Buildings → SMT → Finance → Lettings

Headteacher, 3 Deputy Headteachers, Director of Sixth Form and 2 representatives from the MMT

Administration Meeting
Teacher governors, Health & Safety Coordinator and Deputy Headteacher (AHS1)

MMT
Heads of Year, Bursar and HOD's

Classroom Managers (teachers), Administration and ancillary staff

Kitchen Cleaning

Key: No labelled lines linking the various groups and individuals
Case study: 11-18 School (A2)
Participant: TVEI coordinator, also appointed as the Deputy Headteacher for Curriculum (AHS2)

Key:
1 on-going, meeting when required
2 daily, general curriculum
3 three meetings per term, all three Deputy Headteachers involved
4 infrequent, when necessary
5 infrequent, when necessary
6 infrequent, when necessary
7 one meeting per term
CONCEPT MAP

Case study : 11-18 School-distant (A3)
Participant : Headteacher (code SBS1)

Key:
1 meet daily
2 weekly
3 frequent, informal contact
4 frequent, informal contact
5 monthly
6 half-term review
7 monthly
8 formal, termly meetings but informal, frequent (weekly) briefings
Case study: 11-18 School- distant (A3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator, also appointed as Head of Sixth Form (code SBS2)

Key:
1 irregular meetings
2 regular meetings and informal talks as required
3 termly meetings
4 half-termly meetings
5 termly meetings
6 weekly meeting
7 half-termly meetings
8 monthly meetings
9 regular briefings, approx. every half term
10 monthly management meetings
11 monthly meetings
12 monthly meetings
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Sixth Form College (B1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator, also appointed as Senior Tutor - pastoral (code BPC1)

Key: No labelled lines linking the various groups and individuals
Case study: Sixth Form College (B1)
Participant: Vice Principal for Curriculum (code BPC2)

Key:
1. good informal & regular formal meetings
2. irregular informal, regular formal meetings
3. good informal & irregular formal meetings
4. via Academic Board

Plus elected staff to form Academic Board (excellent forum - nicely balanced)
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Sixth Form College (B2)
Participant: Deputy Principal for Curriculum (code PSC1)

Key: 
1 minutes received
2 convenor
3 weekly meetings
4 attend
5 meet two times per week
6 TVEI coordinator receives minutes
7 convenor
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Sixth Form College (B2)
Participant: TVEI coordinator also appointed as Deputy Principal for Pastoral Matters (code PSC2)

Key: 1 member
2 member
3 member
4 convenor
5 member
6 member
7 convenor
8 minutes received
9 member
Case study: Sixth Form College - distant (B3)
Participant: Principal (code CC1)

MAP 1

Governing Body

Chairman's Policy and Resources Committee

Any subcommittees set up for particular purposes

Finance and General Purposes Committee

Management Group

Senior Staff Meeting

Premises Committee

Curriculum Committee

Tutorial Committee

External Liaison Committee

Various groups/working parties eg. House, Faculty, Department, TVEI, CPVE, EO, IT, CCCP, PSE, Drama etc.
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Sixth Form College - distant (B3)
Participant: Principal (code CC1)

MAP 2

Principal

Vice Principal (Things)

Director of Studies (Thoughts)

Four Heads of Faculty

Language, literature and Performing Arts
Mathematics & Business
Education
Science, Technology, Art & Design
Environmental and Social Sciences

Deputy Principal (People)

Director of Administration (Paper)

Four Heads of House (Senior Tutors)

English
Careers
Administration
Chemistry
Case study: Sixth Form College - distant (B3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator also appointed as Director of Studies (code CC2)

Key:
1. occasional TVEI meetings
2. weekly
3. all the time
4. convenor
5. exams, daily but seasonal
6. enrolment
7. developing and new
8. chair
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College (C1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code AC1)

Key:
1 written reports and invitation to some meetings
2 convenor
3 minutes received/invitation
4 written reports and invitation
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College (C1)
Participant: Vice Principal for Curriculum (code AC2)

Curriculum Provision

Student Management

Key: 1 management
2 coordination
3 managerial

NB. Academic Board Authorisation is implicit throughout the structure.
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College (C2)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code BC1)

Key:
1 inform
2 meet regularly
3 meet regularly
4 advise
5 co-opted as required
6 inform and advise
7 member
8 member
9 work together
10 inform and advise
11 convenor of group
12 meet regularly

NB. Member of group = active role, steering decisions
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College (C2)
Participant: Principal (code BC2)
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College - distant (C3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/director (code SEDC1)

- Cluster Coord.
  - Subgroup
  - Management Group
    - 1 Group
    - 2 VP (Management Group Rep.)
      - Effective Learning Coord. (TVEI)
    - 3 Cluster Coord.
      - 4 Cluster Coord's Groups
      - 5 TVEI Coord.
        - 6 TVEI Coord. (SEDC1)
      - 7 RoA Rep.
        - Entitlement Curriculum
    - 8 TVEI pilot Group
      - 9 Member of Staff within Science & Technology Department
        - 10 TVEI pilot Group
          - 11 Management Team
            - 12 Staff on Courses

Key:
1 papers and conversation
2 papers only
3 meetings, papers and conversation
4 meetings, papers and conversation
5 meetings, papers and conversation
6 useful meetings, papers and conversation
7 useful papers and conversation
8 conversation, not important
9 conversation, important
10 conversation, important
11 meetings, papers and conversation - important
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CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College- distant (C3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/director (code SEDC2)

Coordinator's Cluster Meetings with schools

Cluster Management Group (rep. the Principal)

TVEI Coordinator (SEDC2)

TVEI Consortium/Cluster Meetings with other TVEI Coordinators/Directors

College Management Team

Programme Area

Director of Marketing & Cross-College (including TVEI)

Enhancement Coordinator

Section Coordinator (Secretarial)

Section Coordinator (Business Studies)

Curriculum Enhancement Support Group (TVEI pilot)

Curriculum Enhancement Support Group (TVEI pilot)

Key: 1 fortnightly meetings
      2 fortnightly meetings
      3 as needed
      4 as needed
      5 constantly
      6 constantly
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CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College - distant (C3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/director (code SEDC3)

National Directives etc. → 1 → County TVEI Groups

Cluster Working Groups ← 2 → Cluster Executive Meetings

College Management Teams & Principal ← 3 → Individual School Reps.

TVEI Coordinator /Director (SEDC3) ← 4 → Curriculum Delivery Staff

Other TVEI Coordinators/ Directors ← 5 → College Coordinating Team

Support Group ← 8 → Extension Pilot

Key:
1. information
2. information exchange
3. monitoring reports
4. information exchange, monitoring
5. regular meetings
6. information exchange, formal and informal
7. monitoring
8. information exchange
9. regular meetings
10. development, monitoring & evaluation
11. regular meetings
12. reports, monitoring
Case study: Tertiary College - distant (C3)
Participant: Vice Principal for Curriculum and TVEI
(code SEDC4)

Key:
1 informing
2 access to decisions on important issues
3 informing
4 reporting, source of support
5 reporting, clarifying
6 key path of change
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College - distant (C3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/director (code SEDC5)

Key:
1 information
2 information
3 report to
4 information
5 curriculum modification
6 report to
7 curriculum change
8 review, support
9 contact for curriculum requirements
10 requirements
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College (D1)
Participant: Vice Principal for Personnel & Resources (code FC1)

Key:
1. easy communication
2. prime attendance
3. attend most meetings
4. attendance as secretary
5. convenor (external advice for internal matters)
6. convenor
7. range of links
8. secretary
9. attend most meetings
10. organisation of staff representation and distribution of minutes
11. attend meetings
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College (D1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code FC2)

Key:  
1 information route, each department has course leaders with whom the TVEI coordinator works
2 should be a close working relationship but policy sometimes emerges without the VP (Personnel) being informed
3 not a member, a sub-committee of the Academic Board
4 very important for the organisation of INSET
5 close working relationship eg. joint INSET, liaison with schools
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College (D2)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code SC1)

Key:
1 close relationship
2 informal (frequent) and formal (infrequent)
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College (D2)
Participant: Director of Studies (code SC2)

Policy Steering Group
(Principal & Directors)

1

Director of Studies

2

HOD's

3

TVEI Coordinators

Working Groups
eg. IT, MIS, BTEC,
Special Needs,
Tutorial, Curriculum
& Staff Development

Key: 1 weekly, more frequent as required
2 weekly
3 cannot be seen weekly
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College - distant (D3)
Participant: Deputy Assistant Principal for Curriculum and TVEI (code PRC1)

Key:
1 frequently
2 consultation, occasionally
3 through the Section Heads Meeting
4 regular meetings
5 regular meetings
6 receiving reports
7 regular involvement
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College - distant (D3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code PRC2)

Deputy Assistant Principal (Curriculum and TVEI)

1

Academic Board

TVEI Coordinator (PRC3)

TVEI Coordinator (PRC2)

Schools Marketing Group

Special Needs Coordinator

Science Coordinator

Academic Planning & Resources Group

Key: 1 full information fed up to the DAP but very little fed back
2 invited to attend
3 attend regularly (invited up to current situation)
4 two-way flow
5 give information
6 two-way flow for information about Science & Technology
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College - distant (D3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (code PRC3)

Key: 1 regular meeting
2 reporting
3 regular meeting
4 as and when needed
5 as and when needed
6 as and when needed
APPENDIX 5

ADDITIONAL CONCEPT MAPS

(HAMPSHIRE SURVEY)
SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CONCEPT MAPS

(based on the perceptions of TVEI coordinators only within post-16 institutions in Hampshire, other than those involved as part of the initial case studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-16 Institution</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Post held (other than TVEI Coordinator)</th>
<th>'Model'</th>
<th>Superior position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-18 School</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Director of Studies</td>
<td>Vertical SMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/Mixed [linear]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher</td>
<td>Mixed [pivotal] TVEI</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Curriculum Coordinator</td>
<td>Vertical [pivotal]</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form College</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Vertical [pivotal]</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary College</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Vertical [pivotal]</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Mixed [pivotal] TVEI</td>
<td>Management Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical College</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Vertical [pivotal]</td>
<td>Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Vertical [pivotal]</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Vertical [pivotal]</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [.....] = perceived 'position' within the management model.
Case study: 11-18 School - Additional (E1)
Participant: TVEI Coordinator/Director of Studies

Key:
1. Reports recommendations
2. Curriculum leaders act as representatives
3. Each curriculum area sends one representative to each TVEI development group

NB. Seven TVEI Development groups include; IT across the curriculum, learning methodologies, records of achievement, insights into work, multicultural education, equal opportunities and PSHE.
CONCEPT MAP

Case study : 11-18 School - Additional (E2)
Participant : TVEI coordinator/Deputy Headteacher

Key : 1 Contacts, letters and visits
2 Department meetings
3 Notes
4 Working parties
5 Discussion
6 Talks, visits and taster courses
Case Study: 11-18 School - Additional (E3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Curriculum coordinator

Key: No labelled lines linking the various groups and individuals
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Sixth Form College - Additional (F1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Head of Department

Key:
1. Working relationship
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. Input to and working relationship
6. Input to (only)
7. 
8. 
9. Personal contact as necessary
10. As tutor to students within the section
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College - Additional (G1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Head of Department

Key: No labelled lines used to link the various groups and individuals
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Tertiary College - Additional (G2)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Lecturer

Key: No labelled lines linking the various groups and individuals
Case study: Technical College - Additional (H1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Lecturer

Key: No labelled lines linking the various groups and individuals
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College - Additional (H2)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Senior Lecturer

Key: 1 Written reports
      2 Invitation
      3 Member
      4 Written reports and member
      5 Member
      6 Convenor
      7 Convenor
      8 Member (and convenor of some)
      9 Convenor and minutes received
      10 Minutes received
CONCEPT MAP

Case study: Technical College - Additional (H3)
Participant: TVEI coordinator/Lecturer

Key: CTL - Course Team Leader
     Informal Meetings
     Formal Bodies Meeting
THE ROLE OF THE TVEI COORDINATOR

AN INVESTIGATION

The handbook for institution coordinators (post 16) refers to the 'extent and scale of influence' of TVEI within an institution and to the fact that 'coordinators will differ in their perceptions of the role they undertake'.

The two points may well be closely linked. The extent and scale of influence of TVEI is likely to be affected by the perceptions of the coordinator.

I am investigating the relationship between 'influence' and 'coordinator perceptions' within certain colleges and 11-18 schools in Hampshire. Such case studies have already revealed differences between one coordinator and the next. The coordinators involved have constructed 'concept maps' in which they indicated the working relationships and routes of communication that they have experienced with key individuals eg. Principal, VP, INSET coordinator and key management groups eg. Academic Board, SMT and Heads of Department group.

Could you please construct your own concept map (which may be very different from the models attached) and forward it to me as soon as possible?

The information is completely confidential. If you wish to find out more about TVEI-implementation in relation to coordinator perceptions let me know.

John McCann

(TVEI coordinator)
CONCEPT MAPS - Some examples

Model 1

* - Each connecting line would be labelled to identify form of communication or working relationship

Model 2

* - Each connecting line would be labelled to identify form of communication or working relationship
CONCEPT MAP

TVEI COORDINATOR'S PERCEPTION OF 'MANAGEMENT ROUTES'

Name: .............................................. (TVEI coordinator)

Other responsibilities: .................................................................

Institution: .................................................................

(Please construct your own concept map below)
APPENDIX 6

REPERTORY GRID TABLES - BLANK COPIES
### MANAGEMENT OF TVEI VIA COMMITTEES & WORKING PARTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of Management</th>
<th>Committees &amp; Working Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONFIDENTIAL**

NAME .............. INSTITUTION ............(code)

POST HELD .............. DATE ........
REPERTORY GRID : ORIGINAL DOCUMENT USED IN THE CURRENT STUDY
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: Headteacher (PS1)

1. Two groups formed a closely-related subcluster (a). The groups; SMT (Senior Management Team) and ROA (Record of Achievement Group), were both considered to be 'equally managed', with a high professional expertise, had the headteacher almost fully involved, were decision-making and policy-forming.

2. Subcluster (a) was linked to a third group, HOY'S (Head of Year's Group), to form cluster (b). The only slight difference between HOY's and the other two groups was that HOY'S was not apparently demonstrating the very high professional expertise and was not as responsible for decision-making. The three groups showed a high degree of commonality.

3. Cluster (e) contained the two following subclusters;

   Subcluster (c) - HOD'S (Head of Departments' Group)
   - PRG (Policy Review Group)
   Subcluster (d) - EDUC/IL (Education and Industrial Liaison Group)
   - IT.WP (Information Technology Working Party)

4. The two groups in subcluster (c) were neither equally or unequally managed, had some professional expertise, involved the headteacher and were not significantly dynamic. The headteacher did, however, observe that the groups were 'agents of change'. The groups differed since the PRG was more involved with decision-making and policy-formation.

5. Subcluster (d) contained groups that did not directly involve the headteacher and the form of management within the groups was not known. The two groups did, however, have a relatively strong direction and were somewhat dynamic. They were both not involved with decision-making but EDUC/IL was more capable of forming policy than IT/WP.

6. An eighth group, CC.WP'S (Cross-curricular working parties), was linked to cluster (e) more than to cluster (b). This group was not responsible for decision-making and was therefore similar to the groups in cluster (e). The observation that the headteacher was involved to a certain extent in the running of CC.WP'S did provide a weak link between this group and cluster (b). The group was very different from all other groups since it was considered to have a low professional expertise.
Level 1 Analysis - FOCUSed data

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: PS1 (Headteacher)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: 11-18 School (A1)

Participant: TVEI coordinator (PS2)

(1) A subcluster (a) was identified and consisted of the following;

- ITW/EO (Insights into work and equal opportunities working party)
- ROA (Record of Achievement working party)
- IT.WP (Information Technology working party)

(2) The three groups in subcluster (a) were closely-related since they were all viewed as cross-curricular groups, involved the TVEI coordinator directly, were not significantly exam-based, evolved primarily from TVEI and had an advisory role for the PRG (Policy Review Group). ITW.EO was marginally different from the other two groups because it did not directly involve senior management. IT.WP was different because much time was spent on discussing resources during the meetings.

(3) Subcluster (a) was linked to three other groups to form cluster (b). The three groups were;

- HOY'S (Head of Year Committee)
- HOD'S (Head of Department Committee)
- PSE/WP (Personal and Social Education working party)

The three additional groups located in cluster (b) were relatively similar since they did not spend time on resources, were involved in some cross-curricular issues and had an advisory role for the PRG.

(4) HOY'S was different from the other two groups due to the perception that it did not involve the TVEI coordinator directly and was not exam-based. PSE/WP was considered to be TVEI-evolved, unlike HOY'S and HOD'S.

(5) Cluster (c) was only very loosely-linked to cluster (b). Cluster (c) was formed from two groups; PRG and GB (Governing Body). These two groups spent some time on resources (but not as much as IT.WP), considered some cross-curricular issues, were not significantly exam-based, directly involved senior management, were not TVEI-evolved and did not 'advise' PRG.

(6) The only significant difference between PRG and GB was that the TVEI coordinator was directly involved in PRG but not in GB.
**Level 1 Analysis:** FOCUSed data

**Case study:** 11-18 School (A1)

**Participant:** PS2 (TVEI coordinator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Subcluster (a)</th>
<th>Cluster (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster (b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: 11-18 School (A2)

Participant: Deputy Headteacher for Finance (AHS1)

(1) Two groups were very closely-linked to form subcluster(a). The groups were:
- GOV.MAIN (Governors Maintenance Sub-committee)
- GOV.FIN (Governors Finance Sub-committee)

The DH considered that both groups were relatively ineffective and yet efficient, well-convened, decision-making, involved the DH, had financial implications and only exhibited 'friction' occasionally.

(2) Subcluster(b) also contained two groups;
- CON.GRP (Contracts Group for building work)
- SMT (Senior Management Team)

These two groups were viewed as being effective, relatively efficient, not that well-convened, decision-making, with the involvement of the DH, had financial implications and showed no friction.

(3) Subclusters (a) and (b) were related to a fifth group, DEP.HDS.M (Deputy Heads Meeting - ad hoc), and formed cluster(c). This group was only loosely-related to the others because it was also seen to be efficient, directly involved the DH and had financial implications. The ad hoc nature of the group did mean that it was not convened.

(4) ADMIN. (Administration group) was linked to cluster(c) to establish supercluster(d). ADMIN. was also efficient and directly involved the DH. The key feature of this group was that it was not decision-making.

(5) A separate cluster(e) was constructed based on the views of the DH. This cluster consisted of two groups;
- MMT (Middle Management Team)
- HOD'S (Head of Department group)

The two groups were different from all other groups elicited since they did not particularly involve the DH and (like ADMIN.) did not have financial implications.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: 11-18 School (A2)
Participant: AHS1 (Deputy Headteacher)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: 11-18 School (A2)

Participant: TVEI coordinator/Deputy Headteacher for Curriculum (AHS2)

(1) The various groups elicited by the TVEI coordinator were not very closely-related. Areas of commonality could be observed to form various clusters etc.

(2) Subcluster(a) contained two groups;

- TWG (Technology working group)
- SWP (Science working party)

The TVEI coordinator was not an integral member of the groups but considered the groups to have a financial involvement, to be effective and to be decision-making (to a certain extent).

(3) TWG differed from SWP since it was relatively more TVEI-initiated and was more involved with external liaison.

(4) A third group, CWP (Curriculum working party), was related to the two groups in subcluster(a) to form cluster(b). Like the other two groups, CWP was effective and had a decision-making role. CWP was also similar to SWP since it was not TVEI-initiated. CWP differed from the other groups, however, because the TVEI coordinator was an integral member of the group.

(5) SMT (Senior Management Team) was linked to the three groups in cluster(b) to form supercluster(c). The TVEI coordinator was an integral member of this group and viewed the group as having an external liaison role with financial involvement, effective and decision-making.

(6) Two further groups were elicited by the TVEI coordinator;

- PRIM.L (Primary Liaison group)
- TVEI.SG (TVEI Steering group)

The two groups were not closely-related to those positioned within supercluster(c) and differed greatly from each other. PRIM.L was different because it was viewed as having an external liaison role with little financial implications and relatively ineffective. The TVEI coordinator could also not apply the construct 'decision-making' to this particular group. TVEI.SG was different because this was the only group that was directly TVEI-initiated and had no financial involvement.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: 11-18 School (A2)

Participant: AHS2 (TVEI coordinator)

Key: Subcluster (a)  Supercluster (c)
      Cluster (b)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: 11-18 School [distant] (A3)

Participant: Headteacher (SBS1)

1. One very closely-related subcluster (a) was identified. This subcluster consisted of the following three groups:

   SNG (Special Needs Group)
   DEPT.M (Departmental Meetings - various)
   PTM (Pastoral Team Meetings)

A fourth group, IT (Information Technology Group), was related to groups within subcluster (a), thereby forming cluster (b).

2. The four groups in cluster (b) were similar in that the headteacher did not perceive any 'control' over them and was not fully involved with their business. All of the groups clustered were considered to be relatively effective but they differed in relation to the 'openess' of the agenda. The PTM tended to have a much more open agenda than the others. The groups also differed in relation to financial implications. The IT had much to do with finance and yet the other groups were either not as financially involved or did not relate to financial matters (ie. considered as 'not applicable').

3. A second cluster, cluster (d), consisted of three groups:

   PHM (Pastoral Heads Meeting)
   Subcluster (c) - HOD's (Heads of Department Meeting) and SMT (Senior Management Team)

The headteacher viewed such groups as very effective in relation to other groups elicited, personally involved, confident with the content of the meetings and membership and with relatively closed agendas. The PHM tended to have less involvement with finances than the other two groups (forming subcluster [c]) and the headteacher also considered PHM as being less 'under control'.
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Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: 11-18 School [distant] (A3)

Participant: SBS1 (Headteacher)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: 11-18 School [distant] (A3)

Participant: TVEI coordinator/Head of Sixth Form (SBS2)

1. Two groups were considered as identical in relation to all constructs elicited by the TVEI Coordinator. The groups forming subcluster (a), 6TH.FTM (Sixth Form Tutor Meeting) and TS.WP (Teaching Styles Working Party), accepted the proposals made by the coordinator, were information-giving, presented no conflict and were under the 'control' of the coordinator in relation to the running of meetings.

2. A third group, C.HO6TH (Consortium Heads of Sixth Form Group), differed only slightly from the two previous groups since this group was not quite under the same degree of control by the Coordinator. The three groups were therefore linked to form cluster (b).

3. Three further groups;

   SMT (Senior Management Team)
   JBM (Joint Board Meeting)
   HOD'S (Heads of Department and of Year Group)

were very loosely linked to cluster (b) to form supercluster (c). The Coordinator viewed JBM and HOD'S as under some degree of personal control but this was not so for the SMT. Proposals were accepted to a certain extent in all three groups and the groups were generally information-giving (this was particularly the case for the SMT). Conflict was not usually experienced within HOD'S but did occur within the other two groups.

4. A seventh group was not closely-related to any of the other groups identified and was therefore located outside of supercluster (c). This group, SPC (School Policy Committee), was not under the control of the Coordinator, was information-giving and presented no conflict. The Coordinator did not make any significant proposals to this group and was therefore unable to respond to this particular construct.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: 11-18 School [distant] (A3)

Participant: SBS2 (TVEI coordinator)

Key: Subcluster (a)  Supercluster (c)
Cluster (b)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Sixth Form College (B1)

Participant: TVEI coordinator/Pastoral Senior Tutor (BPC1)

1. Three relatively discrete clusters were established;
   Cluster (a) - TVEI.G (an institution-based group for the management of TVEI across the college), CIM (College/Industry Meeting) and STGM (Senior Tutor Group Meeting)
   Cluster (b) - DEPT.M (Departmental Meetings) and TTM (Tutor Team Meetings)
   Cluster (c) - DGM (Divisional Group Meeting) and STG (Senior Teacher's Group)

2. Cluster (a) represented groups in which the content of the meetings were related to external liaison eg. for TVEI, working within an external consortium framework. The TVEI coordinator viewed the three groups as effective, with much friction demonstrated during meetings, receptive to the coordinator's input (except for STGM) and also giving the coordinator the opportunity to have some 'control over' the events.

3. Cluster (b) consisted of middle management involvement in academic and pastoral aspects of the college. The TVEI coordinator did not have as much control over the events taking place in the meetings of such groups and did not have a significant input but the groups were still considered to be effective and demonstrated friction.

4. Cluster (c) contained two groups clustered not quite as closely as those in clusters (a) and (b). The groups were both effective, showed friction and were involved in the management of financial matters. NB. As a senior teacher (appointed as a senior tutor) the TVEI Coordinator had a greater input into the meetings held by the STG than the DGM.

5. Clusters (b) and (c) were grouped to form a supercluster (d). This indicated that clusters (b) and (c) were more alike, marginally, than either were to (a).

6. The final group identified, the AB (Academic Board) was distinct from all the other groups. It was the only group to contain some elected members. It was also not viewed as having any financial implications and was not considered to be fully effective.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Sixth Form College (B1)

Participant: BPC1 (TVEI coordinator)

Key: Cluster (a)  Cluster (c)
     Cluster (b)  Supercluster (d)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Sixth Form College (B1)

Participant: Vice Principal [VP] for Curriculum (BPC2)

1. One closely-related subcluster (a) consisted of three groups, HODIV (Heads of Division), SMT (Senior Management Team) and IT (Information Technology Group).

2. All three groups in this subcluster were considered to be 'useful', were open in relation to the agenda followed, demonstrated the same degree of effectiveness and contained some form of broad staff representation (but the details of SMT meetings only 'filtered' through to staff, rather than as a result of attendance at meetings).

3. This subcluster (a) was linked to another group, AB (Academic Board), to form cluster (b). As with the groups in subcluster (a), the AB was considered to be open and useful. The AB was also very effective and had full staff representation as a result of its constitution.

4. The WIDER SMT (the SMT with invited staff for particular issues) was loosely linked to cluster (b) to construct the super cluster (c).

5. Another much more loosely related cluster was that of INSET (INSET Committee) and GOV.C (Governors Committee). These two groups were not as professional as any of the other groups identified and had a more 'closed' agenda. The VP also considered the two groups to be 'useless'. The degree of response showed by the VP towards the two groups resulted in only a very weak link between them and the other groups.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Sixth Form College (B1)

Participant: BPC2 (Vice Principal)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Sixth Form College (B2)

Participant: Deputy Principal for Curriculum (PSC1)

1. The IT, DPM and NEPM groups formed a tight cluster(a) with a high degree of commonality. The senior manager interviewed was closely involved with the business of the IT group as a consequence of the responsibility for curriculum. This was also the case for the Deputy Principal's meeting (of which the only other member was the other DP responsible for the Pastoral provision and the management of TVEI) and the Non-examined programme group.

2. A second cluster(b) was recognised but without the same degree of commonality. This cluster included the GB (Governing Body), DPG (Local Deputy Principal and Headteacher Group) and CCG (Cross Curriculum Group). The senior manager was a member of both the DPG and CCG but only attended meetings of the GB as requested.

3. In relation to the perceptions expressed by the senior manager cluster(a) tended to represent an effective part of the management system and was policy-forming. Little friction was felt within such groups and yet there was an impression that individuals had 'axes to grind'.

4. The loosely-related cluster(b) was not considered to be as effective as cluster(a), did not have a significant effect on policy but friction was not experienced during the meetings held.

5. The two clusters formed a supercluster (c), connected marginally to the HOD (Head of Department Group). The senior manager was the convenor of this latter group, a group considered to be effective, policy-forming and with little friction.

6. The most distinct group was the SMT (Senior Management Team), consisting of the two Deputy Principals, VP and Principal. The senior manager viewed this in mostly positive terms such as effective, policy-forming, with financial control and a cross-curriculum perspective. One interesting feature was that this group was considered to have members with 'axes to grind'.
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Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSED data

Case study: Sixth Form College (B2)

Participant: PSC1 (Deputy Principal)

Key: Cluster (a)  Supercluster (c)
Cluster (b)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Sixth Form College (B2)

Participant: TVEI coordinator/Deputy Principal for Pastoral Provision (PSC2)

1. The most closely-related cluster (a) was that of the SN (Special Needs Group), SMT (Senior Management Team) and CCG (Cross-Curriculum Group). The TVEI coordinator was a member of all three groups but the groups would seem to have had very different tasks and possibly different modes of operation. Cluster (a) was also considered to be effective, decision-making and open to change. The three groups involved were subject to 'managed conflict'.

2. Two further clusters, (b) and (d), were construed by the TVEI coordinator. Cluster (b) was represented by STG (Senior Tutor Group) and ROA (Record of Achievement Group) and cluster (d) by HOD and SDT (Science, Design and Technology Group). The two clusters therefore encompassed the 'pastoral' and 'curricular' aspects of the post held by the TVEI Coordinator acting also as the Deputy Principal for Pastoral matters.

3. Cluster (b) was linked to cluster (a) to form a supercluster (c). Supercluster (c) shared the same degree of commonality as cluster (d) and the two were very loosely linked via ITOW (Insights into Work group).

4. Cluster (a) was not as effective as cluster (b) and was not as 'powerful' in terms of the decision-making role.

5. The more curriculum-based cluster (d) did not directly influence the management of TVEI within the college, did not have a major role in decision-making but conflict was managed to a certain degree.

6. The ITOW (Insights into Work Group), [NB. a relatively newly-formed group at the time of the interview], was distinct from the rest of the groups identified. This group was considered to be somewhat ineffective, with poor management of conflict and yet open to change.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: Sixth Form College (B2)
Participant: PSC2 (TVEI coordinator)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Sixth Form College [distant] (B3)

Participant: Principal (CC1)

1. Two groups were seen to be identical in relation to the constructs elicited by the Principal. The groups, forming subcluster (a), were as follows:

   CC (Curriculum Committee)
   TC (Tutorial Committee)

Both groups tended not to be policy-making but recommended policy or suggestions for another group(s) to consider. The Principal was no closely involved with the management of either of the two groups and yet the groups were considered to have some significance in relation to external affairs.

2. A second subcluster (b) consisted of PC (Premises Committee) and ELC (External Liaison Committee). The two groups were again not considered to be policy-making and the Principal was not closely involved. They differed only in relation to their respective link with external affairs, ELC having a prime role in this respect.

3. The two subclusters were related to another group ie. MG (Management Group) to form cluster (c). This group dealt little with external affairs but did involve the Principal much more than the previously-described groups. The MG was recognised as having some policy-forming role.

4. A third subcluster (d) was composed of CPRC (Chairman's Policy and Review Committee - as a task group of the Governing Body) and GB (Governing Body). The two groups were clearly different from all other groups since they both involved governors. The Principal was personally involved with both groups and they had a certain function in relation to external affairs. With the exception of SSM (Senior Staff Meeting), the two groups were the most involved with policy-formation.

5. The SSM was linked loosely with subcluster to from cluster (e). SSM was different since it was recognised by the Principal as the main policy-making part of the college management system. The Principal was also chiefly involved with the running of this particular group.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Sixth Form College [distant] (B3)

Participant: CC1 (Principal)

Key:
- Subcluster (a)
- Subcluster (b)
- Cluster (c)
- Subcluster (d)
- Cluster (e)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Sixth Form College [distant] (B3)

Participant: TVEI coordinator/Director of Studies for Curriculum (CC2)

1. The first cluster identified, cluster (a), consisted of two relatively closely-related groups;

   MG (Management Group)
   TVEI.COORD (TVEI Coordinator's Group Meeting -external)

   The groups were similar because they were not considered as having a recommending-role and were also not decision-making. The two groups were not constructed as task groups and lacked an implementing-function. They were similar in many other respects but differed since the MG was viewed as being 'time-consuming' whereas TVEI.COORD was not.

2. Subcluster (b) was formed from the relationship between the SMM (Senior Management Meeting) and HOFG (Heads of Faculty Group - a new group at the time of the interview). Both groups had a function to recommend policy, had an implementing-function and were under the 'control' of the Principal. The groups differed because the HOFG was task-orientated and did not have such a significant position as SMM in relation to decision-making.

3. The IT (Information Technology Committee) was loosely-related to subcluster (b) to form cluster (c) but was significantly different in terms of time-wasting. This group wasted far less of the Director of Studies' time than the groups within subcluster (b). Cluster (c) also contained CO (College Office). The CO did not form a 'group' within the management of the college as in the case of the others identified. The Director of Studies responded to this group very clearly in relation to the polarity of the constructs ie. the group was clearly not recommending in function and yet was 'implementing', task-orientated and had an external liaison function.

4. Another group was elicited by the Director of Studies. This group, CC (Curriculum Committee), was different from the other groups in relation to many constructs but was loosely linked to groups in cluster (c), thereby forming supercluster (d). The CC was task-orientated, like the HOFG and CO, and was under the control of the Director of Studies. However, CC was viewed as being efficient and did not waste time.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Sixth Form College [distant] (B3)

Participant: CC2 (TVEI coordinator)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College (C1)
Participant: TVEI coordinator (AC1)

1. Subcluster (a) was identified containing the CUG (Computer User's Group) and DEP.M (Department Meetings). NB. The Coordinator was a member of the CUG and a member of one of the Department Meetings (i.e. Biology).

2. CUG and DEP.M were both established prior to the introduction of TVEI, did not have a significant liaison function or financial control, were somewhat disorganised, with little power and advisory rather than decision-making.

3. Subcluster (b) consisted of ADC (Academic Development Committee) and DOS (Directorate of Studies - pastoral). The coordinator was again a member of both groups and was perceived to have the same degree of involvement as with the two groups subcluster (a).

4. The ADC and DOS were also established prior to TVEI-initiation within the college. The coordinator considered the two groups to be slightly more innovatory than the CUG and DEP.M and were more organised in relation to mode of operation. The ADC and DOS groups were not more powerful than CUG and DEP.M although they had more senior management involvement.

5. Subclusters (a) and (b) were linked to form cluster (c). They were related but were different to cluster (d). This cluster was identified to contain three groups:
   - HOD (Heads of Department Group)
   - AB (Academic Board)
   - PG (Principalate Group)

   but the degree of clustering between the groups involved was not as 'close' as that observed for subclusters (a) and (b).

6. The coordinator was a member of only the Academic Board but was invited to attend meetings of the other two groups as required. The groups were similar in that they were established prior to TVEI-initiation, were very well-organised, had some financial control, consisted largely of senior management and were decision-making. Cluster (d) could be considered as being the 'power base' of the management system. The HOD was not, however, as powerful as the other two groups within the cluster.

7. One group did not form a discrete cluster with any of the other groups elicited by the coordinator. The GWP (GCSE
Working Party) was thus identified as an isolated group outside of supercluster (d), it was convened by the coordinator and was perceived by the coordinator as a group with a purely advisory function, without senior management involvement, relatively powerless and yet innovatory. The coordinator also considered that the GWP did not have any financial control within the management system but was 'easy to deal with' and fairly well-organised.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College (C1)

Participant: AC1 (TVEI coordinator)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College (C1)

Participant: Vice Principal for Curriculum (AC2)

1. Two groups formed a very closely-related cluster(a); the HOS (Heads of Section Group) and CTM (Course Team Meetings). The groups were considered by the VP as being at the 'heart' of curriculum provision across the college. Both groups were elicited as having a direct involvement with the experience of students, effective, aware of resource-implications and successful in terms of the management of conflict within meetings (although conflict was detected).

2. The VP also considered the HOS and CTM to be good 'performers' but without much control being provided by the VP.

3. Cluster(b) contained three groups;

   PG (Principalate Group)
   HOD (Heads of Department Group)

   The VP was neither 'happy' or 'unhappy' with the performance of such groups. The PG differed in that much conflict was experienced and was dealt with only some success.

4. The PG consisted of senior management only and was considered to operate with little direct involvement of students. The HOD and ABWP'S were however, more involved with student matters.

5. The two clusters (a) and (b) were linked to a certain extent and formed a supercluster(c). This supercluster was different from cluster(d).

6. Cluster(d) grouped together the DOS (Directorate of Studies) and AB (Academic Board). Both groups were broadly affected or 'controlled' by the VP and yet were viewed as being ineffective. The VP was very unhappy with the 'performance' of the two groups and considered them to lack financial awareness. The DOS demonstrated much more conflict than the AB (of which the VP was a member) but the level of conflict within each group was not particularly well-managed.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College (C1)

Participant: AC2 (Vice Principal)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College (C2)

Participant: TVEI coordinator (BC1)

1. Two groups were very closely-linked to form subcluster (a). The HOFC (Heads of Faculty Committee) and SMM (Senior Management Meeting) were both viewed as prime decision-making groups within the management structure and contained mostly senior management.

2. The HOFC and SMM were not seen to operate in a spontaneous way and tended not to deal with matters relating to marketing. The two groups were responsible for routine or non-innovatory issues and were neither troublesome or trouble-free.

3. Another subcluster was also fairly well-linked and contained the AB (Academic Board) and INSET (College INSET Standing Committee). Both groups had a membership with some senior management involved and were somewhat spontaneous in relation to the way in which they operated. The INSET was more 'outward looking' than the AB since it was considered to encompass more external policy.

4. The two subclusters (a) and (b) were linked to form cluster (c) but were different to CMG (College Marketing Group). All five groups so far analysed had some form of financial basis and yet did not function primarily within a financial framework.

5. The ILC (Industrial Liaison Committee) and IT (IT Committee) formed a distinct cluster (d). The groups both functioned within internal policy and yet were not directly involved with decision-making within the college. They differed since the IT committee was seen as a financially-based group but the ILC were not at all involved with college finances. Both groups were innovatory, spontaneous in their mode of operation and dealt much with external policy.

6. The final group elicited by the Coordinator did not cluster significantly with any of the other groups and was therefore not included within supercluster (e). The EO (Equal Opportunities Standing Committee) consisted of senior management but was not a particularly 'strong' decision-making group. The group was thought to be troublesome and functioned in a spontaneous manner. The agenda for the group related more to internal than external policy and it was considered to operate on a non-financial basis.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College (C2)

Participant: BC1 (TVEI coordinator)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College (C2)

Participant: Principal (BC2)

1. One subcluster and two clusters were elicited by the Principal. The linkage can be summarised as:

   Subcluster (a) a closely-related pair involving IT (Information Technology Committee) and AB (Academic Board).
   Cluster (b) a cluster consisting of ILC (Industrial Liaison Committee) and SW.HC (South West Area Heads Committee), relating loosely to subcluster (a).
   Cluster (c) a distinct cluster of SMM (Senior Management Meeting) and GOV (Governing Body).

2. The two groups in subcluster (a) were related since they were both viewed as being constitutionally-required for the management of a tertiary college, had a membership consisting only of college staff (with therefore an educational background), were advisory and dealt with matters of internal policy. The Principal also considered that both groups were under the Principal's 'control' and were not significantly involved with finances. The groups differed in that the AB considered many subject areas whereas IT was related to a much narrower curriculum perspective.

3. Cluster (b) contained groups with some similarity but also with some differences. The two separate groups (ILC and SW.HC) were both advisory (to the SMM), represented a wide subject interest, and had little financial implication in relation to other groups considered. Membership of the SW.HC was not elected since only Headteachers or Principals were involved as a result of their respective positions, unlike the election of some of the members within the ILC. The groups differed most significantly in respect of the 'type' of membership i.e. the ILC contained many members outside of education.

4. The groups within cluster (c) were distinct from those in the larger cluster (b). The two groups in cluster (c) were only very loosely related because they were perceived as having many differences and few similarities. The SMM was not considered as a constitutional requirement of the college whereas the GOV was an essential component of the college operation. The statutory requirement of a 'heterogenous' governing body (GOV) and the elected membership of that body were also factors seen by the Principal as being significant. The two groups were, however, both reflective of a wide range of subjects and had financial implications.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College (C2)

Participant: BC2 (Principal)

Key:
- Subcluster (a)
- Cluster (c)
- Cluster (b)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: One of four TVEI coordinators (SEDC1)

1. Two discrete groupings were identified by the Coordinator;

   Cluster (a) CMG (Cluster Management Group)
                MT (Management Team)
                Coordinator's Meeting)

   Subcluster (b) STM (Subject Team Meetings)
                  PSCM (Programme Section-
                  Coordinator's Meeting)

2. Cluster (a) consisted of very formal groups, dealing with both internal and external matters, neither effective or ineffective, relatively unfriendly and with a significant control of college resources. The coordinator was unsure about the CMG in relation to its relevance, the construction of agenda and the pro-active nature.

3. Within subcluster (b) the two groups were both internally-focused, relevant to the work of the Coordinator, effective, friendly and did not control resources within the college. The groups differed only in respect of the degree to which they were considered to be pro-active and the degree of formality.

4. Cluster (a) had three other groups associated with it to varying degrees, thereby forming cluster (c). The three groups consisted of the following;

   PAB (Programme Area Board)
   EO (Equal Opportunities Working Party)
   CL.COORD (Cluster Coordinator's Group)

   All three groups were considered to be formal and yet friendly, without significant control over resources. The Coordinator was not familiar with the operation of the EO but did observe that this group was as relatively ineffective as the other two groups. The CL.COORD dealt much more with external matters than the others listed.

5. An eighth group was different from all other groups in many respects. This group, D.TVEI (Director's of TVEI Group - consisting of the four college Coordinators and the Vice Principal responsible for TVEI), was informal, dealt with both internal and external matters, was relevant (but not as relevant to the Coordinator as PAB, PSCM and STM), friendly and with a collectively-determined agenda. The group was, however, viewed as being reactive and with little control over resources.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: SEDC1 (One of four TVEI coordinators)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

CASE study : Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant : One of four TVEI coordinators (SEDC2)

1. As with the groups and views of management (constructs) described for SEDC1, those described for SEDC2 were elicited collectively within a training session, attended by three further coordinators and a VP (Vice Principal).

2. The Coordinator (SEDC2) identified closely-related groups forming;

   Subcluster (a) EO (Equal Opportunities Working Party)
   MT (Management Team)

   Cluster (b) subcluster (a)
   STM (Section Team Meeting)
   SCM (Section Coordinator's Meeting)
   PAB (Programme Area Board)

3. The groups within subcluster (a) were considered to be similar since they were both relatively formal, dealt only with internal matters, neither significantly relevant or effective and somewhat unfriendly. The groups were not particularly pro-active or reactive in their operation.

4. Cluster (b) contained three groups linked to subcluster (a). The three groups were considered to be relevant to the work of the coordinator, ineffective, unfriendly and again not particularly pro-active or reactive. The SCM was more formal than the other two groups.

5. Two further groups were loosely-linked with cluster (b) to form supercluster (c). These groups, CMG (Cluster Management Meeting) and D.TVEI (Director's TVEI Meeting - with a membership consisting of the four Coordinators and the Vice Principal responsible for TVEI), were similar because they were relatively informal, dealt both with internal and external matters and were considered by the coordinator to be unfriendly.

6. An eighth group was viewed in a very different way by the coordinator and therefore did not cluster with the other groups identified in supercluster (c). CL.COORD (Cluster coordinator's Meeting) was different since it dealt only with external matters and was irrelevant in relation to the work of the coordinator. This group was also considered to be the most friendly group and yet ineffective.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: SEDC2 (One of four TVEI coordinators)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: One of four TVEI coordinators (SEDC3)

1. The groups and views of management (constructs) identified by this coordinator were obtained collectively, as in the case of those for the other three coordinators and a VP, as part of a joint training session.

2. One very closely-related subcluster (a) was formed from SCM (Section [Programme] Coordinator's Meeting) and STM (Section Team Meetings). The two groups were relatively informal, relevant to the work of the coordinator and very effective and friendly. The groups were also honest and tended to be pro-active.

3. A second closely-related subcluster (b) consisted of SMT (Senior Management Team) and PAB (Programme Area Board). The two groups involved were both considered to be formal, dealt primarily with internal matters, were mainly relevant to the work of the Coordinator and were neither wholly pro-active or reactive. This coordinator introduced the constructs 'honest' and 'chair led' to describe the various groups listed. In relation to this particular cluster, the PAB was considered to be more honest than SMT and more open i.e. not as chair-led.

4. The two subclusters were linked to two other groups to from cluster (c);

   HSC (Health and Safety Committee)
   CL.COORD (Cluster Coordinator's Meeting)

These two groups were again relevant, effective, friendly and honest. The groups tended to be more formal than those in the second cluster.

5. D.TVEI (Director's of TVEI Group - consisting of the four coordinators and the Vice Principal responsible for TVEI) was only loosely-related to the groups described so far, thus forming supercluster (d). This group was less effective than the others and but was as 'open' as the STM.

6. The CMG (Cluster Management Group), located 'outside' of supercluster (d), was not fully understood by the coordinator and therefore many of the constructs were considered to be not applicable. The group was, however, viewed as being responsible largely for external matters and was the most irrelevant group in relation to the work of this Coordinator.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: SEDC3 (One of four TVEI coordinators)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: Vice Principal with overall responsibility for TVEI implementation (SEDC4)

1. As with the four Coordinators, the groups and views of management (constructs) elicited by the Vice Principal were obtained as a result of a joint training session.

2. Two groups were considered by the Vice Principal to be identical. The groups, CMG (Cluster Management Group) and CL.COORD (Cluster Coordinator's Meeting) formed subcluster (a) and were the same since they were viewed as not being extreme in relation to any of the constructs. For example, they were neither formal or informal and were neither wholly relevant or irrelevant.

3. The two groups were closely linked to a third group, STM (Section Team Meetings) to construct cluster (b). This group differed from the other two because it was considered to be more formal, less relevant, more friendly and less consensus-seeking.

4. A second discrete cluster (c) was recognised. This consisted of:
   - PAB (Programme Area Board)
   - SMT (Senior Management Team)

   The two groups were very formal, relatively effective and influenced the behaviour of the Vice Principal. They differed in that the PAB was far less relevant to the work of the Vice Principal than the SMT. Clusters (b) and (c) were very loosely linked to form supercluster (d).

5. The sixth group was distinct from all others identified and was therefore positioned outside of supercluster (d). The D.TVEI (Directors of TVEI Group - consisting of the four coordinators and the Vice Principal) was the most informal group, dealt with more external matters than the other groups and was by far the most friendly and consensus-seeking.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)
Participant: SEDC4 (Vice Principal)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: One of four TVEI coordinators (SEDC5)

1. The groups and views of management (constructs) elicited were obtained for this Coordinator during the same training session as for the other three coordinators and the Vice Principal responsible for TVEI.

2. Various discrete groupings were identified by the coordinator:

   Subcluster (a) DOSM (Director of Studies Meeting)
                 CESG (Curriculum Enhancement Support Group)

   Cluster (b) subcluster (a)
             ELWG (Effective Learning Working Group)

   Subcluster (c) CL.COORD (Cluster Coordinator's Meeting)
                 CMG (Cluster Management Group)

   Cluster (d) subcluster (c)
             SMG (Senior Management Group)

   Cluster (e) PAB (Programme Area Board)
             D.TVEI (Directors of TVEI Meeting)

3. Groups within cluster (b) were considered to be the most relevant to the coordinator and very friendly. The ELWG was more formal than the other two groups forming subcluster (a) and was not quite as effective.

4. Cluster (d) contained three groups that were generally formal but tended to be unfriendly. The SMG was slightly different from the other two forming subcluster (c) since it was much more pro-active and not as relevant to the work of the Coordinator.

5. Cluster (e) consisted of groups that dealt mostly with internal matters, were not particularly relevant to the work of the coordinator and tended to be somewhat reactive than pro-active. The two groups were not as closely-related as groups within the other clusters.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Tertiary College [distant] (C3)

Participant: SEDC5 (One of four TVEI coordinators)

Key:
- Subcluster (a)
- Cluster (b)
- Subcluster (c)
- Cluster (d)
- Cluster (e)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Technical College (D1)

Participant: Vice Principal for Personnel & Resources (FC1)

1. Two major clusters, (b) and (d), were identified along with one isolated group, the TVEI.C (TVEI Committee - college based). The clusters consisted of;

Cluster (b) SMC (Senior Management Committee)
HOD'S.SMM (Head of Department's Senior Management Meeting)
Subcluster (a) - CC (Careers Committee) and SSC (Student Services Committee)

Cluster (d) TVEI.C.C (TVEI Coordinator's Committee)
Subcluster (c) - CSG (Consortium Subject Group) and MC (Management Committee)

2. Cluster (b) consisted of groups with some form of financial control within the college management system, were relatively effective and the VP generally had control over the group business. The groups differed since the SMC (of which the VP was a member) was considered to be very co-operative, much more than the HOD'S.SMM. The SSC had much more external liaison function (industry etc.) than the other three groups, but formed a subcluster with CC since the two groups were identical in four out of the six constructs elicited.

3. Within cluster (d) all groups were recognised by the Vice Principal as being relatively co-operative and partly effective. The VP did feel, however, that the MC represented an unfavourable environment due to limited personal control. This view was held for CSG, but not to the same degree, and yet the environment of TVEI.C.C was favourable. The two latter groups were also similar in that they were not considered as antagonistic or having an external liaison function, unlike the MC.

4. The eighth group elicited by the VP was very different from the others. The TVEI.C was far less antagonistic than any of the other groups and had no external liaison function as perceived by the VP.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: Technical College (D1)
Participant: FC1 (Vice Principal)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Technical College (D1)

Participant: TVEI coordinator (FC2)

1. Only one cluster was identified as being closely-related. Subcluster (a) contained S.DEV (Staff Development Committee) and CC (Careers Committee). The two groups contained some 'figure heads' as members, were not involved directly with TVEI, adopted a whole college approach and were only affected slightly by the 'personality of the Principal'. The groups differed since S.DEV was restrained by financial resourcing whereas CC was more adequately resourced.

2. All other groups were loosely-related. Subcluster (a) was linked to SS (Student Services) to form cluster (b) due to also having a whole college approach and being only slightly affected by the personality of the Principal. SS was, however, much more involved in reviewing rather than formulating policy. The TVEI Coordinator was very much personally involved with SS in relation to the other two groups.

3. Two other groups, INSET (TVEI INSET Group - ad hoc) and AB (Academic Board), were very loosely-related to the three groups in cluster (b) to construct supercluster (c). The AB was different from the other groups because it was restrained by the Departmental structure of the college (i.e. it did not adopt a whole college approach). INSET differed since it was the only group identified as TVEI-initiated and therefore the Coordinator was directly involved with the running of this particular group.

4. A distinct cluster (d) was identified by the Coordinator. This cluster contained SMC (Senior Management Committee) and GOV (Governing Body). Both groups had 'real power', were directly affected by the personality of the Principal, formulated policy and the Coordinator had either no or very little personal involvement with the groups. The GOV was considered as having no involvement with TVEI unlike SMC.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Technical College (D1)

Participant: FC2 (TVEI coordinator)

Key: Subcluster (a) Supercluster (c)
Cluster (b) Cluster (d)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Technical College (D2)

Participant: TVEI coordinator (SC1)

1. Subcluster (a) contained two closely-related groups. This subcluster consisted of ROA (Record of Achievement Group) and TVEI.CCM (TVEI Consortium Coordinator’s Meeting). The Coordinator was directly involved with both groups, considered them to be relatively effective, experienced some friction within group meetings and observed that the groups were both TVEI-driven.

2. A third group, POST-16.TCG (Post-16 TVEI Consortium Coordinator’s Group), was linked to this subcluster to form cluster (b). This group was viewed as being as effective as the other two groups and was also TVEI-driven. However, POST-16.TCG did not represent 'friction' to the Coordinator, unlike the other groups in cluster (b).

3. Three further groups were linked to cluster (b) in varying degrees, they did not form their own discrete cluster but were grouped to form supercluster (c). The groups consisted of:

- SNWP (Special Needs Working Party)
- TWG (Technology Working Group - with local schools)
- PSC (Policy Steering Group)

SNWP was different since it was related to the provision of a single college policy i.e. the policy on special needs provision. The Coordinator considered the TWG as a group with a function not driven by TVEI because it was so affected by the National Curriculum (due to the local school link). The group, PSC, was different because the Coordinator had very little direct involvement with its operation and was also considered as being very effective in relation to all other groups elicited.

4. The TVEI.MG (TVEI Management Group) was not directly related to any of the other groups. This group was considered as relatively ineffective, with friction and also TVEI-driven. TVEI.MG functioned to some extent with a policy-forming role and the coordinator was not directly involved with its running.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: Technical College (D2)
Participant: SC1 (TVEI coordinator)

Key: Subcluster (a)  Supercluster (c)
Cluster (b)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case Study: Technical College (D2)

Participant: Director of Studies for Curriculum (SC2)

1. The Director of Studies identified a very closely-related subcluster (a) consisting of:

SNWP (Special Needs Working Party)
INSET (INSET - Staff Development Committee)
HOD's (Head of Department's Committee)

All three groups were led by TVEI only to a certain extent, had little friction and had some involvement with policy-formation. The Director considered INSET and HOD'S as only partly co-operative but could not construct a view of SNWP in this respect due to lack of personal involvement.

2. A fourth group, R&E.WP (Review and Evaluation Working Party), was linked to this first cluster for many of the above-mentioned properties but was different because it represented a slightly more co-operative environment and was led more by TVEI issues. R&E.WP was linked loosely with PSC (Policy Steering Committee) and subcluster (a) to form cluster (b). PSC was different because it was clearly the group with a major role of policy formation and contained the most friction for the Director of Studies.

3. A second cluster, cluster (c), consisted of two loosely-related groups, AB (Academic Board) and TVEI.MG (TVEI Management Group[s]). These two groups were not as effective as the other groups elicited but differed since AB was far less policy-forming than TVEI.MG and represented no 'friction' at all, as perceived by the Director of Studies.

4. Another group, TVEI.CCM (TVEI Coordinator's Committee Meeting) was identified but was not located within a discrete cluster. TVEI.CCM was different from all others since this group was considered as the most co-operative, very much TVEI-led and represented no friction.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Technical College (D2)

Participant: SC2 (Director of Studies)

Key: Subcluster (a)                    Cluster (c)
      Cluster (b)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Technical College [distant] (D3)

Participant: Deputy Assistant Principal [DAP] with overall responsibility for TVEI

The constructs elicited by the DAP were almost identical to those of the two TVEI coordinators. Six out of the elements were closely-related and formed cluster (a). The cluster consisted of the following:

- WEG (Work Experience Group)
- SNG (Special Needs Group)
- CTT (Course Tutors Team)
- EOG (Equal Opportunities Group)
- SMT (Senior Management Team)
- AB (Academic Board)

The groups located in cluster (a) were perceived by the DAP to be workable, with some power and relatively effective. With the exception of AB and SMT, the groups could not be related to the construct of 'financial control' by the DAP. AB and SMT had little financial control.

A second cluster (b) was formed from two groups:

- TVEI.C (TVEI Coordinator's Committee)
- SHM (Section Heads Meeting)

The two groups were not as closely-related as those in cluster (a). They were considered to be similar to each other since they were relatively ineffective, did not have power and were not as workable as those groups in cluster (a). The groups differed from each other because the DAP was unable to characterise SHM in relation to financial control but considered TVEI.C to have no financial control.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data

Case study: Technical College [distant] (D3)

Participant: PRC1 (Deputy Assistant Principal)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Technical College [distant] (D3)

Participant: One of two TVEI coordinators (PRC2)

1. Only three constructs were elicited by the TVEI coordinator. The constructs and elements were identical to those of the other TVEI coordinator (PRC3) because the framework of the repertory grids was discussed openly between the two coordinators. The completion of the grids was, however, confidential.

2. Subcluster (a) consisted of three closely-related groups;

   AB (Academic Board)
   MG (Marketing Group)
   SNG (Special Needs Group)

The groups were perceived to be similar since they were not clearly effective or ineffective, had some power and had relatively little financial control.

3. Subcluster (a) was linked to three further groups to form cluster (b). The groups were as follows;

   SMT (Senior Management Team)
   APRC (Academic Planning & Resources Committee)
   EOG (Equal Opportunities Group)

The EOG was viewed as being more effective than other groups in cluster (b) and the SMT less effective than such groups. The AB and SMT both had more power than the other four groups. Whereas the the SMT and APRC (a working group of the AB) had more financial control than the other groups.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: Technical College [distant] (D3)
Participant: PRC2 (One of two TVEI coordinators)
LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS

Case study: Technical College [distant] (D3)

Participant: One of two TVEI coordinators (PRC3)

1. The constructs and elements elicited by this TVEI coordinator were identical to those of the other TVEI coordinator. The framework of the repertory grid was discussed openly between the two coordinators but the completion of the individual 'response' was carried out independently of each other.

2. Two clusters were identified by the coordinator:

   Cluster (a)  SNG (Special Needs Group)
               MG (Marketing Group)

   Cluster (b)  AB  (Academic Board)
                SMT (Senior Management Team)
                APRC (Academic Planning & Resources Committee)

3. The two groups linked to form cluster (a) were both considered to have some power and to have some financial control. The SNG were viewed as being slightly more effective than MG.

4. The three groups forming cluster (b) were similar because the coordinator perceived that they were relatively powerful. APRC and SMT had more financial control than the AB. Whereas, the AB and SMT were considered to be less effective than APRC.

5. A sixth group was seen to be different from the groups described above. This group, EOG (Equal Opportunities Group), was isolated since it had the least power of all groups elicited and had no financial control. However, like SNG, this group was considered to be relatively effective.
Level 1 Analysis: FOCUSed data
Case study: Technical College [distant] (D3)
Participant: PRC3 (One of two TVEI coordinators)
Case study: A1 (participants PS1 and PS2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - five of the groups elicited by the headteacher and coordinator were the same. The headteacher did not refer to the governing body whereas the TVEI coordinator did not include the Senior Management Team (SMT) within the grid.

2. CONSTRUCTS - the constructs used by the headteacher were primarily operational eg. 'direction' and 'policy-forming' and also considered personal involvement. Constructs relating to personal feelings were not used by the headteacher. This was also the case for the TVEI coordinator. The coordinator tended to refer to curricular matters, TVEI-relevance and time spent during meetings.

3. CLUSTERING - with the exception of three groups, the groups identified by the coordinator were not as closely clustered as those of the Headteacher. The Headteacher appeared to have a similar view of the SMT as for the two pastoral groups ie. Heads of Year Group (HOY'S) and the Record of Achievement Group (ROA). The Heads of Department (HOD'S) were, however, more closely linked to the Policy Review Group (PRG).

The ROA was related to the Insights into Work and Equal Opportunities Group (ITW/EO) and the Information Technology Working Party (IT.WP) by the coordinator and the HOD'S were not closely linked to the PRG.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - the curriculum-based Cross-curriculum Working Parties (CC.WP'S) were relatively isolated by the Headteacher. They were not linked closely to the HOD'S, SMT or PRG. The coordinator did not identify a particularly isolated group but the PRG and GB were separated from the other 6 groups elicited.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - At the time of the coordinator's interview the coordinator was not a member of the SMT. This could account for the absence of this group from the repertory grid constructed by the coordinator. The coordinator's concept map also lacked the SMT. The concept map could be best described as 'pivotal' with all groups operating around the central position of the coordinator.

The Headteacher's appointment (3 months prior to the interview) had corrected the absence of the
coordinator on the SMT. The concept map drawn by the Headteacher was more 'reflective' of teamwork and cooperation than that of the coordinator. The SMT shared a central position along with the Headteacher and coordinator. The Headteacher and coordinator were observed to share common areas such as curriculum and INSET but had independent foci such as governors and the management panel for the Headteacher and TVEI-based curriculum support groups (CSG's) and school working parties for the coordinator.

The deputy Headteacher was not identified by the Headteacher on the concept map whereas the coordinator's map showed frequent meetings with the deputy Headteacher (perhaps to accommodate for the absence of the coordinator at that time as a member of the SMT).

3. INTERVIEWS - The interview notes indicated that the Headteacher had made a positive move toward integrating the work of the coordinator into the management structure. Personal involvement with many of the groups had become a prime target for the headteacher during the 'induction period' on taking up the post at the school.

The coordinator was conscious of the temporary nature of the post and had progressed from a middle-management post of Head of Science. The appointment of the new Headteacher was hoped to provide the sort of access to the SMT that had eventually been achieved. The coordinator's length of employment at the school was considered to strengthen the relationships with colleagues required for the introduction of an initiative such as TVEI. The interview also indicated that the HOY'S were an important part of the management structure and the concept map showed that this group was another point of access for the coordinator to the PRG.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. The membership of the coordinator on the SMT was a critical factor, corrected by the appointment of a new Headteacher. The initial link between the coordinator and the SMT via the deputy Headteacher had been apparently removed due to greater access.

2. The Headteacher and coordinator both adopted an operational view of management and tended not to focus on personal feelings. This more objective view of management models would seem to be more appropriate than the purely-subjective view.

3. A strong link between pastoral groups and the SMT was identified by the Headteacher. The Headteacher was not fully conversant with the operation of the HOD'S and the CC.WP'S at the time of the interview and completing the repertory grid.
4. The Headteacher had a more 'global' view of the management structure whereas the coordinator tended to be self-focused. This could reflect a lack of certainty or confidence for the coordinator, as indicated by the awareness of the temporary post and the need to gain the 'support' of the HOY'S (viewed as a strong force within the management structure).

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Policy Review</td>
<td>Cross-curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group/Governing Body</td>
<td>Working Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study: A2 (participants AHS1 and AHS2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The deputy Headteacher for finance (DH) identified 8 groups whereas the TVEI coordinator (also appointed as deputy Headteacher for curriculum) identified 6 groups using the repertory grid.

Only one group, the Senior Management Team (SMT), was identified by both the DH and the coordinator. The DH referred to groups such as the Administration Group (ADMIN.), Governor's Finance Group (GOV.FIN) and Construction Group (CON.GRP). Such groups reflected the responsibilities of the DH in relation to administration and financial matters. The DH did, however, include the Middle Management Team (MMT) and Heads of Department Group (HOD'S) in the grid.

The coordinator included curriculum-based groups within the grid but also referred to two externally-based groups; Primary Liaison (PRIM.L) and TVEI Steering (TVEI.SG) Groups.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The constructs elicited by the DH included both operational and personal aspects. The significance of the way in which a group was convened, the group efficiency and the possibility of friction within a group were all considered by the DH. The coordinator also used operational and personal constructs eg. effectiveness, financial involvement, TVEI-links and the capacity for external liaison. Both individuals considered personal involvement within their respective grids.

3. CLUSTERING - The DH tended to identify relatively close-clusters between the various groups whereas the groups considered by the coordinator formed only loose-clusters. The SMT was closely linked to the CON.GRP by the DH but only partially linked to the CWP by the coordinator.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The ADMIN. group was isolated from other groups elicited by the DH. The PRIM.L and TVEI.SG groups were isolated by the coordinator.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The concept map drawn by the DH demonstrated the position of the DH (as one of three deputy Headteachers) within the SMT. The map did not pivot around the DH but did show a vertical structure of senior, middle (eg. HOY and HOD) and 'other' management (eg. classroom managers, admin. staff) tiers. Communication routes were generally identified with groups, rather than individuals.
The coordinator's concept map tended to pivot around the coordinator, again with the SMT at the upper/vertical position. The map showed communication routes with individuals and with groups.

2. INTERVIEWS - The two individuals did appear to have much autonomy within their respective roles, the DH relating to finance, contracts, buildings, maintenance and lettings and the coordinator relating to curriculum/TVEI matters. The interview with the DH indicated that membership of a team was important and that this aspect had supported the significant change that had taken place for this particular managerial role. A broad understanding of the operation of the management structure in relation to a task-orientated approach and effectiveness/efficiency was shown by the DH.

The coordinator's interview revealed a strong link between TVEI and the general aspects of the school curriculum. The 'integrated' nature of TVEI across the school was particularly evident. The value of TVEI as a 'funding agent' for the creation of posts eg. technology coordinator was considered to be important by the TVEI coordinator. Although the interview and the concept map for the coordinator referred to individuals, the coordinator still considered that 'outcome' was the basis of a managerial system, rather than individuals.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. The DH and the coordinator identified very different groups within the management structure and yet both indicated a vertical/heirarchical model. Only the SMT, of which both were members, was elicited by the two individuals.

2. The groups identified related to the different roles perceived by the DH and the coordinator. The roles demonstrated much autonomy.

3. The constructs were both operational and personal for the DH and the coordinator.

4. The ADMIN. group, presumably central to the role of the DH, was isolated by the DH. The TVEI.SG was isolated by the coordinator, again considered to be relatively central to the particular role. The coordinator also isolated the PRIM.L group from other groups identified, possibly being viewed as a 'responsibility' rather than being significant to the management of the school curriculum.

5. The DH showed a broader view of the management structure than did the coordinator. The DH considered the value of teams rather than individuals. The coordinator related the TVEI role as a 'pivot' within the structure.
6. There was, perhaps, a tendency for the coordinator to emphasise the integrated nature of TVEI as a form of evaluation within the interview. The use of TVEI as a funding agent, referred to by the coordinator, was not considered by the DH. This indicated that the DH had little to do with the financial management of TVEI, although finance was central to the role undertaken.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Primary Liaison Group</td>
<td>Administration Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group and TVEI Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Case study: A3 [distant] (participants SBS1 and SBS2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Headteacher and TVEI coordinator both referred to 7 groups within their respective repertory grids. Only 2 groups were selected by both individuals, the Senior Management Team (SMT) and the Head's of Department Group (HOD'S).

The groups considered by the Headteacher were varied in function but were all internal to the school management structure. The coordinator's groups were also varied but included external and internal types, some of which reflected the coordinator's other role as head of sixth form.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The constructs used by the Headteacher were varied and were both operational and personal eg. type of agenda, effectiveness, personal involvement and control. The coordinator had some difficulty in expressing constructs but did elicit four. The coordinator's constructs were mostly personal eg. control and conflict but one was operational ie. information-giving.

3. CLUSTERING - The clusters of groups identified from the grid constructed by the Headteacher indicated that they were all relatively closely-related. The coordinator identified three very closely-related groups with the other 4 groups only being loosely-linked. Both the Headteacher and coordinator expressed areas of commonality between the SMT and HOD'S but the nature of the association was direct for the Headteacher and indirect for the coordinator.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The Headteacher did not identify an isolated group whereas the School Policy Committee (SPC) was isolated by the coordinator.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The concept map drawn by the Headteacher showed a broad view of the management structure with a group of three foci positioned in the centre ie. 'ME' (Headteacher), TVEI coordinator and task postholders. Various major areas of management were seen to 'feed' into the three foci. The map did indicate a vertical/hierarchical structure with the Headteacher at the top. Many groups were linked to each other as well as to the central foci.

The map constructed by the coordinator showed the coordinator in a central or pivotal position with all groups relating to...
the coordinator. Only two groups had separate links from those with the coordinator. The map included a cascade of external groups, referred to as consortium groups.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview notes taken for the Headteacher showed that the Headteacher had been active in creating the tier of task postholders. Some of the postholders carried out responsibilities relating to TVEI. The interview had taken place before the appointment of the head of sixth form as TVEI coordinator. Two deputy Headteachers had held the post of coordinator before that time. The move towards post-16 extension of TVEI had led to the more recent appointment. The interview of the Headteacher implied an open approach to management with delegation of tasks. The management of post-16 education within the structure was complicated due to the sharing of a federal sixth form.

The interview held with the coordinator showed that the coordinator understood that the ultimate responsibility for TVEI was with the Headteacher and that close liaison was important. The dual role of coordinator and Head of Sixth Form was considered to be beneficial. The management of TVEI was viewed as an extension of the consortium approach already established for CPVE. It was considered that policy was generated by the SMT, of which the coordinator was a member. Matters relating to the management of TVEI were, however, affected by external forces such as the area TVEI manager.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. Only the SMT and HOD'S were identified by both the Headteacher and coordinator. The two groups were considered to be linked by both individuals but to varying degrees.

2. The coordinator's view of the management structure was much more outward-looking than that of the Headteacher, with references to consortium groups. The Headteacher referred only to one such group, the Federal Sixth Form Group (FUCC).

3. The two individuals showed different perspectives in relation to the nature of groups. The Headteacher had a more broader view, including operational constructs. The coordinator's constructs tended to be more personal.

4. The management model was seen to be vertical/hierarchical by the Headteacher (and yet included many links between the various groups identified) but the coordinator's perception was that of various groups working around the pivotal position of the coordinator.

5. The role of coordinator had 'passed around' from one individual to another but was finally with the Head of Sixth Form (due to the post-16 nature of TVEI extension). The
ultimate responsibility for TVEI, particularly in financial terms, was with the Headteacher. The coordiantor did indicate that some autonomy of the role did operate in relation to curriculum.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Operational/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Loose/close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>School Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIXTH FORM COLLEGES - LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

Case study: B1 (participants BPC1 and BPC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The TVEI coordinator (also appointed as Pastoral Senior Tutor) elicited 8 groups whereas the Vice Principal for Curriculum (VP) elicited 7 groups within the repertory grid.

The Academic Board (AB) was the only group identified by both the coordinator and the VP. The coordinator did not consider the Senior Management Team (SMT) [or even the wider SMT referred to by the VP] but tended to focus on groups of staff with a pastoral or curriculum responsibility. This selection of groups would seem to reflect the dual role of the coordinator.

The VP focussed on a broad range of groups, including governors, SMT, INSET and Heads of Division (curriculum). This selection would indicate a broader area of responsibility and a wider view of the management structure than that shown by the coordinator.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The constructs used by the VP were both operational eg. type of meetings held (open vs. closed) and personal eg. useful. The notion of professionalism was introduced by the VP through the grid. The coordinator also referred to both categories of construct including personal views such as conflict and control.

3. CLUSTERING - Five out of the 7 groups elicited by the VP were closely-related, with 2 further groups (INSET and Governor's Committee [GOV.C]) forming a more loosely-linked cluster. Seven out of the 8 groups identified by the coordinator were also closely-related.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The AB, considered by both individuals, was linked to the SMT etc. by the VP but was isolated by the coordinator. The VP did not appear to isolate groups but marginalised the INSET and GOV.C groups.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The VP constructed a concept map showing a variety of individuals rather than groups. Those members of staff not included within the 'wider SMT' were identified as 'staff' and were positioned vertically below the wider SMT. This seemed to indicate a division within the management structure as perceived by the VP, however, the AB was seen as the link between the two areas of the structure. Within the wider SMT the TVEI coordinator was considered as a member but clearly out of the separate management entity of the SMT.
(consisting of the Principal and VP's only). This was also the case for the main curriculum-leaders, the Heads of Division.

The VP also expressed a pivotal role within the structure with 'good informal meetings' taking place with the Principal and other VP's. Various cross-links were shown between individuals and major groups within the structure.

The coordinator found the construction of a concept map to be difficult and therefore chose to use a previously-prepared document, one which had been discussed and agreed within the wider SMT. The map indicated much overlap between a variety of groups and individuals. The TVEI coordinator was at the centre or pivot of the map and was located within the college TVEI group.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview of the VP indicated that the VP also had a dual role involving curriculum and INSET. This dual role was reflected in the selection of groups used for the repertory grid. The VP was experienced in post-16 education and TVEI from a previous appointment. This had led to a direct involvement within the management of TVEI and its integration across the curriculum. The VP valued TVEI as an initiative but recognised that many members of staff did not share this understanding. Departments were identified according to the 'speed' in which TVEI was being developed. The Heads of Division were recognised as a significant force in relation to TVEI implementation.

The coordinator had been in post for some time as a senior tutor (>15 years) and was under pressure to carry out the two roles. The coordinator viewed the responsibility for TVEI as a move towards the central management of the college (ie. the wider SMT) along with the Heads of Division. There was perhaps a feeling of recognition for service and parity between 'senior teacher' roles in relation to the appointment as TVEI coordinator. The coordinator considered that the new management team were much more aware of the system required to support the college than had previously been the case.

(c) Summary

NOTES :

1. The coordinator had been a member of staff for a much longer period of time than the VP. The VP had had previous experience in the management of TVEI and had clear views about the direction in which the initiative should develop within the college.

2. The appointment of a long-standing senior tutor as the coordinator did indicate recognition for service rather than some other function. The coordinator was still not a member of the SMT and failed to identify this group when using the repertory grid.
3. The AB was the only group considered by the two individuals. This group was isolated by the coordinator and yet was viewed as an essential communication route by the VP (being linked closely to the operation of the SMT).

4. The coordinator was much more aware of personal feelings and involvement within the management structure than was the VP. The SMT were generally considered to be conscious of the workings of systems than had previously been the case.

5. Both individuals used concept maps with their respective role in a pivotal position. The use of a previously-prepared document by the coordinator did, however, cloud the analysis. The VP viewed the management structure in a vertical/heirarchical way with the SMT at the top.

6. The ultimate responsibility for TVEI was questionable within the college. The coordinator appeared to have some autonomy but the isolation from the SMT (and the 'informal discussions' with the Principal and VP's) probably reduced the power of the coordinator. The VP, however, did have free access to the control of college management and had established an 'interest' in TVEI-implementation.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>INSET Group/ Governor's Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.................................................................
Case study: B2 (participants PSC1 and PSC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Deputy Principal for Curriculum (DP) and the TVEI coordinator (also appointed as Deputy Principal for Pastoral Matters) both selected 8 groups when completing their respective repertory grids. Three of the groups, the Head of Department Group (HOD), Cross-curriculum Group (CCG) and the Senior Management Team (SMT), were referred to by both individuals.

The groups identified by the DP related to the prime responsibility for curriculum-management and did not appear to overlap with the management of pastoral aspects of the college. The coordinator's groups included both those directly relating to curriculum (presumably in connection with TVEI implementation) but also to the dual role of pastoral-management.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The range of constructs elicited by the DP showed an appreciation of operational aspects eg. financial control and policy-formation and also showed an awareness of personal aspects eg. 'axes to grind' and friction. A similar pattern of constructs was described by the coordinator but included one relating to 'frustration'.

3. CLUSTERING - The cluster patterns produced from the repertory grid of the DP indicated relatively close links between the various groups identified with the exception of two isolated groups, the HOD and SMT groups. A similar degree of clustering was observed between the coordinator's groups.

In relation to the three groups common to both individuals, the DP did not show close links between HOD, SMT and CCG. The clustering for the coordinator's groups indicated commonality between the SMT and CCG but not including the HOD.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - none were identified by the DH but the Insights Into Work Group (ITOW) was isolated by the coordinator.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The DP produced a concept map with the DP in a pivotal position and on the same 'level' as the SMT. The HOD group and 'teachers within departments' were positioned above both the DP and SMT. No apparent hierarchical view of the management structure was evident.

The coordinator used a previously-prepared document as a
concept map. The map had been approved by the SMT but was generated by the coordinator. The map showed the TVEI coordinator in a relatively central or pivotal position, relating to various groups (not to individuals). The SMT was positioned vertically above the coordinator, indicating a hierarchical structure but emphasising that the coordinator was a member of the SMT. The HOD group was positioned 'higher' than the senior tutor (pastoral) and cross-curricular groups but 'lower' than other pastoral groups such as Record of Achievement (ROA) and Special Needs (SN) Groups.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview held with the DP indicated that the two DP's (one of which was the TVEI coordinator) worked very closely. The DP was responsible for any changes in the management system. The HOD group was viewed as a powerful force, with a membership of 16. The nature of the group had presumably altered as a result of the loss of a Faculty structure within the college. Some frustration was expressed by the DP due to the changes that had taken place in the structure beyond the DP's control.

The coordinator was aware of 'burning issues' such as equal opportunities within the college. The coordinator's interview showed that the coordinator was confident about the management of TVEI due to the location of the local consortium manager at the college and due to previous experience within the pilot scheme. However, personal involvement in curriculum matters was not satisfactory for the coordinator and it was also recognised that some staff were still hostile to the initiative.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. Only the HOD, CCG and SMT groups were identified by both individuals. They were members of the SMT and worked very closely together, both appeared to be somewhat frustrated with the management system. The DP (for curriculum) was concerned about the HOD as a strong force without direction, due to the loss of a Faculty structure, and was aware that the CCG was an attempt to overcome this problem by providing a cross-curriculum approach. The reason for the coordinator's recognition of the HOD and CCG groups was uncertain but the isolation of the HOD may have been related to the unsatisfactory separation of the TVEI role from curriculum-management.

2. The DP and coordinator were aware of operational and personal constructs in relation to the various groups identified. The concept maps drawn by the two individuals clearly showed themselves to have a pivotal role within the management structure. In addition, the coordinator indicated a hierarchical model with the SMT at the top. This was not apparent in the map constructed by the DP.
3. The interviews showed that both individuals were very reflective about their respective roles, the apparent overlap of responsibilities, and the reality of 'problem areas' in the management structure such as the HOD Group. The interview notes and constructs elicited implied a mixture of confidence and frustration.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Insights into Work Group</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study: B3 [distant] (participants CC1 and CC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Principal identified 8 groups whereas the coordinator (also appointed as Director of Studies for Curriculum) identified 7 groups for the repertory grids. Only three groups were identified by both individuals i.e. the MG (Management Group of which members of the Senior Staff Meeting [SSM] and some governors were involved), the CC (Curriculum Committee) and the SSM/SMM (a group involving senior staff but given different names by the Principal and coordinator).

The various groups described by the Principal were all major management groups whereas the coordinator recognised groups as diverse as the external TVEI coordinator's group (TVEI.COORD) and the college office (CO).

2. CONSTRUCTS - Those used by the principal were operational whereas those of the coordinator were operational and personal eg. 'control over'.

3. CLUSTERING - The two individuals expressed the same degree of clustering between the various groups described but the Principal perceived that two groups, CC and TC (Tutorial Committee) was almost identical.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - Neither the Principal or coordinator isolated a particular group.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The Principal chose to draw two concept maps, one of which (map 1) expressed the division between governor's groups and college groups and the second (map 2) expressed the relationships between groups operating in the college structure. Both maps were clearly hierarchical with the governing body and management group/senior staff meeting at the top for map 1 and the Principal at the top of map 2. The two Directors of Study, one of which was the coordinator, were of a 'lower status' than the Vice and Deputy Principals and did not link directly with the two main areas relating to curriculum (Heads of Faculty) and pastoral (Heads of House) management.

The coordinator constructed a concept map with the coordinator in a pivotal position but not in the centre of the structure. A cascade of individuals and groups were described and either linked directly to the coordinator or indirectly via the Principal, SSM, college office and bursar.
The map indicated that the coordinator was fully-informed about events occurring in the college and was probably in control of many aspects (including TVEI). TVEI was only a small part of the responsibilities of the coordinator.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview notes for the Principal revealed an awareness of external pressures and that the management structure was capable of dealing with change. The governing body was viewed with high regard and the work of the coordinator (particularly as Director of Studies) was much appreciated. Policy-formation was delegated to four committees, for premises, curriculum, tutorial and external liaison, and yet the committees functioned to make recommendations to the senior staff meetings (of which the Principal was the convenor). This particular group (SSM) was of great importance and was considered to be the backbone of the college structure with the Principal as the 'interface' between the four committees.

The Senior management meeting referred to by the coordinator in the respective interview notes was the same as the Senior staff meeting described by the Principal. This group received a high profile as perceived by the coordinator. The coordinator was aware of the control operating across the management structure and considered that this control was implicit in the dual role of coordinator and Director of Studies. TVEI was seen by the coordinator as a useful source of funding but that the labelling of this initiative was being effectively lost within the college structure. The college office was a significant 'group' for the coordinator and was considered to have equal status as other areas of management. Some frustration was expressed by the coordinator in relation to the unsatisfactory 'dabbling' into many developments/initiatives at one time.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. Three groups were identified by both the Principal and coordinator; the MG of which both were members, the SSM/SMM again of which both were members but also considered by the Principal to be the backbone of the college structure and the CC with a clear link with TVEI-management.

2. The Principal tended to focus on groups with a much higher profile than those referred to by the coordinator. The external agencies, particularly the governors, were viewed as significant forces by the Principal and were therefore integrated into the college structure (map 1). The coordinator considered groups at a more operational level eg, the essential function of the college office and the funding aspect of TVEI in relation to lack of local interest.

3. The Principal implied personal control over college matters through the use of a clear hierarchical approach and yet the work of the coordinator/Director of Studies was
valued. The coordinator, on the other hand, demonstrated much control over events across the college structure. It is of interest that the frustration described by the coordinator in relation to the plethora of initiatives and developments was not expressed in the same way by the Principal. It could be assumed that much was delegated by the Principal to the coordinator. The coordinator viewed the dual role of coordinator and Director of Studies as pivotal for the operation of the management structure.

4. Delegation of policy-formation was incomplete in respect of the four main committees since recommendations still had to be made to the SSM/SMM before policy was agreed.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.................................................................

.................................................................
TERTIARY COLLEGES - LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

Case study: C1 (participants AC1 and AC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Vice Principal for Curriculum (VP) selected 7 groups and the TVEI coordinator 8 groups for the repertory grids. Four of the respective groups were identified by both individuals:
   - DOS (Directorate of Studies - pastoral)
   - HOD (Heads of Department)
   - AB (Academic Board)
   - PG (Principalate Group)

All other groups identified were curriculum-based eg. academic development, course teams and heads of section. The VP referred to the Academic Board Working Parties (ABWP'S) to represent the various working parties of the Academic Board, some of which were referred to individually by the coordinator.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The range of constructs used by the VP and the coordinator reflected an understanding of operational aspects eg. innovation and effectiveness and personal aspects eg. conflict and power.

3. CLUSTERING - Some of the groups were clustered to indicate a high degree of commonality and others were only partially linked. The VP expressed a close relationship between the AB and DOS and between the PG and HOD, whereas the coordinator found the AB to be relatively closely-linked to the HOD and to the PG. It could be assumed that the coordinator viewed the three groups as a triad and that the DOS was linked to the other various groups identified. The different relationships could be expressed as follows:

   VP
   AB --------DOS
   PG --------HOD

   Coordinator
   AB --------HOD
   PG ----- DOS

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The VP did not recognise any isolated groups but the coordinator indicated that the GWP (GCSE Working Party) was isolated.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The concept map drawn by the VP showed various links between the groups identified with an emphasis on management vs. autocracy (following authorisation from the
Academic Board). The map was hierarchical and positioned the PG (expressed as the P/VP but not including the Director of Studies), HOD and DOS towards the top in 'equal' position. The AB was not identified as a separate group on the map but referred to as a 'content' note. The lecturers, described as section/course team members and tutors, were positioned at the bottom of the map. Three tiers of management were demonstrated.

The map constructed by the coordinator showed the coordinator in a central or pivotal position with the various groups radiating from the coordinator. The map was neither matrix or hierarchical and yet the PG, DOS and AB were positioned at the top. The HOD were located at the bottom of the map.

2. INTERVIEWS - The VP suggested that the section and course team meetings were important for the management of TVEI-implementation. The interview notes also showed an understanding that the HOD and PG (of which the VP was a convenor and member respectively) were effective and 'important' in relation to administration. Some concern was expressed about the DOS, a group seen as potentially important and yet with an unclear impact at the time of the interview. The various working parties of the AB were considered to be more effective than the AB itself. TVEI was viewed as a labelled initiative with low status in some areas of the college and high status in other areas eg. Record of Achievement (RoA). The VP was directly involved in the management of TVEI, as curriculum leader.

The coordinator's interview showed an awareness that TVEI had shifted the coordinator from a relatively 'low' position in the college structure to one of high profile. Cooperation from some colleagues, notably those that had also been interviewed for the post of coordinator, was weak. The support from the members of the PG was significant and was thought to be essential to validate the work of the coordinator (particularly in relation to the frequent attendance of external meetings). A direct link with the Principal was apparent.

(c) Summary

NOTES :

1. Four major groups (DOS, HOD, AB and PG) were identified by both the VP and coordinator. The groups were generally considered to have a significant impact on the management of the college (including TVEI).

2. Some concern was expressed by the VP about the effectiveness of the AB and DOS. Operational and personal constructs revealed a high degree of self-awareness within the structure for both the VP and coordinator. The VP linked together the PG and HOD, of which some 'control' was evident. The coordinator isolated the DOS, perhaps sharing the same concerns as those expressed by the VP. It is of interest to
note that although the Director of Studies was a member of the PG, this individual was isolated as a separate entity in the concept map drawn by the VP. This reinforces the assumption that the Principal and VP worked closely together and separate from the Director of Studies.

3. The concept map drawn by the VP was hierarchical but that drawn by the coordinator showed the coordinator in a pivotal position. The coordinator's map also indicated hierarchy with the HOD at the bottom, of which the coordinator had little contact.

4. TVEI had a relatively low status within the structure. This was paralleled by an apparent lack of confidence by the coordinator, requiring support from the PG. No conflict was expressed between the VP and coordinator although the ultimate management responsibility for TVEI lay with the VP.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>GCSE Working Party</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(within map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TERTIARY COLLEGES - LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

Case study: C2 (participants BC1 and BC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Principal identified 8 groups in relation to 8 constructs whereas the TVEI coordinator identified 8 groups in relation to 9 constructs. Four of the groups were recognised by both individuals within their respective repertory grids;

   AB (Academic Board)
   SMM (Senior Management Meeting)
   ILC (Industrial Liaison Committee)
   IT (Information Technology Committee)

2. CONSTRUCTS - With the exception of one construct ie. 'under the Principal's control', the constructs referred to by the Principal were operational and apparently distanced from personal feelings. The coordinator's constructs also tended to be operational but did include aspects such as 'troublesome' and 'spontaneous'.

3. CLUSTERING - A very similar pattern of clustering was established between the groups for both individuals. In relation to 'shared' groups, the Principal expressed some commonality between the AB and IT groups and between SMM and Governor's (GOV) groups, to a lesser extent. The coordinator perceived the SMM to be close to the HOFC (Heads of Faculty Committee) and only partially related to the AB. The coordinator also linked the Independent Learning Committee (ILC) to the Information Technology Group (IT), but only marginally.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The coordinator did consider the Equal Opportunities (EO) group to be somewhat isolated but the Principal failed to isolate groups.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The Principal was relatively new to the college having only been in post for one year at the time of the interview. The Principal was in the process of reviewing the management structure but did refer to a previously-determined structure rather than constructing a 'fictional' concept map. The map (described as an organisational structure) was clearly hierarchical with the Principal at the top, followed by various tiers of Faculty Heads, Departmental Heads etc. Most links were vertical apart from cross-links between the senior staff.

The coordinator's concept map showed the coordinator in a pivotal and central position. Various groups radiated out from the coordinator but the Principal, Vice Principal and
INSET coordinator were identified as individuals. Some cross-links were observed between groups eg. between the AB and the Faculty Heads group.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview notes for the Principal indicated that the Principal considered the prime impact of TVEI within the college to be financial. The SMT showed no indifference towards TVEI and yet the coordinator was not invited to become a member of this significant management team. TVEI was eventually to be given a lower profile within the college so that 'credit' for developments could go to other areas of the management structure. The curriculum value of the college (as a centre of excellence) was to be given greater weight with delegation of aspects such as finance to be directed to the Faculty Heads.

The coordinator was interviewed during the transition between the retirement of the previous Principal and the appointment of the new Principal referred to above. A plethora of cross-college groups had been set up by the coordinator and others in relation to the objectives and aims of post-16 TVEI. It was apparent that the coordinator had not received much access to the previous Principal and was looking towards improved communication with the new Principal.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. Four groups were identified by both the Principal and the coordinator. Both individuals were members of the AB, valued the SMM as a powerful group, considered the ILC as an area for enhancing external liaison and were both interested in the developments occurring within the IT group.

2. The constructs demonstrated by the Principal and coordinator were generally 'guarded', being primarily operational and not revealing personal feelings. Such feelings became evident during the interviews.

3. The SMM shared some commonality with the GOV, as perceived by the Principal, and with the HOFC according to the coordinator's view. The HOFC was certainly becoming a dominant force within the management structure.

4. The communication route between the Principal and the coordinator was not opened with the appointment of the new Principal, although this had been hoped for by the coordinator. In fact, the Principal still maintained the coordinator outside of the SMM and was considering to shift delegation away from the many cross-college groups previously established by the coordinator towards the Faculty Heads. This shift was probably planned to achieve two goals, to lower the profile of TVEI within the college and to make the Faculty Heads more accountable. The ultimate result was likely to be the withdrawal of TVEI into the senior management team.
Footnote: The coordinator was appointed as a Director of Curriculum at another College approximately 1 year following the interview with the Principal.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close/loose</td>
<td>Close/loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study: C3 [distant] (participants SEDC1 to SEDC6)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The tertiary college represented as case study C3 was a large college involved with four different local TVEI consortia. The college was able to participate in each consortium due to the appointment of four different TVEI coordinators termed 'Directors'. The overall management of TVEI within the college was the responsibility of a Vice Principal for Curriculum and TVEI (VP). An interview was held with the college Principal and VP but not with each of the coordinators. The four coordinators, including the VP, completed the repertory grids as part of a training exercise and thus shared many groups and constructs. Concept maps were completed individually but the five individuals received the same introductory remarks at the same time.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The coordinators and VP used a variety of constructs ranging from 'effective and 'relevant' to 'friendly' and 'honest (therefore both operational and personal).

3. CLUSTERING - The coordinators identified 8 groups whereas the VP chose to consider only 6 groups. The groups were primarily TVEI-initiated eg. Cluster Coordinator's Group, senior management or curricular. One group related to equal opportunities (EO) but pastoral matters were not generally reflected in the groups selected. The coordinators generated close cluster patterns whereas the VP also had some loose-clusters. However, a single pattern was not readily identified when considering the overall data. For example, one coordinator (SEDC1) showed a high degree of commonality between the external CMG (Cluster Management Group) and the internal MT (Management Team) whereas another coordinator (SEDC2) perceived the MT to be much closely-related to the EO group.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - No single group was identified as being isolated from other groups for all five individuals completing the repertory grids. However, the internally-based D.TVEI (Directors of TVEI) group was either only partially linked to another group or isolated. The coordinators and VP were all members of this group.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The concept maps drawn by the four coordinators showed each coordinator in a pivotal and central position with the various groups and individuals radiating from the coordinator. Many cross-links were established between the other parts of each map thereby resulting in relatively complex structures. No hierarchy was
Apparent in any of the four maps and the high degree of cooperation with the other three coordinators and the VP was clearly shown. The maps tended to focus on the many groups positioned outside of the internal college structure. This implied that outside forces were recognised to be significant in the management of TVEI.

The VP constructed a map in which the VP and other individuals were identified. The map was hierarchical since it was directed towards the Principal (via the Management team) at the top. The VP was seen to have a central role as the link between the MT and the various coordinators (described as Directors). One of the coordinators (SEDC5) was also identified as a central figure and was positioned at the same level as the VP. As with the other coordinators, this particular individual was not interviewed but it was noted that the coordinator was also described as the TVEI Enhancement Coordinator and was soon to be promoted.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview held with the Principal indicated that the Principal was 'pleased' with the way in which TVEI had been so fully integrated within the college structure. The work of the senior management team (SMT) involved the VP and the coordinators. This team was responsible for general and strategic planning, implying that delegation of TVEI-implementation had been directed to the VP together with the supporting team of coordinators. The delegation was so complete that the Principal's involvement in TVEI relied upon the receipt of minutes of the D.TVEI meetings.

The VP's interview revealed that the many working parties also 'fed into' the SMT. The VP was experienced with TVEI due to involvement in the management of the pilot phase and had an understanding of the tasks carried out by the four coordinators. The delegation of the workload to the coordinators was seen in their shared-representation of the college within the local coordinator's groups etc.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. The Tertiary College was large and showed a commitment to the management of TVEI within a complex situation of four local consortia. A team of staff had been appointed with the prime function of TVEI-implementation, including four coordinators and a VP for Curriculum and TVEI.

2. The working team represented by the D.TVEI group selected similar groups and discussed constructs (both operational and personal) as part of a joint training exercise. No clear pattern emerged from the repertory grid data but the D.TVEI was viewed in a different way to most other groups considered. This group was valued highly by its' members.
3. There was a clear focus of external forces relating to the management of TVEI with representation of the college being shared by the various coordinators. The VP was considered to be supportive and was aware of the particular tasks required for each coordinator due to previous experience in the local TVEI pilot scheme.

4. The coordinators were all members of the SMT, along with the Principal and VP. This access to senior management enabled them to be involved in general and strategic planning. The Principal was impressed with the way in which TVEI had become so fully integrated with the college structure and was able to 'keep a distance' from the day to day management of the initiative.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/</td>
<td>Operational/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close/loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>Director's of</td>
<td>Director's of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TVEI Group</td>
<td>TVEI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal/ Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TECHNICAL COLLEGES - LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

Case study: D1 (participants FC1 and FC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - Out of the 8 groups selected by the Vice Principal for Personnel and Resources (VP) and 7 groups selected by the TVEI coordinator only 3 were referred to by both individuals;
   - SMC (Senior Management Committee)
   - CC (Careers Committee)
   - SSC/SS (Student Services Committee)

The VP and coordinator selected groups primarily relating to senior management.

2. CONSTRUCTS - The constructs elicited by the VP were operational and personal, with reference to the 'cooperative' nature of groups. The coordinator's constructs were also of both types but also included one construct specifically related to the Principal's personality.

3. CLUSTERING - Although the cluster pattern was different for each of the two individuals, there was some degree of similarity in relation to the degree of commonality expressed. The VP viewed the CC and SSC to be linked and to have some degree of commonality with SMC. The coordinator, however, showed the CC to be linked with S.DEV (Staff Development Committee) and partially with SS. The coordinator did not relate the SMC to the other two 'common' groups but to the GOV (Governing Body).

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The VP isolated one group, the TVEI.C (TVEI Coordinator's Committee). This group was the only TVEI-based group referred to by the VP in the repertory grid and was external to the college management structure. The coordinator did not clearly identify an isolated group.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The VP constructed a concept map in which the VP had a pivotal but not central position. The map was hierarchical with the Principal at the top, followed by the VP and the Management Committee. The VP related to a variety of internal groups and individuals e.g. Principal, VP for Curriculum and SSC and also had links with a second cluster of groups relating to the TVEI coordinator. It was apparent that the management of TVEI was considered to be ultimately under the control of the senior management and yet delegation of external liaison etc. was given to the coordinator. The coordinator did not have a direct link with the VP (Curriculum) or Principal and was not involved with the Management Committee.
The coordinator's concept map was complex due to many cross-links between the various groups and individuals. This map was also hierarchical with the Principal towards the top, below the Academic Board and Governors. The coordinator was positioned at a lower level within the map, at the same position as the Staff Development Officer (with a cross-college role) and a second TVEI coordinator also appointed as the Careers coordinator. The coordinator interviewed did not perceive to have a direct link with the Principal but did communicate via the VP. The coordinator had access to the academic board only through the Heads of Department.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview held with the VP indicated that the recent review of the management structure for the college had included TVEI-management. The VP considered that the TVEI coordinator had a direct line management with the Principal with membership of the 'important' Curriculum Development and Liaison Committees. Furthermore, the working relationship between the VP and the coordinator was considered to be valuable and that this gave the coordinator access to the senior management of the college.

The coordinator had been in post as a Head of Department (for General Education) prior to being 'shifted' to the post of TVEI coordinator. The interview notes showed that the coordinator was conscious of status and that this was retained as a result of being partly responsible for the management of TVEI. The coordinator had a link with careers since the second TVEI coordinator was also responsible for this area of management. The two coordinators worked relatively closely together. The coordinator also recognised the working relationship with the VP but considered that the VP was not always aware of policies generated by the Principal. Communication with other 'leaders' in the management structure was thought to be satisfactory. The Principal was seen as a powerful figure and controlled groups, including the Governing Body. The AB, of which the coordinator was not a member, was viewed as being ineffective.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. Three different groups were identified by both the VP and the coordinator. There was not a clear reason for this 'common' selection since the two individuals were involved with the groups in different ways eg. the VP was a member of the SMT but the coordinator was not a member.

2. The constructs elicited by the VP included one relating to cooperation within the various groups but the coordinator's constructs included the factor of the Principal's personality. The coordinator considered the Principal to be a powerful member of the management structure, almost too
powerful with control over the Academic Board and Governing Body. The VP had the view that the coordinator had a line-management connection directly with the Principal and yet the coordinator saw the VP as the communication route.

3. TVEI management was considered to be integrated within the structure, as discussed by the VP. However, the VP's concept map showed the groups relating to TVEI to radiate from the coordinator in a separate cluster and the VP's repertory grid isolated the TVEI.C.

4. Both individuals constructed concept maps with a clear heirarchy. The VP was viewed as having a pivotal role in both maps and the coordinator's map showed that the VP was the link between the coordinator and other members of the senior management team.

5. The coordinator had been appointed previously as a Head of Department, a high-status post. There was some concern shown by the coordinator that this status was retained as a result of the shift from one post to another. The coordinator had lost the direct link with the academic board (having previously been a member as a Head of Department) and viewed this board to be ineffective.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/</td>
<td>Operational/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close/loose</td>
<td>Close/loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TVEI Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Pivotal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(within map)</td>
<td></td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECHNICAL COLLEGE - LEVEL 2 ANALYSIS

Case study: D2 (participants SC1 and SC2)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Director of Studies (DOS) for Curriculum selected 8 groups and the TVEI coordinator (one of three within the college) selected 7 groups. The groups were varied in both cases but both individuals did make some reference to groups responsible directly for the management of TVEI.

Four of the groups were referred to by both the DOS and the coordinator;
- PSC (Policy Steering Committee)
- SNWP (Special Needs Working Party)
- TVEI.CCM (TVEI Consortium Coordinator's Meeting)
- TVEI.MG (TVEI Management Group - external)

2. CONSTRUCTS - The DOS and coordinator selected five constructs of which some were operational and others were personal eg. 'policy-formation' and 'friction' respectively.

3. CLUSTERING - The pattern of clustering between groups showed a greater degree of commonality for the DOS than for the coordinator.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - The DOS isolated the TVEI.CCM whereas the coordinator viewed this group to be relatively closely-linked to the ROA (Record of Achievement) group. Conversely, the coordinator isolated the other TVEI group, the TVEI.MG, and the DOS considered this group to be linked to the work of the AB (Academic Board).

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - The concept map drawn by the DOS did not contain many groups or individuals. The map was hierarchical with the PSG at the top, the DOS and Heads of Department (characteristically viewed as senior staff within Technical Colleges) in the middle tier and the three TVEI coordinators at the bottom. The DOS questioned the link between the coordinators and the HOD's and working parties eg. Special needs group. The AB was drawn as an isolated group without connections.

The coordinator's concept map showed the coordinator to have a pivotal and central position within the management structure. The map was not hierarchical since the ROA group was at the top and the 'powerful' PSG at the bottom. The DOS was perceived as the link between the coordinator and the PSG. The coordinator was not directly involved with the PSG. The working parties eg. Special needs group were seen to be directly related to the work of the coordinator. This map
also made some reference to externally-managed TVEI whereas the DOS did not include this aspect.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview with the DOS indicated that the DOS was directly involved with the management of TVEI and 'supervised' the work of the three coordinators. The DOS had many cross-college responsibilities but still met relatively frequently with the coordinators as individuals and as a group. The DOS had been promoted within the college from the post of Head of Department and appeared to adopt a broad view of TVEI as being 'the right thing to do anyway. The impact of TVEI was put into context within the overall management of a very large college (10,000 full and part-time students). The coordinators were appointed before the DOS was given the responsibility for their line management. The relationship between the DOS and the other senior managers was such that the VP was responsible for the HOD's and the Principal was the Chairperson of the AB. The DOS considered the HOD's to be a powerful group, having the strength to veto the PSG decisions. Some form of informal hierarchy existed between the HOD's according to the size of the respective Department.

The interview with the coordinator referred to the appointment of the coordinator at the college for 8 years, the promotion to TVEI coordinator and the status as 'middle man' between the senior and teaching staff. It was anticipated that the status of the coordinator was to increase in the near future (to the level of Senior Lecturer). Timetable restrictions were thought to generate problems for communication between the three coordinators but the access to the DOS was appreciated. Problems were 'filtered' through the DOS to and from the PSG. Some tension was experienced within the various external TVEI groups, particularly in relation to perceptions of group function.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. The DOS and coordinator referred to externally-based TVEI groups. The TVEI.CCM was attended by the coordinator and was 'isolated' by the DOS from other groups considered. The DOS attended the TVEI.MG, which was isolated by the coordinator. This seemed to imply some division in the management of TVEI between the two individuals (presumably including the other two coordinators) with different perceptions of how the respective groups operated.

2. The various constructs listed within the repertory grids indicated a greater degree of commonality between the groups identified by the DOS than those identified by the coordinator. The DOS may have selected groups with a common, senior management function, whereas the coordinator listed groups of which there was some form of personal link.
3. The management structure was viewed as a hierarchy by the DOS but not by the coordinator. However, the coordinator was fully aware of the power of groups such as the HOD's with the ability to veto PSG decisions. The coordinator considered the DOS to be a communication 'filter' with senior management and access to the DOS was appreciated.

4. The DOS viewed the working parties as being separate entities from the coordinator and yet the coordinator recognised direct links with the work of such groups. In fact, the coordinator was perceived as being pivotal and central to the management structure.

5. The status of the two individuals was considered to be important. The DOS had been promoted to the Policy Steering Group but noted that the VP was still responsible for the HOD's and the Principal retained the chairmanship of the AB. The coordinator was soon to be promoted to Senior Lecturer level, having been already involved with the management of TVEI for 2.5 years.

**CHECKLIST:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
<td>Operational/ personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close/loose</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>TVEI Management Group</td>
<td>TVEI Consortium Coordinator's Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Case study: D3 [distant] (participants PRC1 to PRC3)

(a) Specific analysis

1. GROUPS - The Deputy Assistant Principal (DAP) selected 8 groups and the two TVEI coordinators jointly selected 6 groups. The coordinators chose to complete their repertory grids at the same time and decided to share the same three constructs i.e. effectiveness, power and financial control. It was considered that these particular constructs reflected the most important aspects of college management systems.

Four of the DAP's groups were also identified by the two coordinators;
- SNG (Special Needs Group)
- EOG (Equal Opportunities Group)
- SMT (Senior Management Team)
- AB (Academic Board)

2. CONSTRUCTS - The constructs used were operation and personal for both the coordinators and DAP.

3. CLUSTERING - The DAP considered the four groups described above to be very similar in relation to four constructs. The constructs were the same as those selected by the coordinators plus one referring to 'workable'. The two coordinators also found the groups to be relatively closely-related. This could be due to the lack of discrimination due to the use of only four constructs.

4. ISOLATED GROUPS - No single group was considered to be isolated by the DAP or the coordinators. The DAP did, however, indicate the separation of two externally-based groups, TVEI.C (TVEI Committee) and SHM (the local Secondary Head's Meeting), from the other groups identified.

(b) Supporting data

1. CONCEPT MAPS - All three participants constructed concept maps independently of each other. The maps showed each participant to be involved in a pivotal and central position with various groups and individuals radiating from the centre.

The DAP's map was hierarchical with the Principal at the top. The hierarchy was not complete since tiers or levels of management could not easily be identified below the upper point. The Assistant Principal was, however, in a position between the Principal and DAP. The DAP had direct access to the Principal and did not rely on the Assistant Principal as an avenue for communication. It was evident that the DAP had frequent meetings with the two coordinators.
One coordinator's map (PRC2) was partly hierarchical with the DAP in a superior position, the AB at the next level and the two coordinators at the middle level. The link between the coordinator (PRC2) and the DAP was identified as one in which much information was given to the DAP but with very little feedback.

The second coordinator's map (PRC1) also had the DAP in a superior position. The link with the DAP was described as 'reporting' and again was not two-way. The first coordinator was positioned slightly 'higher' than the second to establish a triangle of links between the two coordinators and the DAP. The communication between the two coordinators was clearly two-way. The map drawn by the second coordinator also included a TVEI manager external to the college. This manager was viewed as having direct access to the DAP as well as to the second coordinator.

2. INTERVIEWS - The interview notes for the DAP showed that the DAP was conversant with the management of TVEI within the college and the local area. The DAP had been a coordinator for four years during the pilot phase, was promoted to the current position with responsibility for the tertiary curriculum of the college and was still much involved in the management of TVEI. The DAP described the role of the coordinators as pivotal. It was noted that the coordinators should be convenors of various TVEI/curriculum groups, advisers for staff and members of course teams relating to areas such as BTEC. The DAP was personally enthusiastic about the further development of TVEI within the college.

Only one of the two coordinators (PRC2) was interviewed. This coordinator described some concern during the interview about the current situation whereby a new Acting Principal had been appointed and was changing the management structure. The changes were seen as threatening and disruptive since the college management was apparently being withdrawn into a tight group of senior managers, one of which was the DAP. The main direction for the delegation of TVEI was towards the Heads of Department. Decisions had been made about the management of TVEI without the coordinator's involvement. The coordinators had not received relevant paperwork and were rarely involved with the meetings of the AB, a powerful group. The day to day management of the college lay with the Assistant Principals, supported by their respective DAP's. The DAP referred to above was seen as a threat since this particular DAP, with a strong background in TVEI, had developed some autonomy for the management of TVEI and was seen as having 'overall responsibility'.

(c) Summary

NOTES:

1. The two coordinators (PRC2 and PRC3) chose to share groups and constructs during the completion of the repertory grids. The DAP considered similar constructs but selected more
groups, some of which were external to the college structure eg. TVEI.C.

2. Out of the 4 groups selected by all three individuals, two ie. SMT and AB were of particular interest. The DAP was a member of both groups whereas the coordinators were not and also viewed them with some concern.

3. All three concept maps showed the respective individuals in a pivotal and central role and yet were all hierarchical to some degree. The DAP's map showed the Principal in a superior position whereas the coordinator's maps both showed the DAP in such a position (without reference to the Principal). The coordinators did not effectively have any access to the Principal but the DAP had free access.

4. Communication between the coordinators and the DAP was also questionable. The DAP seemed to imply that much support was given to the coordinators and that their pivotal role was fully appreciated. The coordinators, however, described a one-way communication route with the DAP ie. they gave information but did not receive feedback. The interview with one of the coordinators (PRC2) was clearly used as an opportunity to release the tension that had developed as a result of the situation.

5. A significant shift in the management of TVEI was evident. The new Acting Principal was seen, by the coordinators, to be directing TVEI management away from the coordinators towards the Heads of Department (an established and powerful group). The TVEI management was apparently becoming much more centralised with the DAP in control. The coordinators had felt threatened by the environment created and somewhat isolated.

CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>TVEI coordinator</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
<td>Operational/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Groups</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TVEI Committee/Secondary Head's Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (within map)</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
<td>Pivotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 9

FORMALISED ELEMENT-TREE DATA (REPERTORY GRID)
INSTITUTIONS : 11-18 SCHOOLS

Arbitrary units of commonality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Arbitrary units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 tc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 tc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 tc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORMALISED ELEMENT-TREE DATA (REPERTORY GRIDS) : SHOWING THE CLUSTERING OF MANAGEMENT GROUP 'TYPES'
INSTITUTIONS: SIXTH FORM COLLEGES

Arbitrary units of commonality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Greatest</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>T-E</td>
<td>T-E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>S-C</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>S-C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sm</td>
<td>G-G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INSTITUTIONS : TERTIARY COLLEGES

Arbitrary units of commonality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Greatest</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 tc</td>
<td>C—C</td>
<td>C—P</td>
<td>A—S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td>C—C</td>
<td>P—A</td>
<td>A—P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 tc</td>
<td>C—S</td>
<td>A—O</td>
<td>E—E</td>
<td>E—C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td>C—A</td>
<td>E—E</td>
<td>S—G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 tc</td>
<td>(SEDC 1)</td>
<td>C—C</td>
<td>T—T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>E—O</td>
<td>T—T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SEDC 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>(SEDC 3)</td>
<td>C—C</td>
<td>T—T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>(SEDC 5)</td>
<td>C—C</td>
<td>E—T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td>T—E</td>
<td>C—T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONS : TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Arbitrary units of commonality

Greatest Level: 100 90 80 70 60 50

Case study

D1 tc

---

sm

---

D2 tc

---

sm

---

D3 tc (PRC 2)

---

sm

---

D3 tc (PRC 3)

---

sm

---

KEY : tc = TVEI coordinator (code name within brackets where necessary)

sm = Senior Manager

Group 'types' = S (Senior Management Team/SMT), T (TVEI), A (Academic Board/Policy group), P (Pastoral), C (Curriculum), E (External liaison) G (Governors) and 0 (Others)
APPENDIX 10

INFORMATION MODEL GRID AND MATRIX OF CONCEPTS
INFORMATION MODEL GRID : MODIFIED AS A RESEARCH TOOL
FROM THE REPERTORY GRID USED IN THE CURRENT STUDY
(p 274-275)

MANAGEMENT OF TVEI VIA COMMITTEES & WORKING PARTIES

CONFIDENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME ............</th>
<th>INSTITUTION ............ (code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POST HELD ........</td>
<td>DATE ....................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT of management</th>
<th>Committees &amp; Working Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 WRITTEN COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 VERBAL COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 ATTENDANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 DECISION - MAKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This grid was completed by each participant as an extension of the repertory grid. The management groups (described as Committees and Working Parties) used for this grid were copied directly from the repertory grid.
**MATRIX OF CONCEPTS - USED TO CONSTRUCT INFORMATION MODELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Sub-concept (Attribute)</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1a Central</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1n Neutral</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c Peripheral</td>
<td>b b</td>
<td>b a</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>2a Central</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2n Neutral</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c Peripheral</td>
<td>b b</td>
<td>b a</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>3a Co-opted</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3n Neutral</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3c Invitation</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>n a</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>a n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>4a Convenor</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4n Neutral</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c Member</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>5a Major</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
<td>a b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5n Neutral</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5c Minor</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>a n</td>
<td>n b</td>
<td>n b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

(1) The relationship between the five concepts listed above formed the basis of the information models. The concepts were not elicited from the participants but were selected by the researcher in order to pursue the various foci of the research programme with a corresponding reduction in variability of the data.

(2) Each participant completed an information model 'grid' (p 373) as an extension of their repertory grid. The five concepts were uniform but the elements (i.e. management groups) were variable due to selection by each participant using the repertory grid technique.
APPENDIX 11

INFORMATION MODEL DATA
INFORMATION MODEL DATA

Responses of TVEI coordinators and Senior Managers to concepts C1 to C5

( Key: S = SMT, T = Institutional TVEI, A = Academic Board/Policy, P = Pastoral, C = Curricular, E = External liaison and G = Governors groups; Participants T = TVEI coordinator and SM = Senior Manager )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Information study model group</th>
<th>'Types' of management group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCEPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INFORMATION MODEL DATA (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Information model CONCEPT</th>
<th>'Types' of management group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S T A P C E G</td>
<td>T SM T SM T SM T SM T SM T SM T SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>a a - - a a a b b a - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>a a - - a a a b b a - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>b a - - a b a n b a - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>n b - - b a b n n a - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>a a - - a b a b b a - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>a a - - a - - - - a a a b - a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>a a - - a - - - - a a a b - a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>n a - - a - - - - b b a b - a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>n a - - b - - - - a b b b - a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>a a - - a - - - - a b b b - a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>a a a a a - - - - a n a a a - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>a a a a a - - - - a n a a a - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>a a a a a - - - - n a a a a - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>b b b a - - - - n b a a a - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>a a b a - - - - b b a b - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>b a b a - n a - - a b - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>n a b a - b a - - n a - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>n n n b - b b - - b b - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>a b n a - a a - - a b - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>a a b a - b a - - a n - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>a n a a b a a n - a - a - b n -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>a n a a n a a a a - - a - n n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>b a a a n a a a a - - a - n n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>n b a a n b a a - b - n n -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>a b a b b a b b - b - n b -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>b a - - a n a - - b a b a - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>n a - - a b b - - n b a b - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>n a - - a n n - - n b b b - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>n b - - a b b - - b a a a a - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>n n - - b n b - - b b b b - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote: (1) Key for response (sub-concept/attribute) a, b and n varied according to the type of construct - see p 43

(2) The responses from the TVEI coordinators within case studies C3 and D3 (with more than one coordinator participating) were represented by participants SEDC1 and PRC2 respectively.
APPLICATION OF THE INFORMATION MODEL 'PRINTOUT'

(Using a computerised programme, after Kontiainen & Hobrough, 1991)

CASE STUDY EXAMPLES

Case study: C1 (Senior Manager) - SMT group p 159

PRINTOUT:

\[
\begin{align*}
C2a, C3a, C4b, C5a & \rightarrow C1a & \text{Written} & : \text{Central} \\
C1a, C3a, C4b, C5a & \rightarrow C2a & \text{Verbal} & : \text{Central} \\
C1a, C2a, C4b, C5a & \rightarrow C3a & \text{Attendance} & : \text{Co-opted} \\
C1a, C2a, C3a & \rightarrow C4b & \text{Involvement} & : \text{Member} \\
C1a, C2a, C3a, C4b & \rightarrow C5a & \text{Decision-making} & : \text{Major}
\end{align*}
\]

MODEL:

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (1a) at (0,0) {1a};
  \node (2a) at (-1,-1) {2a};
  \node (3a) at (1,-1) {3a};
  \node (4a) at (-1,-2) {4a};
  \node (5a) at (1,-2) {5a};

  \draw[->] (1a) -- (2a);
  \draw[->] (1a) -- (3a);
  \draw[->] (1a) -- (4a);
  \draw[->] (1a) -- (5a);
  \draw[->] (2a) -- (3a);
  \draw[->] (2a) -- (5a);
  \draw[->] (3a) -- (4a);
  \draw[->] (3a) -- (5a);
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

Case study: B1 (TVEI coordinator) - TVEI group p 159

PRINTOUT:

\[
\begin{align*}
C2a, C3a, C4a, C5a & \rightarrow C1a & \text{Written} & : \text{Central} \\
C1a, C3a, C4a, C5a & \rightarrow C2a & \text{Verbal} & : \text{Central} \\
C1a, C2a, C5a & \rightarrow C3a & \text{Attendance} & : \text{Co-opted} \\
C1a, C2a, C5a & \rightarrow C4a & \text{Involvement} & : \text{Convenor} \\
C1a, C2a, C3a, C4a & \rightarrow C5a & \text{Decision-making} & : \text{Major}
\end{align*}
\]

MODEL:

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (1a) at (0,0) {1a};
  \node (2a) at (-1,-1) {2a};
  \node (3a) at (1,-1) {3a};
  \node (4a) at (-1,-2) {4a};
  \node (5a) at (1,-2) {5a};

  \draw[->] (1a) -- (2a);
  \draw[->] (1a) -- (3a);
  \draw[->] (1a) -- (4a);
  \draw[->] (1a) -- (5a);
  \draw[->] (2a) -- (3a);
  \draw[->] (2a) -- (5a);
  \draw[->] (3a) -- (4a);
  \draw[->] (3a) -- (5a);
\end{tikzpicture}
\]
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Case study: B3 (TVEI coordinator) - SMT group  p 160

PRINTOUT:

C2b, C3a, C4b, C5b ===> C1b Written : Peripheral
C1b, C3a, C4b, C5b ===> C2b Verbal : Peripheral
C1b, C2b, C4b, C5b ===> C3a Attendance : Co-opted
C1b, C2b, C3a ===> C4b Involvement : Member
C1b, C2b, C3a, C4b ===> C5b Decision-making : Slight

CASE STUDY: B3 (TVEI coordinator) - TVEI group  p 160

PRINTOUT:

C2b, C3a, C4b, C5b ===> C1b Written : Peripheral
C1b, C3a, C4b, C5b ===> C2b Verbal : Peripheral
C1b, C2b, C4b, C5b ===> C3a Attendance : Co-opted
C1b, C2b, C3a ===> C4b Involvement : Member
C1b, C2b, C3a, C4b ===> C5b Decision-making : Slight

CASE STUDY: B3 (TVEI coordinator) - HOD/Curric. group  p 160

PRINTOUT:

C2a, C3a, C4a ===> C1a Written : Central
C1a, C3a, C4a ===> C2a Verbal : Central
C1a, C2a, C5n ===> C3a Attendance : Co-opted
C1a, C2a ===> C4a Involvement : Member
C3a ===> C5n Decision-making : Neutral

CASE STUDY: B3 (TVEI coordinator) - TVEI group

MODEL:

Key – ===> = Direction of connecting line between attributes/sub-concepts (for models) 378
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