Critically Discuss the applicability of the Connell paper to the Case Study.

Introduction:
The case study highlights one of the central difficulties facing both teachers and families in dealing with the current social attitudes towards higher education and vocational choices for children. This paper suggests that ultimately, despite the many theoretical angles and policy approaches that could be applied, the issue underpinning each of these is essentially one of humanness, and of how we as individuals choose to conduct ourselves within our society. Historically our concepts of success and achievement have changed a lot in the post-war years and this is seen in the changing attitudes toward trade services, the rise of neo-liberalism has done nothing to aid this shift away from trades as a valued and valid career path. Within the current literature treating the issue of class within education and the difficulties this may bring to both families and educators, the approaches are diverse and broad, and include historical theories extending back to a classic divide between Marxism and Humanism. This paper contends that the issues must be conceptualised within a broader historical framework. In order that we might scrutinise the 'ideological acceptability' of viewing the working-class as needing moral instruction and repair.

Body:
Tett and Crowther (1998:450) lend support to Connell (2003) through their questioning of the "ideological acceptability" of the role of parents as "consumers, managers and agents of competition rather than partners in the education process". This is furthered by the denial of the humanistic goals seen in educational equity policy where the emphasis is shifted from a societal and governmental level (the public sphere) into the private sphere of family, where a "denial of society" takes place and a moralising of working-class culture is bought into. This act of public pressure placed onto the single unit of a family structure does great violence to the family, the student and society as a whole.

Historically, it was not until the post-war years that this transition away from the working-class family as a moral unit worthy of reproduction took place. This historical shift is too often neglected in current literature. As is the question of violence done to students who too readily absorb the impact of signals directed toward the devaluing of their home life and culture, as highlighted by Taylor (1993 in Tett and Crowther1998:452):

"linked to deficit perspectives and the approach of 'blaming the victim' because such programmes had targeted families living in socio-economically disadvantaged areas as a kind of prophylactic against the potential failure of 'deprived' households. This approach has meant that there has been a move away from the identification of social and cultural forces as creators of poverty and alienation and a focus instead on the family unit as the site of failure."

also by Tett and Crowther1998:452

However, rather than viewing the home as a site of educationally constructed failure, it could instead be seen as a source of diverse influences upon the educational process. From this perspective the focus would be on the recognition of the diversity of thought, language, and world-view that reflect the actual lives and experiences of children, families and community members
rather than a reproduction of a constructed ideal.

bond also; The factor of the socio-economic backgrounds of both the teacher and the parents may intrude into the interaction and redefine the relation of teacher to pupil. More specifically, a middle-class teacher may behave in a very different manner toward a middle-class parent than toward a lower-class parent. This picture may be rendered more complex through the introduction of other variables, such as the race, ethnicity, and religion of teacher and parent. The notion of role set encompasses this complexity and permits a powerful explanatory formulation of situational interaction to emerge.

*********

This first draft has served to get my ideas down. I have dumped the big blob of ideas and thoughts down onto paper, and for the first time I can see how they are going to work. At this point the essay is not structurally sound, the intro is a bit too 'heavy' in that it uses a lot of big words, but is not easy to read and is a bit unclear about itself.

The body is 'just a dumping' of info and quotes I need to choose how I am going to deal with: direct quote – they are probably too long for this in such a short essay, so I may have to select just a few words for direct quoting, or paraphrase instead. The body at this point ambles along and really has no direction, and the essay is completely lacking a conclusion!

I have a LOT of decision making to make now, and it is time to move more fully into my Linear mode of thinking.