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Abstract

This paper offers insights into the policy environment within which work-based learning takes place. Since 1999, work-based learning in New Zealand has been reframed by a series of ‘third way’ policies implemented by the Labour-led coalition government. These initiatives incorporate an interesting mix of borrowed ideas, principally from the United Kingdom, and domestic imperatives. The purpose of this paper is to outline, examine, and evaluate New Zealand’s ‘third way’ approach to education and training and its present and future implications for work-based learning.

The direction of Labour’s policies was signaled in its 1999 election manifesto document, Skills for 21st Century. Buoyed by the support for and success of its initial policies, the government has continued to borrow and adapt overseas initiatives. This paper builds on previous comparative research (Piercy, 2003; Murray and Piercy, 2003). It traces the implementation of key policy reforms that relate to the broad area of work-based learning. It describes, briefly, the evolution of the current Tertiary Education Strategy (TES) and the contribution made by the ‘third way’ Tertiary Education Advisory Committee (TEAC). The TES is a five to seven year plan that intends to give focus and certainty to the entire post-compulsory education and training sector (PCET); this effectively includes all work-based learning. The paper also examines the three Statements of Educational Priorities (STEP) that have been released to date (the latest in April 2005). The STEPs constitute an action plan for each phase of the TES. The paper concludes that the adoption of a ‘third way’ approach since 1999 has not only altered significantly the role now played by employers, unions, and industry training organizations (ITOs) but also provided opportunities to transform important aspects of work-based learning.

Introduction

Globalisation, technological change, international competitiveness and revived but altered conceptions of human capital theory (Marginson, 1993; 1997) have affected both the purposes and implementation of work-based learning, particularly apprenticeship (Piercy, 1999). In New Zealand, these alterations occurred initially against the backdrop of neo-liberalism, deregulation and the market-based economy. Between 1990 and 1999, the National Government’s approach included a reduced role for the state, an introduction of a market model for the provision of education and training, and a shift of responsibility for learning onto the individual (Law, 1998; Piercy, 1999). However, by the late 1990s, a heightened skills crisis and challenges to neo-liberal social policies created space for changes in policy and practice (Doyle, 1999; Law, 2003a; 2003b). Elsewhere, ‘third way’ promoters, such as Anthony Giddens (1998), argued that an amended approach that brought the state back in had the potential to compensate for the more negative impacts of globalization and neo-liberalism. Shortly before the 1999 election, ‘third way’ ideas were promoted in New Zealand in a collection of essays (Chatterjee et al, 1999). Several of the authors had close associations with the union movement and the Labour Party. Not surprisingly
therefore, policy prescriptions indebted to that volume formed part of the new government’s approach to education and training following Labour’s election. Thus the purpose of this paper is to outline, examine, and evaluate the ‘third way’ reframing of the policy environment within which work-based learning has developed since 1999. This will be based on a critical analysis of policy concerning post-compulsory education and training (PCET) in New Zealand since 1999. The paper briefly defines the ‘third way’ in an international context and notes its adaptation by the Labour-led government (see Duncan, 2004). It then examines key legislation and policy and practice that relates to work-based learning. The paper concludes with a discussion of the impact of those policy changes on work-based learning.

For the purposes of this paper, ‘work-based learning’ refers to learning that is directly related to paid work. It may be undertaken at the workplace or at a recognized, post-compulsory education and training provider (see Boud, 2005). In general, ‘workplace learning’ refers to “human change in consciousness or behaviour occurring primarily in activities and contexts of work” (Fenwick, 2005, p. 673).

**Literature Review**

_The ‘third way’_

The ‘third way’ is a term that is difficult to define. As used in New Zealand, the term refers primarily to the British set of ideas popularised by the Blair Government and in Giddens’ publications *Beyond Left and Right* (1995), *The ‘third way’* (1998) and *The ‘third way’ and its Critics* (2000). For practical purposes, the term can be seen as a label or ‘brand’ that has been pinned to political platforms in different countries that have attempted to reconcile the traditional aims of socialism with the changing nature of globalised capitalism and/or neo-liberal economic imperatives (Giddens, 2000; Harris, 1999; Powell, 2003). Because each country where this policy agenda has been pursued constitutes a particular historical and political context, the precise application of third way policies has varied. However, what is clear is that since the mid- to late-1990s several countries have been “pursuing policies that have some new and distinctive elements” (Powell, 2003, p.106).

Very briefly, Giddens argues that his conception of the ‘third way’ has its origins in some western countries’ attempts to forge an alternative to neo liberalism. Giddens’ (1998) particular focus is the ‘new’ model, both the one applied in the United States under Clinton and the one Blair used to create New Labour in the United Kingdom. Giddens views the ‘third way’ as a framework of thinking and policy-making that seeks to adapt social democratic ideas to a world that has changed fundamentally over the last two to three decades.

Giddens (2000) argues for a shift in public policy away from the re-distribution of wealth, to the creation of wealth. This, he claims, will solve some of the threats to social cohesion caused by the deregulation of markets. According to Eichbaum (1999), Giddens advocates that the solution is “a supply side agenda that seeks to alleviate inequality of outcomes by means of equality of access” (p.48). Thus, as Powell (2003) observes, ‘third way’ solutions to poverty and inequality are therefore not addressed by transfer payments but instead by increased investment in health and, more significantly for this paper, in human capital.
Investment in human capital via post-compulsory education and training, and within that work-based learning, is one policy approach whereby the ‘third way’ seeks to promote and create social cohesion by ensuring citizens have access to work. To this end, a rhetoric of lifelong learning becomes necessary as the impact of globalisation and international competition contribute to job insecurity, with upskilling and reskilling seen as key forms of investment in human capital in order to ensure that citizens still have access to the labour market. As this process of ‘skilling’ can come under the rubric of the various flavours of flexicurity, the provision of these related services come under the role of the state (Powell, 2003).

The ‘third way’ in New Zealand

The publication of Chatterjee, Conway, Dalziel, Eichbaum, Harris, Philpott, and Shaw (1999) *The New Politics: A ‘third way’ for New Zealand* imported many of the ideas popularised by Giddens and Blair. The book sketched a way to pursue social democratic ideals in a (post?) neo-liberal landscape (Law, 2004b). But while the authors drew on much of the Blair Government’s policies and practices, they did not do so uncritically. Significantly, the New Zealand authors advocated a much more active role for the state than did Giddens. This paved the way for an adaptation of ‘third way’ ideas rather than simply their adoption (Law and Piercy, 2004). In this sense, the 1999 volume can be seen as an important bridge between the policies of the 1990s and those of the 2000s. This change in emphasis was also reflected in Labour’s 1999 manifesto documents and in its post-election policies.

21st Century Skills: Building Skills for Jobs and Growth

By the late 1990s, after spending nine years out of office, Labour (with considerable assistance from unions) had sharpened its understanding of the limitations of the neo-liberal, facilitative, voluntarist market model that framed PCET and work-based learning (Law, 2002). The neo-liberal model had distanced work-based learning from the state’s influence. This had been achieved by removing most work-based learning from the moderating influence of state-run polytechnics. With curriculum and provision regulated by employer-led Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)—over half of which had no union or worker representation—and with provision increasingly the province of private training establishments, most of the structural elements for a market model were firmly in place by 1999.

Labour’s manifesto document *21st Century Skills* (1999) was critical of National’s market-based approach. The document’s general direction was inclined towards a more legislative, semi-regulatory approach coupled with a more pronounced, ‘third way’ notion of partnership (Law, 2003a; Law and Piercy, 2003; Piercy, 2003). The central theme that threaded through the document was the view that education and employment/industry/economy had to be brought together. Thus the manifesto:

- affirmed the role of education and training in contributing to international competitiveness;
- reiterated the notion of pathways to higher qualifications and greater skills; and
- re-emphasised the importance of a need for clarity in the transition from school into industry.

Furthermore, Labour’s alternative approach favoured a ‘third way’ shift to the use of targets, partnership and networks in order to co-ordinate and encourage collaboration.
while still trying to retain the neo-liberal, market model’s funder/provider split (Powell, 2003; Piercy, 2003). Labour also made it clear that it intended the state to play a larger role in relation to the provision of PCET and work-based learning.

Discussion

Work-based Learning in New Zealand

In 21st Century Skills Labour set out its intention to alter the infrastructure regulating PCET and work-based learning. One the new government’s first initiatives was the enactment of the Modern Apprenticeship Act 2000. While this legislation did not challenge directly the current system, it did provide a pathway to access learning for younger members of the labour market who had previously been marginalized; prior to the introduction of modern apprenticeship, youth comprised less than 10% of industry trainees (Piercy, 2003; Murray and Piercy, 2003; Murray 2005). The second major government initiative was to set up a tertiary education advisory committee (TEAC). Its task was to review and evaluate the entire area of PCET provision in New Zealand. This two-year process resulted in:

- the publication of four reports;
- investigations into specific elements of the PCET sector, including industry training/work-based learning;
- the creation of a tertiary education strategy, the setting of targets, new funding requirements, and;
- the establishment of a new government department.

Several very important policy changes resulted from the broader TEAC exercise. First, the role of the state was enhanced with the establishment of a Transition Tertiary Education Commission: “a single comprehensive, central steering body for the whole education system” (TEAC, 2001a, p.xvi). One of the Commission’s first actions was to implement a tertiary education strategy (TES): a five-year plan that had been outlined in the third TEAC report, Shaping the Strategy (2001b). The TES can be seen as a ‘third way’ device that allows for the setting of targets and for investigations into how specific parts of PCET can be regulated or tinkered with in order to better meet the needs of society and the economy. This is significant as it highlights how ‘third way’ policy makers do not want to return to the high levels of prescription characterised by social democratic governments, yet still want to intervene in situations of either perceived market failure or social exclusion. This policy direction, of which a part is to make education a key part of the economy, is emphasised in the stated purpose of the TES: “to outline how, by making best use of one’s resources, tertiary education can make its contribution to the development of the Government’s six national goals” (TES, 2002, p.3, emphasis added).

The ‘third way’ character of the TES is reflected in:

- the incorporation of the key assumptions of Human Capital Theory, particularly those which were developed in response to the ‘need’ to be internationally competitive;
- the subscription to the ‘third way’ assumption that access to education will lead to increased employment opportunities for the wider society which in turn will lead to greater social cohesion (Eichbaum, 1999);
• the findings and key recommendations of the industry training review, *Moving Forward: Skills for the Knowledge Economy* (2001) which substantially favoured an employer-led approach and a continued degree of voluntarism;
• the general model of tertiary education shaped by the four TEAC reports, in particular the final one, *Shaping the Funding Framework* (2001), which retained a much more competitive funding model than might have been expected, given Labour’s stated preference for greater collaboration.

Nevertheless, the TES does allow the Government to steer the PCET system towards contributing to six national goals. This is to be achieved through six corresponding strategies, which aim to:
• Strengthen system capability and quality;
• Contribute to the achievement of Maori development aspirations;
• Raise foundation skills so that all people can participate in our Knowledge Society;
• Develop the Skills New Zealanders need for our Knowledge Society;
• Educate for Pacific Peoples’ development and success; and
• Strengthen research, knowledge creation and uptake for our Knowledge Society (Ministry of Education, 2002a)

The framework for this strategic process is designed to cover a five-year period extending from 2002 to 2007. In its Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment Act 2002 the government enshrined many of the TES aims and provided for the creation and implementation of a Statement of Tertiary Educational Priorities (STEP). Each STEP, published at least every three years but in practice between 12 and 18 months, outlines the priorities that are needed to work towards the six strategies and sets dates for when the priorities are to be implemented (Ministry of Education, 2002a).

The first STEP (2002-2003) outlines how the market model will have to be retained in order to ensure responsiveness by Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs). However, clear future statements provided by both the first STEP and subsequent STEPs are intended to provide a more certain and supportive policy climate in order to promote collaboration between key stakeholders, including unions (Ministry of Education, 2002b). For example, STEP suggests that the initial changes will be driven by TEOs through a Charter and Profile exercise, the purpose of which is to illustrate how each TEOs can contribute to the achievement of both the TES and the six national goals. The STEP also outlined how the Charter and Profile exercise would be used to assess the need and suitability for funding of the TEOs. This priority had been outlined in *Shaping the Funding Framework* (2001c). This emphasis on funding as policy tool, reflects the carrot and stick approach of ‘third way’ policy (Powell, 2003). In other words, the state will take an increased role and increase regulation and will remove funding from those organisation that do not toe the line.
A key priority for the second STEP 2003-2004 was to establish the Tertiary Education Commission and to remove the transition organisation. Others included continued development of the infrastructure and processes that support the new system. For the most part, the priorities in STEP 2003-2004 remained largely unchanged from the first, given that the reform process had not yet finished (Ministry of Education, 2003a). But a significant shift in emphasis allowed for a greater leadership role for industry training and its stakeholders, ITOs, employers and unions (Ministry of Education, 2003b). This development, combined with changes in legislation, such as modern apprenticeship, further highlights how a ‘third way’ government can re-direct funding to increase investment in a nation’s human capital in a targeted fashion.

The key priority for the period covered by the third STEP 2005-2007 is “Improving the quality and relevance of tertiary teaching, learning and research” (Ministry of Education, 2005, p.1). This longer term STEP “focuses on securing the shifts that the education reforms were designed to bring about” by reiterating more firmly how funding via the profile process will be linked to an organisation’s ability to provide relevant courses (Tertiary Education Commission, 2005, p.1). This statement makes it clear that the development phase is over and that organisations involved in the provision of PCET will have to demonstrate the ability to meet targets or risk losing public funding. Those involved in the provision of education and training related to work-based learning will benefit in this type of environment as it is clear that through increased funding priority will be given to TEOs that support innovation and which contribute to social and economic development.

**Opportunities for transformation: A labour studies view**

The changes to PCET policy have not happened in isolation. There have also been substantial, related changes to employment or industrial relations legislation. These reforms incorporate ‘third way’ concepts of collaboration, acknowledgement of social exclusion and the need to rectify market failure (Law, 2003a).

Law (2003a; 2004) argues that the resurgence of unions under the Labour-led government has created space for workers to access learning that goes beyond meeting labour market needs. In the strictly neo-liberal era (1990-1999) unions were sidelined. A very significant effect of the Employment Relations Act, 2000 (ERA) and related industrial relations legislation has been the return of unions as the collective voice of organized workers and as significant social partners. This notion of partnership is reflected in the re-involvement of unions in both work-based and work-based learning (Law, 2003a; 2004). The re-embracement of a traditional (social democratic) partner has been extended throughout PCET. First, there was a union view on TEAC and representation on the TEC. Second, under the brand-name ‘Skill New Zealand,’ a new, tripartite initiative, involving the NZCTU, BusinessNZ, and the TEC, was taken to promote work-based learning (BusinessNZ, 2002). Third, Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment Act 2002 included a requirement that an ITO’s profile must demonstrate that it is “developing arrangements for the collective representation of employees in the governance of the organization.” in order to gain approval for funding (Government cited by the NZCTU, 2003). In effect, this provision has given relevant unions representation on ITOs.
These opportunities extend well beyond industry training. For example, the reform of the Health and Safety in Employment 2000 legislation which enshrined the place of the union movement in the provision of health and safety education. From a work-based learning perspective, the Employment Relations Education and paid educational leave provisions in the ERA and the guidelines that govern ERE approval are especially important (Law, 2003a; 2003b; 2004). These extend beyond instrumental education and both explicitly and implicitly acknowledge Maryan Street and Michael Law’s (1999) pre-election advocacy of a more inclusive, broader programme of state assisted union education. Another, more recent (2005) example of a broad, workplace learning approach is the state funded workplace learning representative initiative conducted by the Council of Trade Unions.

The Workplace Learning Representative (http://www.learningreps.org.nz/) initiative has enormous potential. Like modern apprenticeships, the idea was imported from Britain but has been adapted in ways that reflect a more social democratic tinge. It incorporates notions of partnership not just between government and unions but also with employers. In this sense it, along with the skill New Zealand project mentioned above, marks something of a return to the tripartism (government, employers, and unions) that preceded 1990s neo-liberalism. The project is ‘British third way’ in that an important part of a workplace learning representative’s role will be to promote the various learning opportunities that workers can access in relationship to labour market considerations. But in that the learning brief is much wider than just work-based learning and in that the project is union-led, there is a distinctively New Zealand, almost residual social democratic echo of a broader tradition of worker education (Law, 1993; 1996; 2005).

Related to the government’s more tripartite approach is its willingness to enhance the role of the state. This is reflected in increases in funding and access, expansion of the number of trainees and modern apprenticeships, and the reinsertion of public educational institutions and educationalists into the design and provision of qualifications. These initiatives are also supported by a steady stream of ministerial statements that promote and affirm work-based learning as a prestigious educational pathway.

**Threats to transformation**

The re-election of a Labour-led government in September, although with a more centrist/near right bias, offers both further possibilities for a modest transformation of work-based and workplace learning and greater threats. On the one hand, the third way dilution of a neo-liberal approach, especially the particularities of the New Zealand project, can rekindle traditions of solidarity, notions of collective knowledge and learning, and the quest for more socially just, adult education outcomes. But on the other hand, the retention of a quasi-market model, the continued dominance of employers, and the entrenched culture of individualism that has developed over the past two decades all militate against significant transformation. From a labour studies perspective, much still depends on the capacity of re-invigorated union movement to give voice to working people’s learning aspirations.

There is also a problem with the emphasis on increased investment in human capital as a cure-all. Keep (2005) argues that strategies to up-skill the nation, such as those implemented in Britain, create real problems with labour market dynamics: workers
may up-skill themselves out of sectors in the labour market where there are more employment opportunities. In addition, other British commentators have called into question the actual assumptions behind the human capital framed policies of Britain and the negative impact they have on citizens (eg Coffield, 1999).

**Conclusion**

The clear mandate for PCET to meet the needs of the knowledge society and economy has meant that those who are involved in the provision of learning related to the workplace have been able to access more funding and public support than under the previous neo-liberal regime. Attention is now focussed on work-based learning whereas it languished under the neo-liberal era. Opportunities and increased awareness have created the impetus for expansion and most importantly for buy-in regarding human capital investment by employers. This has real potential to lead to increased access to work-based learning of high quality and relevance to workers and employers alike.

With these insights in mind this paper has argued that the adoption of a ‘third way’ approach since 1999 has not only altered significantly the role now played by employers, unions, and industry training organizations (ITOs) but also provided opportunities to transform important aspects of work-based learning. This includes: closer relationship between the state and key stakeholders; increased funding and access; greater provision of services; re-introduction of educational institutions and educationalists into design of qualifications, and promotion of work-based learning as a preferred and prestigious pathway.

While a change in government or an economic downturn could challenge some of the opportunities created by the current emphasis on partnership, the explicit link of the TES to the needs of the economy will be enduring, given the pressures of globalisation and the associated need to be internationally competitive. However an alternative government would likely reduce the role of state or rather the methods and amount invested in human capital and would place more responsibility on individuals. In summary, under Labour’s ‘third way’ approach lifelong learning will continue to have a dual function: a method to achieve greater equality and a way to ensure that citizens are not dependent on a handout from the state.
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