DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 895 CG 026 509

AUTHOR	Watts, Tony
TITLE	New Models of Learning, Work and Careers: An International Perspective.
PUB DATE	28 Apr 94
NOTE	24p.; Keynote address presented at the "What Works?" Conference (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, April 28-30, 1994).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Awareness; *Career Counseling; *Career Development; Career Education; Career Planning; Decision Making Skills; Employment Potential; Employment Services; Foreign Countries; *Guidance Programs; *Job Skills; Labor Education; Outcomes of Education; Schools; Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS	England; United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The growing interaction between education, careers, and the nature of work is explored in this document and examples of this interaction are provided. The implications of these changes are explored in relation to guidance services and career counseling. New developments in career counseling are presented as well as strategies for improving guidance and career development services. A theoretical account of future trends in the nature of work is also included in the document. Contains 24 references. (SR)

BRIDGING THE GAP

ÉTABLISSONS DES LIENS

New Models Of Learning, Work And Careers:

An International Perspective

by Tony Watts

Director of the National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling
Cambridge, England

Text of the Keynote Address to the What Works? Conference
Sponsored by Bridging the Gap

Thursday, April 28, 1994

In Canada:
Bridging the Gap
155 College Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5T 1P6
(905) 660-1056
Fax (905) 660-7450

Outside Canada:
National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling
Sheraton House,
Castle Park, Cambridge
CB3 0AX
England
(0223) 460277
Fax (0223) 311708

New Models of Learning, Work and Careers: an International Perspective

A.G. Watts

National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling, Cambridge, England

Keynote address delivered to "What Works?: a Showcase of Successful Programs Bridging Education and Employment", held in Toronto, Canada, on 28-30 April 1994

Introduction

In most advanced industrialised countries, we are currently experiencing a profound revolution, which we all recognise but which most of us still dimly understand. It is a revolution in the nature of work, in the nature of learning, and in the nature of careers. It is related to profound changes in the relationship between the individual and the organisational structures on which our societies have been based. It offers opportunities, but it also offers threats. It affects the personal lives of all of us. But it also affects the work of those of us in this room in a particularly direct way, because our work - which often, however worthy, has seemed somewhat marginal and peripheral - is crucial if our societies are to avoid the threats and realise the opportunities.

The industrial model

Our current models of work, of learning and of careers are creatures of the Industrial Revolution. It is important to remember this, because sometimes we act as though we believe they represent eternal verities, the loss of which implies the dawning of the Day of Judgement. Not so. Unemployment, for example, was barely written about until the 19th century,[1] largely because employment was less central to the web of social ties that held society together. But certainly since then, work has come to be regarded as synonymous with employment, and employment has become the basic source of status, of

identity and of income. When sociologists study social class, they use employment position as the main indicator. When we meet someone at a party, we ask "What do you do?" and we expect an occupational answer - because this is the speediest way of passing the maximum information about who we are. In many ways, employment has come to represent the modern form of the social contract, through which individuals agree to devote some of their time and energies to wider social purposes, in return for which they are given social status and identity, plus access to income which they are free to use in their own time in whatever way they choose. This is, I suggest, a powerful way of understanding the centrality of employment in our societies, and why unemployment is so devastating to those who experience it.

For most people, employment has been provided in large organisations. These organisations have utilised people's labour, and in return have provided them with their income. Some people have been promoted up the steps within the hierarchical structures of the organisation. These people have had "careers". The rest have simply had "jobs".

Our industrial models of learning have in many respects reflected and reproduced our industrial models of work.[2] We have herded young people into schools, where they have learned the attitudes and behaviours they require for their likely futures in the workplace. An important role of the school has been to sort out those destined for careers and those destined for jobs. It has done this on the basis of examinations. These examinations have been expected to provide the motivation for learning, just as wages have been expected to provide the motivation for work.

All this has worked well enough. It has, in truth, been a limited model both of learning and of work. It has assumed that learning only takes place in schools, and work only in employment. It has limited the extent to which individuals control their learning

and their work. It has assumed that both need to be motivated extrinsically - through examinations and wages - rather than through their intrinsic merits. Further, it has assumed that education precedes employment: that learning is separate from, and precedes, work. But the model has operated reasonably smoothly - until now. Now, though, it is breaking down - fast.

New models of learning and work

Within employment, the traditional concept of a "job for life" is dying. The pace of economic change means that organisations have to be prepared to change much more regularly and rapidly. They are less and less willing to provide security of tenure. Many are seeking to reduce their core workers, and to operate in more flexible ways through a growing contractual fringe and through the use of part-time and temporary workers. More employees are based in small and medium-sized rather than large organisations. Flatter organisational structures mean less opportunities for hierarchical progression. More people are experiencing periods of unemployment. The number of part-time workers, teleworkers operating from home and self-employed workers is growing: the coming adage is "if you want a steady job, be self-employed". More individuals are now operating what Charles Handy terms a "portfolio" existence in which they are engaged simultaneously in several different "jobs".[3]

Parallel changes are also taking place in education. Course structures in the UK and other countries are being broken down to make it possible for individuals after the end of compulsory schooling to move in and out of the education system in more flexible ways. Flexible learning, open learning, modular courses, accreditation of prior experiential learning, and credit accumulation and transfer, are all designed to reshape educational

institutions as resources for individuals to use as and when they have particular needs which such institutions are able to meet.

At the same time, there is a growing interaction between the worlds of employment and education: they are increasingly penetrating each other. Many of the most exciting developments within education are now linked to various forms of education-business partnerships, of the kinds which we are celebrating at this conference. Active learning and experiential learning, in particular, have been given a great boost by such partnerships. Increasingly, students are going out into the world of employment for project work or for periods of work experience or work shadowing. At the same time, more business people are spending time in educational institutions, enriching the range of resources on which students can draw. This is a revolution in itself. Educational institutions used to regard business not as a learning resource but as a threat to educational values. This stemmed, I suspect, from the historical role of schools in protecting children from child labour in mines and factories. This virtuous but ultimately pernicious industrial legacy is now, at last, beginning to disappear.

Conversely, employers are increasingly paying attention to the power of learning within the workplace. In countries like the UK, Australia and New Zealand, we are moving towards a system of vocational qualifications based not on examinations in colleges but on assessment of performance in the workplace - which makes it possible to accredit and value all the learning that takes place on the job and in informal ways as well as that which takes place in the classroom. Some employers, like Ford, are supporting their employees in learning of all kinds, whether vocational or not, on the grounds that this is likely to make them more motivated and productive employees. Business gurus are now stating that the most successful corporations of the future will be "learning organisations":

organisations that are continually expanding their capacity to create their futures.[4] Part of this vision is that all employees need to regard themselves as continuing learners.

In short, both educational institutions and employers are now focusing increasingly on the interaction between learning and work. The notion of learning as separate from work is discredited. One works to learn; one learns to work. They are symbiotic: they depend upon one another. Both are continuing processes. In the post-industrial world, a society that wishes to work must be a learning society.

New models of "career"

These changes have powerful implications for the concept of "career". We are seeing the slow death of the traditional concept of "career" as an orderly progression up graded hierarchical steps within an organisation or profession. But we are also seeing the resurrection and transfiguration of career as describing an individual's lifetime of learning and work. The "career" is now owned by the individual: it is a process, not a structure. One of the effects of this new definition is to open it to all. The traditional concept was limited to the few who were able to secure access to structural positions that provided progression. But progression in learning and in work can take place through lateral and horizontal as well as vertical movement; it can occur within positions; it can be effected outside organisational structures altogether. It therefore offers opportunities of careers to everyone.

What we are seeing is a profound change in the "psychological contract"[5] between the individual on the one hand, and the education and employment systems on the other. Employers are less prepared to take responsibility for long-term commitments to individuals. Educational institutions increasingly want to view individuals as independent

learners. Pressures are being exerted on both sets of institutions to be more responsive to individual needs and demands. Individuals are moving more frequently between educational institutions, between employers, and between the two. Their relationships with the institutions are open to more regular review. The "contract" is being constantly renegotiated.

Implications for guidance

All of this transforms the role of guidance services. Within the traditional industrial model, the role of guidance services has been very limited. Choices have been determined largely by social forces, and by selective processes within education and employment. Guidance services have therefore tended to be confined to acting as a kind of switch mechanism at the transition from education to employment. They have accordingly tended to be marginal in position and low in status.

Within the emerging model, on the other hand, the role of guidance is potentially central and pervasive. If individuals are constantly to develop their learning and their work, and regularly to negotiate their relationships with educational institutions and employers, then guidance needs to be available on a continuing basis. It is a key means of empowering individuals within this negotiation process. It is the essential lubricant to make the emerging model work.

Within the UK, guidance is currently being given greater policy prominence than ever before. This stems significantly from a seminal report produced by our Confederation of British Industry entitled Towards a Skills Revolution.[6] The CBI argued that if we are to survive and flourish as a high-wage economy, we need to be a high-skill economy. This is an argument that is now familiar in all advanced industrialised countries. The CBI

also, however, criticised our current education and training system as giving higher priority to the needs of providers than to the needs of individuals. It accordingly argued that the way to achieve the skills revolution we need is to "put individuals first" and to encourage them to develop their skills and knowledge throughout their working lives. It advanced this concept, which it termed "careership", as one which should be applicable to all, arguing for example that publicly-funded support for education and training should increasingly be channelled through credits which would give individuals control over the form such provision should take. It then viewed effective careers guidance as the essential means of ensuring that such individual decisions were well-informed, and related to the needs of the labour market. The CBI has subsequently followed this up with two further reports: the first proposing improved guidance as one of four key building blocks for delivering the concept of "careership"[7]; the other devoted entirely to ways in which guidance provision might be improved.[8] These reports have exerted considerable influence on government policy.

The basic concept underlying the CBI reports is that guidance is a market-maker: a way of making the labour market, and the proposed education and training market, work, by ensuring that the individual actors within these markets are fully informed about the range of options and their pros and cons in relation to labour-market demand. My own organisation in collaboration with the Policy Studies Institute developed this rationale in an influential report on The Economic Value of Careers Guidance.[9] This spelt out the ways in which guidance can aid the efficient operation of the labour market, and marshalled what evidence is available - limited but positive - on its economic benefits in this respect. Much of the evidence available at present, however, relates not directly to economic outcomes but to learning outcomes - in relation to self awareness, opportunity awareness,

decision-making skills and transition skills. We argued that these were the most appropriate measures of guidance in terms of its aims, but that we need studies to examine their relationship to long-term economic outcomes so as to establish the extent to which they can be used as proxies for such outcomes. I was interested to see that the same argument has been adopted in the recent report by the Canadian Guidance and Counselling Foundation on Career and Employment Counselling in Canada.[10] Such arguments and evidence are crucial if policy-makers are to be persuaded of the importance of public funding for guidance provision.

A three-pronged strategy

The aim we are now setting ourselves in the UK is to achieve lifelong access to guidance in support of lifelong learning and lifelong career development for all. It is a bold aim, and will not be easy to achieve. What is clear, within our own context, is that no single agency can deliver what is needed. The model we are moving towards, I believe, is a strategy based on three prongs.[11] The first is careers education and guidance as an integral part of all educational provision. The second is career development as an integral part of all employment provision. The third is access to neutral careers guidance when individuals wish to review possibilities for movement between educational institutions, or between employers, or between the two, from a neutral base. I would like to say a little about each of these.

The concept of careers education and guidance as an integral part of education has two facets. The first is the role of compulsory schooling in providing the foundations for lifelong career development. This attaches particular importance to careers education within the curriculum, designed to develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes which will

enable students to make and implement career decisions both now and in the future. This includes understanding of the distinctive characteristics - one's abilities, skills, interests, values - that define who one is and who one wishes to become. It includes understanding of the world of work, the opportunities it offers, the demands these opportunities make, the rewards and satisfactions they offer. It includes acquiring skills for making career decisions. And it includes skills for implementing these decisions and managing career transitions. It needs to incorporate progressive experiences of the world of work. In Sweden, for example, all pupils have for some years been expected to spend six to ten weeks in workplaces between the ages of 7 and 16: this includes group visits by the younger pupils, plus a day spent shadowing their father and/or mother at their place of work, and later at least one week's work experience in each of three broad sectors of working life - manufacturing, commerce, and social services.[12]

Then within but also beyond compulsory schooling, all educational provision should provide regular opportunities for students to relate what they are learning to the wider society and to their future career development. This will have implications for the curriculum itself. It is also likely to require tutorial support, and/or specialist careers services. A particularly powerful movement in British education at the moment is the introduction of regular recording of achievement and action planning by students. Students are regularly encouraged to review their learning experiences, inside and outside the formal curriculum, and to define the skills and competences they are acquiring through these experiences; they are also encouraged to identify and review their long-term career goals, their short-term learning objectives, and ways of achieving these objectives.

Interestingly, the same kinds of processes are also increasingly being set up within employment, which is the second prong of the strategy I am proposing. The notion is that

employees, too, should be given regular opportunities to review where they are and where they are going. Many organisations have introduced appraisal systems in recent years: often they are experienced by individuals as informing the organisation's decisions about them - about performance-related pay, for example - rather than their own decisions relating to their self-development. But in a growing number of cases these systems are being explicitly designed to focus on such self-development. Other organisations are preferring to set up a parallel system of development reviews. In addition, an increasing number of organisations are introducing other systems to support career development: career planning workshops, assessment centres, career resource centres, mentoring systems and the like.[13]

The parallels between the guidance that is offered within education and within employment are remarkably close. This struck me strongly when I was simultaneously involved in evaluating an action-planning programme in schools[14] and in helping to establish an appraisal system in my own organisation. The issues that arose were almost identical. Whose interests were we primarily seeking to serve? What was the relative importance of the process as opposed to the product (the documents)? Who owned the documents? What were they to be used for? To what extent was the process a guidance process, the success of which required self-disclosure, or a negotiation process, the success of which from the individual's perspective required effective self-presentation? Educational organisations and employers have much to gain from exchanging and sharing experience in relation to such issues. This could, indeed, provide the basis for education-business partnership activities of an unusual kind: based not on reciprocity, with one party giving and the other receiving, but on common learning in relation to a common problem -

the task of simultaneously supporting individuals in relation to their learning and work, and negotiating effectively with them.

The potential advantages of guidance within education and within employment are twofold. First, they have more continuous contact with the individuals based in their organisation, and so are able to deliver more sustained guidance than any external service could do. Second, they are likely to be in a stronger position to influence their organisation to alter its opportunity structures in response to individuals' needs and demands, as revealed through the guidance process. In adult education, for example, it is now widely recognised that one of the crucial roles for guidance is providing feedback on learners' needs which are not met by existing provision. This can be applied in other areas too. Guidance can thus not only help individuals to choose between the opportunities available, but also encourage providers to adapt their provision to individuals' requirements.

On the other hand, guidance within education and employment also share common limitations. First, they do not cover everybody: many people spend significant parts of their lives outside education and employment structures - because they are unemployed, for example, or engaged in child-rearing. Second, guidance services within particular organisations do not usually have a sufficiently broad view of opportunities outside that organisation. And third, the organisation can have a vested interest in the outcomes of the individual's decision, which can make it difficult to provide guidance that is genuinely neutral. In Britain, for example, our schools are rewarded financially if their students stay on beyond the compulsory school-leaving age: this means that they tend to bias their guidance in favour of their own offerings rather than the opportunities available elsewhere.

Employers, too, tend to be reluctant to encourage valued employees to explore opportunities in other organisations.

For these reasons, it is crucial that there should be access to the broader and more impartial perspective which a neutral guidance service can provide. This, however, requires separate funding, and raises issues about who is to pay for it. Within Europe, three rather different models appear to be emerging at present.[15] In Germany, vocational guidance and placement is the sole and exclusive responsibility of the Bundesanstalt für Arbeit: a self-governing body financed by contributions from employers and employees through the social pensions insurance scheme, and controlled by the three social partners - employers, unions and government - which in effect ensure that their respective vested interests are balanced and that the individual's interests are given primacy. In France, there is a proliferation of public services, addressed to different target-groups. In the United Kingdom, a variety of providers is also being encouraged, but in addition active consideration is currently being given to whether free guidance services should be focused on particular target-groups (e.g. young people, the unemployed, women returners), with individuals and/or employers being encouraged to meet all or some of the costs in the case of other groups. In short, attention is being given in the UK to establishing some kind of market in guidance provision, at least for adults.

I hope to discuss this notion of a market in guidance, and its tensions with the concept I outlined earlier of guidance as a market-maker, at the training session I will be running on Saturday morning. I will not therefore explore it further here. I only wish to say that there <u>are</u> tensions and that my own view - which I have been arguing at every possible opportunity in the UK - is that a market in guidance should only be permitted and encouraged if it seems likely to deliver effectively the role of guidance as a market-maker.

In Britain, the case for free guidance provision for young people is not in question. In relation to adults, the model which I and others have been advocating in terms of practical politics is that there should be some foundation guidance provision available to all, free of charge. This should comprise open-access information centres, supported by brief guidance interventions designed primarily to identify guidance needs for which enhanced provision - counselling interviews, psychometric tests and the like - might be required. These enhanced services should be costed: individuals who are able to pay for such services could be expected to do so, while public funding - perhaps in the form of guidance vouchers - could be targeted at groups where the ability to pay is low and/or the public interest in take-up is high. This is not the model I would ideally like, but I believe it is the best model which is sellable to our current market-oriented government.

The other UK development which may be of interest to you is that - with active support from the CBI and other organisations - we are currently setting up a new National Advisory Council for Careers and Educational Guidance, which is being launched this June. Other European countries like Denmark and the Netherlands have done much the same. It will bring together, on a voluntary basis, the major employer organisations, education and training organisations, consumer organisations, and guidance professional associations. Its major tasks will be to provide strategic leadership in relation to a national strategy which I hope will be broadly along the lines I have outlined here, and to define quality standards in relation to guidance delivery in all the different sectors in which it takes place. It is, I think, a potentially significant development, which could enable us to develop the guidance system we need for our post-industrial future.

The future of work

In my final few minutes, I want to return to broader issues relating to the future of work. You will gather that I am an optimist. I do believe that the changes that are taking place in our societies offer real opportunities for individuals to take more control over their lives. I also believe that education-business partnerships and guidance services have a critical role to play in delivering these opportunities.

But I also have fears. It is easy to talk about career development for all, but much more difficult to deliver it. The reality is that in my society, and I suspect in yours, we are experiencing a growing bifurcation between the haves and the have-nots, the skilled and the unskilled, the employed and the unemployed. Some wise writers have warned us of the dangers. John Kenneth Galbraith has pointed to the culture of contentment established during the 1980s in which the growing economic comfort of the fortunate and politically dominant community contrasted with the growing poverty of the under-class.[16] Robert Reich, in his important book The Work of Nations, has pointed to the risk that what he calls the "symbolic analysts" - the new aristocracy - are increasingly losing the sense of belonging to a wider community, and becoming resentful of any support for the well-being of others. He notes, tellingly, that their sense of enclosure is illusory: that "the piece of mind potentially offered by platoons of security guards, state-of-the-art alarm systems, and a multitude of prisons is limited". The same point was made by Tom Woolfe in his brilliant novel The Bonfire of the Vanities.[18] Again, Charles Handy in his new book The Empty Raincoat - which explores many of the wider issues I have touched on in this address - reminds us that in the French Revolution, it was fraternity that reconciled the apparent opposites of liberty and equality.[19]

The issue is represented most acutely in the now chronic problem of unemployment which is poisoning our societies. We are now getting accustomed to permanent unemployment rates of 8-20%. Full employment is an idol to which token genuflection continues, but without any genuine faith. We know, though our politicians rarely admit, that economic growth no longer necessarily creates jobs. We know, though again our politicians rarely admit, that unemployment is related to crime, delinquency, drug-taking, mental and physical ill-health: all of which have enormous economic as well as social costs. Unemployment does not define anything: it defines the absence of something. It describes a situation in which we continue to regard employment as the chief source of status, identity and income, and then deny access to it to millions of people. It represents an attempt to hold on to old-think when new-think is needed.

What options might there be? Some suggest that we are moving towards a leisure society in which there will be a new leisure class. That sounds like an unthought-through sixties utopia rather than a realistic political proposition. Others say that if employment is declining, we should share it out more evenly. This sounds more plausible, particularly to people in employment - perhaps many of us in this room - who find ourselves, ironically, working longer and longer hours. The difficulty with it, though, is that while many of us would be quite keen to share some of our work, not so many of us are keen to share some of our income. Yet unless we do so, it will not create jobs, except at the margin. Perhaps, in any case, this notion is based on narrow and rigid mental models. It seems to assume that there is a finite amount of work, which is contracting and therefore needs to be distributed more equally. But in reality there is an infinite amount of work: an infinite range of needs to which human energies can be devoted. Think of all the social needs - of support for children and old people, for example - or all the environmental needs. The

real issue relates to what forms of work we are prepared to pay for, how these forms of work are to be organised and distributed, and how this distribution is to be related to the generation and distribution of wealth. These are profoundly political questions, and are resolved through social arrangements. The basis for these arrangements can be changed.[20]

To consider such changes, it is important to recognise that much work is not carried out in employment at all. I noted earlier that an ever-increasing number of people are now self-employed. But in addition, much work is carried out in the three informal economies - which we talk about much less, but which represent big business. The first is the hidden economy, which covers work carried out for money that is hidden from taxation and regulatory authorities: it ranges from undeclared criminal and immoral earnings (e.g. prostitution, drug trafficking), through office pilfering and perks, to undeclared income earned in particular by the self-employed, by "moonlighters", and by the unemployed. Estimates of its extent in Italy, for example, have varied between 10% and 40% of the national income,[21] and parts seem to be officially tolerated as a matter of policy. Second, there is the household economy, which covers work within the home for which substitutes might otherwise be purchased for money: cooking, decorating, laundry, child care, home repairs, garden produce. It was estimated a few years ago in the USA that if the all the work carried out in the household was converted into monetary form, the total would be equal to the entire amount paid out in wages and salaries by every corporation in the country.[22] And thirdly, there is the communal economy, which includes voluntary work plus all the informal gift work that is offered to friends and neighbours.

Ways could be sought of bringing work from these informal economies into the formal one - through "wages for housework", for example. This however raises wider issues. In particular it raises questions about how far we want work to be built around a

cash nexus or around other kinds of relationship. In modern times, the market - which in earlier societies was subordinated to socio-religious goals - has come to set the goals of our societies. Economic growth has become the prime aim of governments; forms of service have increasingly been based around the cash nexus. Yet we all recognise the devaluation that can occur when some human activities are turned over to the market-place: when love becomes prostitution.

The establishment of the welfare state, in which services like education and health are made freely available to the public, is a response to this. It does however raise its own problems. Those offering such services - nurses, social workers, teachers - have shown increasing concern with financial rewards, and a growing willingness to subordinate their clients' interests to strikes and the like. In a society which judges worth in monetary terms, this is hardly surprising or reprehensible. But it can erode the moral base of the taxation systems on which such services rest. We have become accustomed now to hearing politicians talk about taxation as a necessary evil that must be limited, rather than as a social good on which the quality of all our lives depend.

In the end, every society is held together by activities for which payment is neither given nor expected - by activities motivated not by acquisitiveness but by love, caring, creativity, curiosity, energy. Yet the capacity to devote all one's time to working without monetary reward implies access to money without effort, which in turn - unless it takes the form of inherited wealth - implies a kind of dependency. Traditionally, it is women who have been the chief source of "gift work" in household and communities. Dependent on the incomes of their husbands, they have performed many of the unpaid caring and expressive roles - looking after young children and elderly parents, carrying out voluntary services for friends and neighbours, simply giving people time and attention - which are so

crucial to the social cohesion of communities and to the quality of life within them. From the viewpoint of social status, and of access to power and wealth, these roles are demeaning and entrapping; from the viewpoint of social value and moral quality, they are arguably superior to much if not all paid employment. Hitherto, rigid gender divisions have tended to confine such roles to women, and to give women little choice in accepting them. Women understandably are now challenging this. But the result is to place gift work under greater threat. The women's movement has tended more readily to take the form of claims to male prerogatives and privileges, than of affirmations of the superiority of traditionally female roles and values (thought the balance seems now to be shifting a little in this respect). Men, meanwhile, have shown little inclination to give up their power, status and wealth in the quest for social and moral virtue. So what happens to the re-evaluation of gender roles, and to the relationship between gift work, the welfare state and the market economy, are in my view crucial to the future of work.

My own belief is that the most optimistic scenario for a post-industrial future is based on the concept of a basic income.[23] If we could collapse our current labyrinthine structures of benefits and taxes into a single system based on a guaranteed basic income for all - children, adults, employed, non-employed - received as a right with no sense of stigma or guilt, many advantages might accrue. The poverty trap created by our current benefits systems would be abolished. Much hidden-economy activity would be legitimised. Greater equality could be created between men and women, and greater value attached to child-rearing. Voluntary work could be encouraged. More flexible patterns of employment could be established. There could be a more open and responsive labour market. Resistance to technological change would be reduced. In short, the proposal has many attractions right across the political spectrum. It would, at a stroke, destroy the

concept of unemployment, and enable individuals to establish their own personal mixtures of employment and other forms of work. It could also, I believe, enable us to create for the post-industrial era a just society in John Rawls' challenging definition of the term: a society we would choose to live in if we did not know what position within it we ourselves would occupy.[24]

Conclusion

I am conscious that I have covered a great deal of ground. My last section has been somewhat political and philosophical, and has touched briefly on some very complex matters. I have included it partly because I was asked to say something about the future of work, but mainly because I believe passionately that those of us working in the field of guidance and education-business partnerships must maintain a critical perspective on what we are doing and what we can achieve. We are placed very strategically in relationship to tumultuous changes. We are part of those changes: we have a crucial role to play in making them work and realising their beneficial potential. It gives our own work an importance that it has not had previously. But precisely because of these advantages, we have a responsibility to avoid mere hype. While we should continue to be action-oriented optimists, we should recognise and seek to understand as fully as we can the deep nature of the questions our work is addressing. If my presentation has helped you in this respect, than I will be well pleased.

References

1 Garraty, J.A.: Unemployment in History. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

2 Bowles, S., and Gintis, H.: Schooling in Capitalist America. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

3 Handy, C.: The Age of Unreason. London: Business Books, 1989.

4 Senge, P.M.: The Fifth Discipline. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

5 Argyris, C.: Understanding Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1960. See also Herriot, P.: The Career Management Challenge. London: Sage, 1992.

6 Confederation of British Industry: Towards a Skills Revolution. London: CBI, 1989.

7 Confederation of British Industry: Routes for Success. London: CBI, 1993.

8 Confederation of British Industry: A Credit to Your Career. London: CBI, 1993.

9 Killeen, J., White, M., and Watts, A.G.: The Economic Value of Careers Guidance. London: Policy Studies Institute, 1992.

10 Conger, D.S., Hiebert, B., and Hong-Farrell, E.: Career and Employment Counselling in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Guidance and Counselling Foundation, 1993.

11 Watts, A.G.: Lifelong Career Development: Towards a National Strategy for Careers Education and Guidance. Cambridge: Careers Research and Advisory Centre, 1994.

12 Watts, A.G.: "Some International Comparisons". In Miller, A., Watts, A.G., and Jamieson, I.: Rethinking Work Experience. London: Falmer, 1991.

13 Jackson, C.: Careers Counselling in Organisations: the Way Forward. IMS Report No.198. Falmer, Sussex: Institute of Manpower Studies, 1990.

14 Watts, A.G.: "Individual Action Planning: Issues and Strategies". British Journal of Education and Work, Volume 5 No.1, 1992, pp.47-63.

15 Watts, A.G., Guichard, J., Plant, P., and Rodriguez, M.L.: Educational and Vocational Guidance in the European Community. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, 1994 (in press).

16 Galbraith, J.K.: The Culture of Contentment. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

17 Reich, R.B.: The Work of Nations, p.303. London: Simon & Schuster, 1991.

18 Woolfe, T.: The Bonfire of the Vanities. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. 1987.

19 Handy, C.: The Empty Raincoat. London: Hutchinson, 1994.

20 Watts, A.G.: Education, Unemployment and the Future of Work. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1983.

21 de Grazia, A.: "Clandestine Employment: a Problem of our Times". International Labour Review, Volume 119 No.5, September-October 1980. Also Hansen, J.: "The Real Black Economy". New Society, No.884, 13 September 1979.

22 Burns, S.: The Household Economy. Boston: Beacon, 1975.

23 See e.g. Roberts, K.: Automation, Unemployment and the Distribution of Income. Maastricht, Netherlands: European Centre for Work and Society, 1982.

24 Rawls, J.: A Theory of Justice. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

P:\...\articles\nmlwcip.wp5