

PERSPECTIVES

STUDENT-CENTRED COURSES AND SOCIAL AWARENESS: CONTRARY EVIDENCE FROM UK WORKERS' EDUCATION¹

Bruce Spencer

Athabasca University

Abstract

Can student-centred courses utilising experiential learning techniques automatically lead to students' greater social awareness or are students locked in to narrow immediate experiences and, in some cases, conditioned by external course structures outside of their control? This article explores these issues by means of an examination of recent developments in UK workers' education.

It argues for a pluralistic provision of experiential and structured courses to meet union training and educational requirements of workers. Broadly applied, this argument defends the use of traditional liberal adult education to support social awareness and social action.

Résumé

Est-ce que des cours centrés sur l'étudiant, ou sont employées des techniques d'apprentissage expérientielles, conduisent automatiquement à une plus large conscience sociale, ou est-ce que les étudiants se trouvent enfermés à l'intérieur de leurs expériences personnelles immédiates? Et ne seraient-ils pas, dans certains cas, conditionnés par des structures pédagogiques qui échappent à leur contrôle? Nous analysons ici ces dilemmes à la lumière des développements récents en études ouvrières au Royaume-Uni.

¹ Manuscript received February 1991, revised manuscript received October 1991.

Notre argument favorise, pour satisfaire aux exigences pédagogiques, un mode pluraliste de cours, à la fois expérientiel et structuré. Sur un plan plus global, il favorise une pratique d'éducation permanente traditionnelle et libérale pour promouvoir la conscience et l'action sociales.

Student-centred courses with a student-determined content are often considered, following Freire, as the way to increased social awareness and social action.¹ Democratic participation in the classroom is held to lead to participatory democracy in society at large. But is this true in complex western society; will broader social awareness grow in an unstructured way from experiential learning? What happens if the course framework is determined institutionally and is state influenced, outside of student control; can student-centredness in the classroom overcome external control? Whatever the situation, can the student-centred curriculum act as a partition preventing students moving beyond basic education and training towards broader educational insights and greater social awareness?

These are complex issues which impact on adult, community and workers' education wherever it is practised. This article will explore these themes via an examination of UK provision of industrial studies for trade unionists. We shall look at what kind of educational support is available to workplace trade union representatives, in particular concentrating on the issues and arguments surrounding the Trades Union Congress (TUC) scheme of courses and will attempt to discover whether or not it meets the educational needs of these representatives and their organizations in the 1990s. This will lead into a debate around the organization and control, education and training, and the methods and content of TUC and other union courses before drawing some conclusions and comparisons with Canadian provision.

"Tool" or "awareness" courses?

Debates about the structure, content, objectives and impact of the TUC courses broke out after 1979 when a change in government coincided with a change in approach by the TUC Education Department. A number of worker educators, particularly within the Society of Industrial Tutors, whilst recognising the importance of the more technical aspects of skills training for working class organization and for the importance of issues of immediate and practical relevance to workers, also argued for a wider

curriculum.² They felt that workers' education should address some of the broader issues raised in previous debates about the purpose of workers' education and that the prevailing political conditions warranted a rethink of TUC education beyond the focus on workplace problems or "tool" courses (the phrase is used in Canada to describe training courses for negotiators and representatives in union locals; in the UK context it can be applied to TUC shop steward and safety representative training courses). This is not to deny the need for skills-based or worker-centred education but to argue for a recognition that if this was all that was on offer it would be a limited education not directly encompassing a broader framework of social understanding. Obviously, there was much valuable work being undertaken and, within limitations, regardless of the formal content of the TUC programmes, the classroom provided opportunities for a variety of educational initiatives. However, it would be wrong to argue that all trade union education is necessarily achieving its objectives. Each segment of educational provision needs to be considered alongside other segments to see if the whole of what is being provided is actually matching the overall needs and requirements of the workers involved.

A number of tutors involved in the TUC scheme saw the changes, outlined below, as a further retreat by the TUC into skills and workplace based courses and away from a graded scheme beginning in the workplace and focused on skills development, but leading into more sustained study of the legal, political and economic context of trade unionism. Few examples exist of TUC Education Department staff engaging in extensive defence of these developments—indeed, many chose administrative means deliberately to close down debate about these changes.³ But a model and defence of the TUC scheme has been presented in an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation by Glynn Powell.⁴

Although the TUC scheme is not the only industrial studies programme arranged for trade union students, it is the most extensive, and the TUC Education Department Reports and Powell's thesis concentrate on these ten/twelve day (and shorter) release courses. Firstly, Powell argues that TUC courses are independently organized by the trade union movement, and that in spite of being located with various educational providers the TUC has largely succeeded in establishing them as union courses addressing industrial relations issues from a trade union viewpoint.

Secondly, there is, the TUC would claim, no meaningful distinction between education and training and therefore the TUC skills-based scheme is simply regarded as an educational programme. This contention is

supported by two further assertions, firstly, that the distinction between training and education is an academic debate of little value to a body such as the TUC and secondly, that in practice, the TUC courses are educational.⁵

Thirdly, Powell argues, the TUC model, including the delivery through educational providers, led the TUC Education Department on to organize a team of "TUC-briefed" tutors employed by these providers, and to prepare packs of TUC core material for use on TUC courses run by these tutors. This was deemed necessary to ensure a concentration on an independent "union" curriculum. This was needed, as it had already been well argued, in face of opposition to union courses from the more "incorporatist" (workers and employers should have the same goals) and "managerialist" (workers should support management in solving company problems) models of industrial education prevalent in many local colleges.

Fourthly, having established this base, in 1979 the TUC was ready for the next stage. This was to be away from the "follow-on course" model previously established, towards two-stage basic courses and a further extension of student-centred methods.⁶ TUC courses were to be seen primarily as meetings of workers, with educationalists as facilitators, with the tutor as a member of the course, and with the classroom as a kind of campaign room-cum-workshop. This would mean the tutor would not have a "separate desk" and would not be seen as a "fountain of knowledge". More importantly, the course would set its own agenda and there would be no specific course content.⁷

This model, it was argued, would allow for real organizational problems and issues to be addressed and for industrial and political conclusions to be made from shared student experience and shared activity on the course. Workers would thus determine for themselves the social, political and economic solutions to problems collectively and democratically. This would counter passivity and the cult of leadership, so prevalent in labour movement organizations. Thus the model comes full circle to be a model of independent worker organization and independent worker education—judged by Powell to be the most suitable to support workplace trade unionism.⁸

Unfortunately, the Powell thesis is flawed by selective use and quotation of TUC documents both leading up to the establishment of the TUC scheme in 1964 and after. The origins of the scheme were at best contradictory with limited aims and a cramping, top-down structure for

delivery.⁹ Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen the model presented. In 1964 the TUC did reject arguments for a more open educational programme, based on greater regional autonomy and under closer lay scrutiny—via, for example, a national education conference. But nonetheless it can be argued that the 1964 scheme and subsequent developments did provide scope for TUC radicals. Some of those employed in the Education Department were able to fashion a scheme not only largely independent of employer influence but supportive of independent worker organization. This can be supported by the fact that some of the organizers for the National Council of Labour Colleges (NCLC) were employed as the new Regional Education Officers (REO's) and by recognising that those attracted to work in the TUC Educational Department were likely to include those who felt education and activity were linked.

Those supporting this TUC model would claim that it does deal with a number of key threats to an independent workers' education, one of which would be a managerialist perspective which would undermine independent separate trade union education. It would also be seen as dealing with the threat of a neutral, independent, professional expertise which could, it is argued by Powell, undermine workers' confidence by highlighting the importance of knowledge and also present issues in a "neutral" fashion but which actually can reflect the dominant ideology of the time.¹⁰ Using this line of argument it can also be seen that the defence of academic freedom can also be seen as a threat to the development of worker controlled education, assuming worker control can be equated with TUC control. The supporters of this view would also claim that there is not a body of knowledge "out there" which is useful and desirable for trade unionists to study.¹¹ Traditional areas of knowledge and traditional methods of delivery of that knowledge are assumed to be a threat to the development of independent worker education and activity.

In order to look at some of these issues and arguments, particularly as they apply to the TUC scheme, I will consider a number of headings: *organization, scope and content, and learning methods.*

Organization

Outside individual trade union provision, the majority of courses targeted at workplace representatives have been organized through the TUC scheme. This scheme, still backed by a statutory right to paid release for training although for limited industrial relations purposes, is centrally

determined both in terms of the range of courses available and course curriculum. It is essentially organized through a regional educational structure including an advisory body largely under the control of the TUC Regional Education Officer. The provision of courses is via the local colleges, polytechnics, Workers' Educational Association (WEA) or university departments involved in the scheme.¹² The overwhelming majority of the courses are provided in local education authority colleges, a number of which have been designated Trade Union Studies Centres (the TUC insists on at least two "full-time TUC-briefed tutors" and on designated rooms and resources, and in return the college is treated as the local centre with priority for running whatever courses are available). The TUC attempts to influence the teaching of courses by insisting on "one tutor per course", and by encouraging local authority college to develop "full-time TUC tutor" facilities within their college. It is understandable that the TUC should use publicly provided education; indeed, since it is the mass of working people who pay for these facilities the TUC has a right to claim some of these resources. But it remains the case that by financing its courses from a State grant—with conditions attached—and by providing the courses through local education authorities, some of which may not be sympathetic, it is jeopardising the independence of its education.¹³

Further it could be argued that employers and the State, particularly from 1963, have deliberately intervened via the TUC to use education to weaken the independence of shop steward organization. It also raises the question of how this provision can be regarded as independent in the old NCLC (or Powell) sense when it is mounted as part of State provision and financed uniquely by a direct State subsidy. Further evidence is provided by the TUC Education Committee's withdrawal, in the summer of 1991, of the new TUC "Working Women" booklet. A few passages offended the government and the TUC meekly complied with the government's insistence that it could not be used on government funded training courses.

The TUC and many providers appeared happy to accept the limiting nature of the release with its focus on courses directly relevant to the shop stewards' role in the bargaining structure and were prepared to justify this concentration in terms of directly meeting workers' felt needs. However, it is clear that, if anything, the Conservative government will seek to limit further unions' role in society and shop steward and workers' rights at work. The 1989 Employment Act included even more restrictions upon time off for workplace representatives—limiting it to the issues for which recognition has been granted.

Organizationally there are few links between the different sectors of trade union education. Few educational relationships exist between the TUC and the work of residential colleges for example. There is much duplication of the work between the TUC and its affiliates, particularly over introductory courses. Educators involved in the TUC scheme have no formal means of discussing with the TUC the shape and format of its education. Inevitably, in this situation the TUC is able to play off one educational body against another, which leads to insecurity within the providing organizations. The TUC Regional Committee—which might be seen as accountable to local trade unionists and local trades councils (labour councils)—has no decision-making role within TUC education. The TUC Regional Education Advisory Committee (REAC)—a less representative and accountable body than the TUC Regional Committee—may have some influence on regional developments but cannot determine the policy of the Regional Education Officer who is directly answerable to Congress House. The TUC has, of course, argued that it is answerable to its constituent unions but in reality there is very little critical and open discussion within the TUC education committee of the provision of the TUC nor indeed of what its relationship with the providers and individual unions should be. The Education Report is received at Annual Congress without controversy. All this should be contrasted with the original proposals for a unified education scheme put forward in 1925 and endorsed right up to 1963 by successive TUC Congresses for local committees and annual education conferences.¹⁴

Scope and content

Industrial studies for trade unionists is, in today's climate, essentially limited to trade union representatives—shop stewards, staff representatives, health and safety representatives and branch officers. There have been a number of attempts to develop membership education and attempts to target specific groups of workers who may or may not be representatives—for example, women members or black workers. The TUC has provided a number of limited campaign workshops addressing political and economic questions, but the large bulk of its provision derives directly from its restricted conception of the role of the union representative (discussed more fully below). The potential role that shop stewards could play as representatives on higher union bodies or inter-union bodies and delegates to political organizations is largely ignored in favour of the workplace representative role with a concentration on limited negotiation and bargaining. Whilst many engaged in the TUC scheme would argue that they do introduce historical, political, and economic perspectives

within their work, it really is stretching the point to argue that the current focus on workplace problem-solving automatically leads to a serious consideration of broader conceptions. A focus on these other issues would require some serious and sustained study of the kind undertaken in the university extramural and adult residential college courses.

From case studies of the experience of trade unionists at work, it is clear that trade union education does need to address issues of organization and bargaining in the workplace. But it is also clear that if such issues are to be successfully contested, in the end those workplace organizations need to link up both horizontally and vertically, externally and within their own union to address broader economic and political issues. Therefore, leaving aside the compelling argument for a liberal educational approach, trade union education needs to deal with the immediate needs of workers and also with the broader political and economic context within which workers are operating. To argue that trade union education is only giving workers what they want is to accept the very limiting nature of what has been identified as being a weakness within British trade unionism—its limiting focus of a union consciousness within the workplace.

Most British workers' education, therefore, reflects the majority politics of the British Labour Party and trade union movement. It does not set out to challenge the hegemony of capitalist society to replace it by an alternative socialist hegemony. This is not surprising: but it could perhaps be expected to endorse a liberal adult education approach which would offer diverse solutions and a broader analytical context to political and economic problems. Of course, the dynamic interaction of students and tutors in the classroom can lead to a wider content than that embodied in the formal curriculum, but the TUC has tended to police provision to ensure that tutors and courses stick to the established TUC programme.¹⁵ The position has been commented on by Frank Cosgrove, the education officer of Britain's largest union, the Transport and General Workers (TGWU):

Subject matter has tended to be limited to what can be called the non-political or non-controversial aspects of trade unionism. By far the greatest amount of TUC and individual trade union courses concern themselves with what is essential training. Although the principles of trade unionism and their wider questions of trade unionism are more often than not included in such courses, this is a secondary aspect, often slipped in by the tutor.¹⁶

Learning methods

The TUC model dismisses the idea that there may be a tradition of liberal adult educational approaches for dealing with the problem of the interface of experience and knowledge and simply passes over the discussion in liberal adult education of how this can be achieved. It therefore also tends to be exclusive in the sense that it does not acknowledge that there could be a variety of methods and approaches that could achieve both workplace problem-solving in parts of the curriculum with explorations of knowledge in other areas. The Freirian concept argued in "Pedagogy of the Oppressed",¹⁷ for an education based on experience as a way of liberating people educationally and politically, is asserted at the expense of any other alternatives, which are all seen as contributing to oppression. One example of an alternative would be to explore the parameters of a particular problem and, having done that, perhaps in a more traditional pedagogical manner, to then stop a tutor-led delivery and break into groups to explore the implications of the argument and maybe also to look at steps to be taken to deal with it.¹⁸ The present TUC programme also locks students into a perpetual round of basic workplace problem-solving courses, not opening out into sustained study of areas of knowledge which could deepen insights and extend understandings.¹⁹

The proponents of the TUC/Powell model argue against the usefulness of expertise and/or having experts brought in to courses to discuss their interpretation of events or of an area of knowledge. This is held not to be "learning" but passively and disarmingly confronting students with "their betters".²⁰ It is not acknowledged that it could be useful especially to have (in some cases openly hostile) views to test against those of the students. The idea that nothing can be learned and acted on in these situations is constantly contradicted by experience. An interesting example was recently provided by Alan Grant, the TUC National Education Director. He was discussing a seminar organized for full-time officers on changes at work, particularly of management approaches to organizational problems. One railway official came up to him afterwards and said, "I have just realised we have not really been addressing any of these questions...we are not prepared at all for the shift to local bargaining etc."²¹ What this anecdote illustrated—apart from Alan Grant's point about how officials can sometimes be out of touch—was that unless insights, understandings and opinion outside people's direct experience are brought into the classroom then the students are missing areas of useful knowledge which may help them look again at their experience and force them to re-evaluate.

At this point it might be useful to summarize my conclusions in relation to the "TUC/Powell model". A questioning of the arguments that the TUC courses do in fact provide independent workers' education, which was overlooked in Powell's thesis, has been provided in a detailed article by John McIlroy.²² In his closely argued account of post-war TUC provision McIlroy points out that although TUC courses are held to be accountable to the TUC at Congress House, the use of the State grant and the legal limitation to release and use of local authority educational facilities have all ensured that the TUC scheme operates within these constraints. The range and scope of the courses has had to be compatible with these legal, financial and organizational limitations. Whilst the courses may well be correctly regarded as trade union courses addressing collective bargaining issues primarily from a trade union viewpoint, very rarely do they broaden out consciously to explore the social and economic contexts within which trade unions exist and operate.²³

Secondly, he establishes that the TUC quite openly and deliberately set out to provide a training focus for its courses. The TUC is shown to have been under no illusion about the distinction between education and training—and the TUC consciously chose training and not education. The objective was clearly to provide a skills-based training focus for TUC courses, intended to provide better lay trade union functionaries and more effective and responsible workplace bargaining.

Thirdly, although it was understandable that the TUC should wish to create a team of "TUC-briefed" tutors and a pack of core TUC material in order to counter the managerialist perspectives of many of the educational providers it must be recognised that these measures also provided the TUC with control. The insistence that only "briefed tutors" could teach the courses, and the provision of well produced core material, helped to ensure a greater influence over what was happening in the classroom. The TUC, by concentrating provision in local colleges, also attempted to ensure a technical skills approach to training rather than the more open critical perspectives that may have been found in University extra-mural departments or the Workers Educational Association.²⁴

Fourthly, McIlroy has documented how in 1979 the TUC deliberately chose to move away from the introductory course/follow-on course *model towards* a two-stage introductory course with a focus only on workplace issues. The TUC had a choice: it could have tried to establish a broader curriculum for second stage courses but in pursuing a workplace, problem-solving, approach it avoided both a conflict with government over the uses of State

grant, and avoided a debate within the TUC General Council over any conflict between TUC education provision and “new realist” perspectives of the Council. The shift to seeing courses primarily as meetings of workers, and educators as primarily facilitators, provided a useful cover, a veneer of workers’ choice, which avoided having to use the TUC education service directly to confront the political and economic issues raised by Thatcherism.

In conclusion, then, rather than seeing TUC education—as Powell does—as primarily concerned with actively supporting workplace representatives and workplace democracy aimed at simply increasing activity amongst the membership, McIlroy recognises that the TUC programme could be characterised as consciously limiting those stewards to workplace perspectives and collective bargaining procedures. He comments:

...[the TUC] has, as we have shown, evolved its own hard educational philosophy and organization. Unable or unwilling to employ its own tutorial staff, faced with a situation where it felt unable or unwilling to develop sufficient resources and mobilise public opinion to establish schools of trade union studies, yet lacking faith in the orientations and philosophy of the education institutions in which it has lodged courses, it embarked on a process of neo-colonisation attempting to turn areas of those institutions to its own ends.²⁵

Another problem with the TUC/Powell approach is that there have been no serious attempts to research the impact of trade union education. If, as Powell insists, the value of these courses is that they support democratic activity in workers’ organizations then the test of how useful the education is, is empirical not theoretical. His own study did not evaluate critically his own experience nor did it include any survey of his own or look seriously at what surveys had been done. Admittedly, surveys of the impact of education are bound to be problematic with many undertaken as evaluative exercises by tutors involved. They can be self-fulfilling to a large extent. Those who have tried to draw conclusions from survey material have not always taken account of the more contradictory evidence that is available.²⁶ But there is survey material available from which some tentative judgement can be made and this evidence casts doubt on TUC claims for the efficacy of their model above all others. This survey material points to the need for a layered provision to be made available for trade union students, beginning with trade unionists’ experience, but also going

beyond the workplace to directly address the political, legal, economic and social context of trade unionism.²⁷

Comparison with Canadian Provision

There are a number of significant differences between the provision offered by the TUC and that offered by the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC) reflecting the different political and organizational context of Canadian union education. The grant received by the CLC from the Federal government is for the promotion of labour education. The assumption that it will result in "improved" labour relations is much the same as the origins of the UK grant but it has not been restricted to "labour relations" purposes, that is relations with the employer, but has also been used to fund courses aimed at improving union organization per se. The grant can also be used to support labour history or social and political change courses, in which a variety of perspectives are addressed. In many cases it is the provincial federations of labour which promote the courses and then seek CLC support, a structure which reflects the political geography of Canada and provides opportunities for worker educators to build trust provincially. In the past there have been some disagreements between worker educators and the Canadian labour movement, for example, in the 1970's in Nova Scotia, particularly over the programmes at the Atlantic Region Labour Education College, but these have left few scars and are minor by comparison with disagreements in the UK.²⁸

The CLC has to account for the monies spent and bid for new money; it could face political interference and strings could be attached. To date there have been few examples of state interference, and the grant given is more akin to the situation in Sweden (no strings attached) than the UK, although the Canadian labour movement should not become complacent. There are some at the CLC who see the TUC programme as a model and would like to see a shift of resources to more workplace, problem-based, courses and a break with broader "awareness" courses. However, the continuation of the CLC's own educationally demanding eight week residential Labour College ensures that will not happen easily.

Notes

1. For a well-argued case along similar lines see T. Pynch, "Participatory Action Research as a Way of Life: A Personal Account," *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education* IV, 2 (November 1990):47-62.
2. C. Edwards et al., "Student-Centred Learning and Trade Union Education: A Preliminary Examination," *The Industrial Tutor* 3, 8 (1983):45-54; J. Brown et al., "Fundamental Questions About Student-Centred Learning," *Trade Union Studies Journal*

(Spring 1983):4-6; J. McIlroy, "TUC Stage 2: An Opportunity to Change Course," *The Industrial Tutor* 3, 6 (1982):67-71.

3. D. Gowan, "TUC Course Development: The Tasks Ahead," *Trade Union Studies Journal* (Spring 1980):10-12; "Student-Centred Learning Revisited," *Trade Union Studies Journal* (Winter 1982):3-5. These articles did not debate the issues but stated the TUC position.

4. G. Powell, "Ideology, Industrial Relations and Trade Union Organisation." Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1987. This is largely written as a reassertion of the TUC position which ignores much of the literature critical of the case put forward. The most thorough discussion of the development of the TUC scheme was in J. McIlroy, "Adult Education and the Role of the Client—The TUC Education Scheme 1929-80," *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 17, 1 (1985):35-58.

Powell was not the only commentator to refuse to engage with McIlroy's analysis; an article in the same journal (edited by J.S. Marriott) just a year later completely ignored McIlroy's carefully referenced discourse: K. Mackie, "Trade Union Education in the United Kingdom: The Background to the Current System of Provision," *Studies in the Education of Adults* 18, 2 (1986):91-109.

5. TUC, *Review of the TUC's Education Service, General Council Report*, 1987.

6. Powell, "Ideology, Industrial Relations and Trade Union Organisation." Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1987, 343-344; Gowan, "TUC Course Development" *Trade Union Studies Journal* (Spring 1980):10-12.

7. Powell, "Ideology, Industrial Relations" (1987):347-349.

8. *Ibid.*, 349. "...the students' course work would spill over into trade union activity because the course would be dealing with the real problems found in the workplace; as identified by the members of the course in conjunction with discussions with union members." And *Ibid.*, 35, "The importance of the transferability of the individual skills, learned in such discussions; and the possibility of transferring such methods to other areas of collective activity—working class meetings of all kinds—is yet to be developed but the potential is clearly obvious."

9. T. Smith, "Trade Union Education: Its Past and Future," *Industrial Relations Journal* 15, 2 (1984):20-33. McIlroy, "Adult Education and the Role of the Client." It could be argued this point was accepted by Powell, "Ideology, Industrial Relations," 327, "the TUC had little choice but to take the academics and the professionals on in ideological battle."

10. Powell, *Ibid.*, 302-317, characterises trade union education as being against professionalism, and against academic independence, *Ibid.*, 317-345, without recognising the value of academic independence from the TUC or how a committed "professional" tutor could be valuable to workers' representatives and their organization.

11. His view that knowledge could undermine workers' confidence was shared by other TUC tutors, for example C. Baker, "Health and Safety: Agenda for Change," *Trade Union Studies Journal*. (Winter 1984):6-8.

12. The UK adult education framework is outlined in B. Spencer and J. McIlroy, "British University Adult Education in Context: Lessons for Canada?" *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education* 17, 2 (1991):21-40.

13. An alternative would be to provide the courses directly using the union's own resources. However, British unions depend upon their members' dues which, as a proportion of the average earnings, have been static or declining for decades and are amongst the lowest in Europe. Therefore, if unions regard a fully independent education service as crucial they need to address the problem of very low fee income. At the moment, given the problems of declining membership and inter-union rivalry, there is certainly no political will amongst unions to tackle this issue.

14. These early debates were ignored in Powell's thesis—for a discussion see McIlroy, "Adult Education and the Role of the Client," (1985).
15. *Ibid.*
16. F. Cosgrove, "Re-Shaping Trade Union Education: TGWU Proposals for Government Support," *The Industrial Tutor* 3, 8 (1983):62-67.
17. P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (London: Penguin, 1972). For an interesting assessment of Freire's pedagogy see F. Youngman, *Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy* (London: Croom Helm, 1986):Chapter 5, 123-145.
18. B. Spencer, "Collective Bargaining and the Rights at Work Courses," *Industrial Tutor* 3, 9 (1984):52-57.
19. See note 10 above. This argument is supported by Freire *Pedagogy* (1972) "banking education minimises students creative powers," 47.
20. The TUC has campaigned against longer "certificate" courses—questioning the distribution of leaflets on TUC courses explaining these courses, and questioning tutors who set them up and run them. This position should change under Alan Grant's leadership. It should also be noted that some TUC REO's took an independent stance on this issue—John Connell and Jim Mowatt.
21. A. Grant speaking at the SIT Annual Conference, September 1989. A. Grant, "Trade Union Education: A TUC Perspective," *Industrial Tutor* 5, 1 (1990):9-21.
22. McIlroy, "Adult Education and the Role of the Client," (1985).
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.* The TUC used briefings to control who would teach what and where, putting briefed tutors forward for part-time work and full-time posts and refusing briefings to tutors who would not toe the TUC line. See M. Turnbull, *Letter to Times Higher Education Supplement*, 5 July 1984, p. 16.
25. McIlroy, "Adult Education and the Role of the Client," (1985).
26. P. Mahon and J. Sterling, "I Can Do That: The Impact of Trade Union Education," *Industrial Tutor* 4, 7 (1988):54-60 and TUC, *Review of the TUC's Education Service* (1987) are examples of selective review of the evidence—the TUC did not discuss the implications of their finding that stewards wanted to know more about the law, instead they reiterated their commitment to methods as content.
27. G. Keithley, "Industrial Relations Training for Shop Stewards—Workplace Perceptions of its Objectives, Impact and Consequences," Ph.D. diss., University of Durham, 1983. T. Smith, "Trade Union Education: Its Past and Future," *Industrial Relations Journal* 5, 2 (1984):20-33. J. Kelly and C. Grooms, "TUC Basic Courses: Participants' Views," *Industrial Tutor* 4, 3 (1986):49-56. B. Spencer, "Educational Methods and Student Needs," *Industrial Tutor* 4, 5 (1987):67-73. See also the published reports on the *Transport and General Workers' Union Distance Learning Courses*. J. Fisher and B. Camfield, "Missing Link in Trade Union Education?" *Industrial Tutor* 4, 4 (1986):30-36. J. Sterling, T. Nesbit, and D. Miller, "Developing Distance Learning—the TGWU Region 8 Experience," *Industrial Tutor* 4, 4 (1986):37-43. J. McIlroy, "Back to the Future," *Adults Learning* 1, 3 (1989):73-75. B. Spencer, "Distance Education in British Trade Unions: Some Preliminary Results," *Research in Distance Education* (January 1991):6-7.
28. Comments based on author's conversations with Rick Williams and Anne Bishop, Halifax (November 1991).