

Durham E-Theses

Vocational cooperative education in Cyprus

Anthony Michaelides

How to cite:

Michaelides, Anthony (1987) Vocational cooperative education in Cyprus. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6691/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

ANTHONY NICHOLAIDES

VOCATIONAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION IN CYPRUS, 1960 - 1986

(In Two Volumes)

VOLUME 1

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

A Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of
Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Durham.

JUNE 1987



17 FEB 1988

VOCATIONAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION IN CYPRUS, 1960 - 1986

Summary

The major objective of the research is to investigate the quality of secondary vocational education in Cyprus, identify and illuminate its strengths and weaknesses, and establish its potential as a desirable alternative to full time technical and vocational education in the island. A main assumption of the research is that vocational cooperative programmes could offer significant economic, social and pedagogical benefits. The guiding hypothesis is that in Cyprus cooperative programmes failed to produce the expected results because of internal and external inefficiencies which stemmed (a) from environmental factors, and (b) from the way the programmes have been designed and implemented.

The research covers the cooperative programmes offered in the post-compulsory, upper secondary age group of 15-18. The programmes that operate on these lines are mainly the vocational streams of secondary technical schools and the apprenticeship programmes run jointly by the Ministries of Labour and Education.

The main hypothesis is examined through

(a) the historical development of Cyprus vocational education in general, and the cooperative programmes in particular, and

(b) the quality of the cooperative programmes as perceived by teachers, students and employers.

The historical analysis highlights the cultural and political reasons that adversely affected the development of adequate and relevant technical and vocational educational programmes in the island. The problems in the cultural field stem from the very strong idealist heritage of Greek Cypriot education, and the deep-seated prejudice against Technical Education. On the political side, prior to independence in 1960, the efforts of the colonial government to further technical and vocational education were received with mistrust by many, who perceived them as a government propaganda ploy to gain sympathy among the people. After independence, vocational education continued to be a bone of contention, this time between the Ministries of Education and Labour. The antagonism between the two Ministries has consequently been a constant source of

dysfunctions in the technical and vocational system.

The surveys lend support to the conclusions reached in the historical section. The findings, thus, revealed that teachers on the whole are hostile towards cooperative programmes, as they believe that pupils should receive their education at school. Students, on the other hand, expressed general satisfaction with their Industrial Training Programmes. Employers are also in agreement with the concept of cooperative vocational education, in spite of the fact that they have some misgivings as to the way vocational programmes are planned and administered.

Some suggestions are made in the final chapter for possible courses of action to overcome many of the problems identified. Key areas for further research are also identified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible without the assistance of many people and institutions. Special thanks must first go to my tutor Mr.S.G.C.Stoker, who provided me with encouragement, stimulation and ideas throughout. Thanks are also due to those colleagues who helped me with the survey, and to those officials in the Ministries of Education and Labour who so generously gave their time and support.

Two people, who are very dear to me, need special mention. The first one to whom I am greatly indebted is my wife Barbara, who not only showed extreme patience with me and was a constant source of moral support, but also spent endless hours on the arduous task of typing the thesis on our small B.B.C. computer. In this task she was assisted by my daughter Christina, to whom I am also deeply grateful for giving much of her valuable time, even though she was herself under the stress of preparing for her G.C.E. examinations.

Finally my thanks go to the many teachers, students and employers in Cyprus, without whose cooperation this research would have been impossible.

LIST OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 1,

	Page
Summary	(iii)
Acknowledgements	(v)
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Definitions	1
2.0 Objectives of the Research	5
3.0 Statement of the Problem	6
4.0 Literature Review	12
5.0 The Current Situation	30
Notes and References	37
CHAPTER TWO: THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH AND THE METHODS USED	
1.0 Introduction	43
2.0 Overall Design	44
3.0 The Surveys	53
3.1 The Samples	53
3.2 The Questionnaires	59
3.3 Questionnaire Response Rate	59
3.4 Statistical Analysis	59
Notes and References	60
CHAPTER THREE: TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT	
1.0 Introduction	62
2.0 The Philosophical Background	63
2.1 Educational Links with Greece	63
2.2 The Nature of the Greek Educational Tradition	64
2.3 The Effects on Technical Education	67
3.0 Technical Education Prior to Independence	69
3.1 The British Colonial Rule and the Demand for Enosis	69
3.2 The Conflict over Education during the Colonial Period	72
3.3 The Development of Technical Education in Cyprus during the British Colonial Administration	74
3.4 The Establishment of the Integrated Scheme of Technical Education	80
3.5 Training of Students in Industry	83
3.6 Teaching Staff	83
3.7 Concluding Remarks	84
4.0 Technical Education After Independence	85
4.1 The Continuing Conflict	85
4.2 The Economic Situation in 1960	87
4.3 The Dilemma over Educational Policy	88
4.4 Consequences on Technical Education	94
5.0 Conclusion	100
Notes and References	102

CHAPTER FOUR: THE INTRODUCTION OF APPRENTICESHIP IN CYPRUS

1.0	Introduction	107
2.0	The Initial Report	108
3.0	The Appointment of the First Apprenticeship Board	111
4.0	Activities of the First Apprenticeship Board	113
5.0	The Plan for the Apprenticeship Scheme	114
6.0	The Introduction of Apprenticeship on a Voluntary Basis	118
7.0	The Enactment of the Apprenticeship Law	123
8.0	Differences between the Apprenticeship Plan and the Apprenticeship Law	124
9.0	Problem in the Implementation of the Law	128
10.0	Other weaknesses in the Law	133
11.0	Despondency and Doubts over the Need for the Law	135
12.0	The Harburger Report	137
13.0	The Implementation of the Law is Shelved	140
	Notes and References	144

CHAPTER FIVE: THE INDUSTRIAL TRAINING AUTHORITY

1.0	Introduction	148
2.0	The National Industrial Training Programme	150
2.1	The Nature and the Objectives of the Proposed Programme	150
2.2	Expression of Doubts as to the Adequacy of the Technical Schools	152
2.3	Proposal for a New Form of Apprenticeship	153
2.4	Discussion of the Programme	154
2.5	Reaction of the Ministry of Education	157
2.6	Apprenticeship is Dropped from the Programme	158
2.7	Further curtailing of the Programme	161
2.8	Comments on the Institution of the National Industrial Training Programme	162
3.0	The National Manpower Assessment Board	164
3.1	Introduction	164
3.2	Functions and Constitution of the Board	165
3.3	The Scheme is Dropped	167
3.4	Comments on the Attempt to Establish the National Manpower Assessment Board	170
4.0	The Industrial Training Authority	172
4.1	Developments that led to the Creation of the Industrial Training Authority	172
4.2	Discussion of the Draft Law	175
4.3	Discussion by the Ministerial Committee	179
4.4	Divergence of Views as to the Powers of the Authority	182
4.5	The Authority and Apprenticeship	183
5.0	Conclusion	188
	Notes and References	189

CHAPTER SIX: THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SYSTEM		
1.0	Introduction	195
2.0	The Main Characteristics of the Apprenticeship System in Cyprus	197
3.0	The Apprenticeship System Inside the Technical Schools	200
3.1	The Initial Arrangements	200
3.2	Integration of Apprenticeship in the Technical School Programme	203
3.3	Divisive Feature in the System of Administration	205
3.4	The Request for Separate Clerical Staff	207
3.5	Concluding Comments	209
4.0	Administration of Apprenticeship in the Ministry of Labour	209
5.0	Instances of Friction between the two Ministries	213
5.1	Introduction	213
5.2	Conflict over the Use of Facilities in the Technical Schools	214
5.3	Crises over the use of the Technical Schools by Apprentices	220
5.4	Problems over the Financial Arrangements	223
6.0	The Report of the Senior Employment Officer	226
7.0	The Report of the Interdepartmental Technical Committee	229
7.1	Introduction	229
7.2	The Purpose and the Constitution of the Committee	229
7.3	The Interim Report	230
7.4	Deliberation over the second part of the Report	232
7.5	Findings and Recommendations of the Committee	235
7.6	Conclusion	237
	Notes and References	239

CHAPTER SEVEN: APPRENTICESHIP BOARD, APPRENTICESHIP COMMITTEES AND INSPECTORATE.

1.0	Introduction	245
2.0	Apprenticeship Board	246
2.1	Constitution and Functions of the Board	246
2.2	The Chairman of the Board	249
2.3	The Board and the Exercise of Control Inside the Schools	256
3.0	Apprenticeship Committees	258
3.1	Constitution and Functions	258
3.2	The Policy of Exclusion of the Apprenticeship Committees from the Technical Schools	260
3.3	Contribution of the Apprenticeship Committees	262
4.0	Apprenticeship Inspectors	264
4.1	Functions of the Inspectors	264

4.2	Appointment of Inspectors	265
4.3	Remuneration of Inspectors	268
4.4	The Teachers' Union Efforts for Salary Increase	270
4.5	The Effects of Low Remuneration on Inspectors	272
4.6	The Effect of Payment of Inspectors According to the number of Apprentices	275
4.7	Other sources of Dysfunction	276
5.0	Concluding Remarks	281
	Notes and References	284

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR VOCATIONAL STUDENTS

1.0	Introduction	288
2.0	Developments that led to the Introduction of the I.T.P.V.S.	290
3.0	The Initial Plan for the I.T.P.V.S.	296
4.0	Rules and Regulations for the Programme	299
5.0	The Reaction from Schools	300
6.0	The Problem of Placing Students in Industry	306
7.0	The Problem of the "Apolyterion"	309
8.0	The Reaction from the Parents	311
9.0	The Views of the Teachers' Trade Union on the I.T.P.V.S.	314
10.0	The 1982 Revision of the Scheme	321
11.0	The Role of the Industrial Training Inspectors	319
12.0	The 1986 Revision of the Scheme	321
12.1	The Nature of the Revision	321
12.2	The Reaction from Schools and Parents	324
12.3	Reaction from OLTEK	325
12.4	Implementation of the Revised Regulations	327
13.0	Concluding Comments	327
	Notes and References	331

VOLUME II

	Page
CHAPTER NINE: THE HOTEL TRADES INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAMMES	
1.0 Introduction	336
2.0 The Development of Hotel Training Courses	338
2.1 Introduction of the Courses	338
2.2 Industrial Training in the Hotels	342
2.3 Extension of the Period of Training	343
2.4 Community Support for the School	346
3.0 The Hotel and Catering Institute Programmes	352
3.1 Introduction	352
3.2 The Financing of the Hotel and Catering Institute Project	354
3.3 Administration and Functions of the Institute	356
3.4 The Industrial Training Programme at the "Basic" Level	357
3.5 Difficulties caused by the Turkish Invasion	359
3.6 The Industrial Experience of Students at the Philoxenia	361
3.7 The Philoxenia Hotel	362
3.8 The Grandone Report	364
3.9 The I.T.A. Subsidises the Hotel Industrial Training	369
4.0 The Clash between OLTEK and the Director over the Hotel Courses	371
4.1 The OLTEK Demands	371
4.2 The Director Concedes in Principle to the OLTEK Demands	372
4.3 The Industrial Training Programme is cut short	374
4.4 Further Debate on the Industrial Training Programme	376
4.5 Support for the Director from the Employers	380
4.6 Proposal for the Creation of a Consultative Committee	382
4.7 OLTEK gives its Tacit Approval	384
5.0 The Students' Views	386
5.1 Introduction	386
5.2 The Students' Socioeconomic Background	387
5.3 Students' Perceptions of the Industrial Training Programme	388
5.4 Student Perception of the Programme within the School	396
6.0 Summary and Conclusions	403
Notes and References	409

CHAPTER TEN: STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAMME	
1.0	Introduction 413
2.0	The Socioeconomic Background of Students 415
2.1	Social Class by Father's Occupation 416
2.2	Social Class by Mother's Occupation 418
2.3	Social Class by Father's Education 419
2.4	Social Class by Mother's Education 420
2.5	Conclusion 421
3.0	Some Further Student Characteristics 422
4.0	The Industrial Training Programme 430
4.1	Student Perceptions of Programme Relevance 431
4.2	Student Perceptions of Programme Effectiveness and Efficiency 436
4.3	Students' Attitude towards Work 445
4.4	Student Perceptions of Social Climate at Place of Work 453
5.0	Students' Perception of the Institutional Programme 458
6.0	Choice of Trade 470
7.0	Summary and General Conclusions 478
	Notes and References 481
CHAPTER ELEVEN: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMMES	
1.0	Introduction 483
2.0	Teacher Characteristics 485
2.1	Sex and Age of the Teachers 485
2.2	Qualifications 486
2.3	Conditions of Service 488
3.0	Technical School Effectiveness 489
4.0	Where Teachers Prefer to Serve 497
5.0	Certain I.T.P. Policy Issues 505
6.0	Curriculum Issues 511
7.0	Cooperative Students 517
8.0	Relations with Industry 524
9.0	Schools Vs Industry for Training 531
10.0	General Conclusions 534
	Notes and References 536
CHAPTER TWELVE: EMPLOYER'S PERCEPTION OF THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMMES	
1.0	Introduction 537
2.0	Training Policy Issues 539
3.0	Employer Satisfaction with Students' Job Performance 548
4.0	Availability of Workers 552
5.0	Technical Schools 553
6.0	Curriculum 558
7.0	The Training Programme in Industry 564
8.0	General Comments by Employers 569
9.0	Summary and General Conclusions 570
	Notes and References 573

CHAPTER THIRTEEN: SOME CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE	
1.0 Introduction	574
2.0 Comparisons with the Havelock and Huberman Model	576
2.1 "Change and the Functioning of the System"	576
2.2 "Optimal Political Conditions"	582
2.3 Participation	585
2.4 Barriers to Innovation	587
3.0 Concluding Remarks	591
4.0 On Further Research	596
4.1 Tracer Studies of Graduates	596
4.2 Evaluation of Curriculum Materials used in the Cooperative Programmes	596
4.3 Student Attributes	598
4.4 Teacher Attitude	599
Notes and References	601
APPENDICES	602

Declaration

No part of this thesis has been submitted for a higher degree at any institute of learning apart from the University of Durham.

Date..12.6.87.....

Attention is drawn to the fact that the copyright of this thesis rests with its author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

(xv)

The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity, and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity, will have neither good plumbers nor good philosophers. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.

John Gardner

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. Definitions

1.1 For the purposes of this research, "Cooperative Education" denotes the type of education which combines attendance at school and training in industry. The term, which originated in America, obviously stems from the fact that in cooperative programmes learning takes place through the cooperation of school and industry.

Thus in their book "Cooperative Education", Hubert and Woloszyk define this form of education as "an organisational plan of instructional delivery system that combines work-related learning experiences available in the community with occupationally oriented instruction provided in an educational institution" (1). The authors further elaborate that in the U.S.A. cooperative education programmes are comprised of basic elements required by the Vocational Act of 1963, as amended, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The essential elements are the following:

(a) Alternate or parallel periods of instruction in



school and supervised or private employment are required. Periods of work and classroom activities may be made up of alternate half-days, full days, weeks, or other time segments. Whereas work hours vary for each secondary student, many state vocational education agencies have established a minimum number of hours necessary for students to receive credit and an average necessary for a school to receive financial reimbursement. The average minimum of hours is usually between fifteen and twenty hours per week.

(b) A written agreement among the schools (secondary or postsecondary), the employers, the students and, where appropriate, the parents or guardians is required. The training agreement is school initiated, and it outlines the responsibilities of the educational agencies, employers and students to the programme.

(c) Instruction (including required academic instruction) must be related to the job and to the students' academic or career goals. Vocational Cooperative education programmes normally have time requirements for related vocational instruction by occupational area, as dictated by the state vocational agencies.

(d) The alternation of study and work must be planned and supervised to further the students' education and

employability. Cooperative education coordinators are responsible for planning and conducting related academic and vocational instruction designed to meet the students' on-the-job needs. The training sponsors have the responsibility of providing a variety of well-planned tasks to assist students in becoming competent employees.

(e) Students must be employed and compensated in compliance with federal state and local laws. Such compliance ensures that students are not exploited for private gain. (2).

Another term which is synonymous with "cooperative education", though sometimes used in a wider context, is "experiential education". Thus in a study prepared by a panel headed by R.J.Miguel, experiential education was defined as " a set of planned educational experiences designed to enable learners to acquire attitudes and skills and knowledge for work and other life roles by participating in work settings" (3). In this definition there is the implication that "experiential education" is a more generic term and is meant to include, in addition to the strictly vocational programmes, experience-based academic programmes.

It is pertinent to note that the organisers of the fourth World Conference on Education, held in Edinburgh

in September 1985, stated that in the U.K. cooperative education is generally taken as synonymous with "sandwich" education. For the purposes of the conference, however, it was decided to extend this definition to cover all education which is conducted in cooperation between the place of work and the place of study (4). In this way school programmes that include work experience, but are not strictly vocational, were deemed to fall under the umbrella term "cooperative education".(5) The tendency to render the term a wider connotation seems to be universal.(6)

1.2 The other terms that need to be defined are "Technical Education" and "Vocational Education". The definitions which seem to be universally accepted are those provided by Unesco as quoted below:

(a) Technical Education : education designed to prepare technicians for industry, agriculture, commerce, home economics, medicine, etc., which is usually provided at the upper secondary or lower tertiary level. The curricula of technical education include general education, general technical theory, training in special technical procedure and skills, and related theory. These components may vary considerably depending on the type of technicians to be trained and the level at which these programmes are offered.

(b) Vocational education: education designed to prepare skilled workers for industry, agriculture,

commerce, etc., which is usually provided on the upper secondary level. Programmes of vocational education include general studies, practical training for the development of skills required by the chosen occupation and related theory. The proportions of these components may vary considerably but the emphasis is usually on practical training. These programmes may be full-time in schools or other educational institutions or part-time as supplementary education for apprentices or others receiving their practical training in employment.(7)

In Cyprus the terms are used according to the definitions above. However at the secondary level both technical and vocational programmes are invariably taught in the same schools, they are funded by the same budgets and they are regulated by the same legislation. For this reason, on matters pertaining in a general way to technical and vocational education, the term "technical education" is used to include both forms of programmes. This policy has been adopted by the researcher as well.

2 Objective of the research.

The major objective of the research was to investigate the quality of vocational cooperative education in Cyprus, identify and illuminate its strengths and weaknesses, and establish its possible potential as a desirable alternative to full time technical and

vocational education in the island.

A main assumption of the research is that cooperative programmes could offer significant economic, social, and pedagogical benefits. The guiding hypothesis is that in Cyprus cooperative programmes have failed to produce the expected results because of internal and external inefficiencies which stemmed: (a) from environmental factors, and (b) from the way the programmes have been designed and implemented. The desired changes that the research will indicate are, therefore, directed towards the improvement of the efficiency of the system, taking into consideration the existing environmental constraints.

The research covers the cooperative programmes offered in the post-compulsory, upper secondary age group of 15-18. The programmes that operate on these lines are mainly the vocational streams of technical schools and the apprenticeship programmes run jointly by the Ministries of Labour and Education.

3. Statement of the Problem.

Since its independence in 1960, Cyprus, like many other newly independent countries, has tried to develop technical education in order to train technical manpower for the industry. Like other new nations, Cyprus has

placed the main stream of technical education within the formal education system. The other initial training programmes which were run on a cooperative basis between industry and schools has performed merely a supplementary or subsidiary role. Indicative of this policy is the following statement:

Comparing the estimated requirements as well as the needs expressed by large establishments themselves for the next twelve months with the number of graduates from technical and vocational schools, it is found that in general the latter will not suffice to satisfy the former. These rough indications will be supplemented by further detailed study and the findings will be used for the purpose of reorganising and expanding technical and vocational education. However, even after the expansion of technical education, training in certain skills will have to be catered for by other training institutions and programmes.(8)

As a result of this policy, technical and vocational training is offered mainly in secondary technical schools on a full-time basis. Students enter these schools at the age of fifteen, after they complete their first cycle of general studies. The duration of the courses is usually three years.

The courses offered in technical schools are of two levels, technical and vocational. The technical courses which are the more academically demanding, have the following objectives:

(a) to offer skills and knowledge to young people who want to seek employment in industry, and

(b) to offer such theoretical education that would allow the more academically able graduates to proceed to further studies.

The vocational courses aim at training craftsmen (skilled workmen) for the needs of the local industry. Thus these courses provide more workshop practice and less theory than the technical courses. In an effort to diversify technical education, the Ministry of Education decided in 1978 to introduce a cooperative education programme in the final year of the vocational courses.(9) Under this scheme, students of the vocational stream, after undergoing two years of full-time technical schooling, spend part of their third year in industry training under the general supervision of the school. Initially students spent two days at school and four in the industry. The new scheme was criticised for various reasons by the teacher trade unions, by the headmasters and by the parents' associations.(10) As a result of this reaction, and because of the fact that there was a surplus of teachers due to the cut-down of teaching periods, the time allocated to school was increased from two to three days a week. Currently, there is considerable pressure from the teachers to abolish industrial training altogether and revert to full-time education at school(11)

The other form of cooperative programme in the island is

the apprenticeship scheme which was established in 1963.(12) This programme, which constitutes a common effort of the Ministries of Education and Labour, aims at providing training for young people between the ages of fourteen and sixteen who work in industry. The apprentices attend school for one or two days a week and for the rest of the time they receive training in industry.(13)

The apprenticeship scheme is also facing difficulties. As a result, in spite of many efforts by the Ministry of Labour and the employers to expand the scheme, the numbers of apprentices in the last few years are actually dropping (14).

The above indicate that the concept of cooperative education is meeting with some resistance. Perhaps one of the reasons for this reaction is the one offered by a Unesco expert in 1968.

In the absence of adequate training arrangements in industry, technical education has had to fulfil a dual function - the provision of education and basic training and much of the actual craft and technician skill which is provided in many countries by the industry itself.(15)

However, there are growing signs that many people in the island feel that technical education should become more diversified. According to this school of thought, and after the experience of twenty years of technical education, the time is perhaps ripe for industry to be

more actively involved in the training processes. This would not necessarily mean that full-time secondary technical education in its present form needs to be abolished. It would rather mean that in addition to full-time technical education, the potential of training people in industry, through cooperative programmes should be fully explored and utilised.(16)

Even if these views were adopted, however, before new forms of cooperative programmes are introduced, it would be extremely useful if the existing programmes were evaluated, so that the reasons for the present weaknesses and failures as well as successes may be identified.

Another serious problem is that vocational education bears the stigma of "second class" education appropriate for those who cannot perform in the academic programme. It has often been described as education "fit for other people's children" and seems to attract students of lower socio-economic status.(17) The cooperative programmes are the most popular target of such criticisms. Yet cooperative education seems to be a possible answer to the serious educational inflation that is causing serious problems of unemployment, whilst there is a shortage of skilled workers in tourism and in certain sectors of production and in the services.(18)

A new dimension to the problem has been added since it was announced that the Ministry of Education is giving due consideration to a suggestion that the existing two departments of secondary education, general and technical, should be unified into one.(19) The advocates of technical education programmes fear that if this goes ahead, technical education programmes will lose their vocational character. Such misgivings would be only natural, as there is a traditional mistrust and antagonism between the two Departments.(20)

The plans for a possible merger of the two departments seem to be welcomed by the General Secondary Department as it is much bigger than the Technical Department. The former caters for 82% of the state pupil population, whilst the latter caters for only 18%. So, perhaps understandably, the Technical Department feels threatened, as a result of a fear that integration would lead to its assimilation or absorption by its much bigger rival. These fears are reinforced by rumours that if the merger goes ahead, the vocational programmes will be gradually abolished and replaced by "diversified" programmes, in which elements of technical education will be incorporated in the general secondary programmes. Furthermore, there seems to be some justification for these rumours, as a similar scheme has recently been implemented in Greece on an experimental basis. For many, this fact is by itself enough evidence

that the Cypriot authorities are considering introducing the diversified programmes, as the Cyprus educational system is very closely connected with the Greek one.(21)

It is obvious from the above, that if the ideas on the unification of secondary education and the introduction of diversified programmes materialises, the nature of the existing cooperative programmes will probably be affected.

4. Literature Review.

4.1 The analysis of the problem shows that there are two critical but independent dimensions to the research target which require the application of two currently separate research theory bases. The first draws from the literature on national development and is based on assumptions about national development needs. The second is concerned with the evaluation of existing modes of cooperative education and draws from literature on evaluation. The researcher feels that the adoption of the two separate theory bases, which has made necessary the use of different research instruments should contribute to a more balanced treatment of the subject, as the two approaches are in many ways complementary.

The survey of literature in this section deals with issues associated with the role of vocational education in national development. The literature on evaluation will be reviewed in the section on the methodology of research.

It should be noted that the researcher is of the opinion that the main issues in the literature associated with cooperative vocational education, though of a more specific nature, are in fact not different from the issues related to vocational education in general. These issues again need to be examined in the wider context of the economic function of education.

4.2 The role that education is expected to play in national development is very concisely stated in the World Bank Sector Policy Paper. The Paper first claims that "education has long been recognized as a central element in national development." (23) Then it justifies this claim by adding that one must think of education not only as a sector of development, in the same way that one would consider agriculture and industry but as a pervasive element that must be integrated horizontally and vertically into all development projects. (20) The Paper, however, does not confine itself to the system but also addresses itself to the rights of the individual by stressing that education is a basic human need and, furthermore, it is a means of meeting other

basic needs.(24)

In the literature there is very little evidence of any serious objections to the validity of any of the above claims. Where there is serious controversy is over issues that centre around (a) the degree that education can actually contribute towards the economic development of a country, and (b) the kind of education that would best serve national development and the institutional forms that can most effectively deliver it.

4.3 The General Perspective.

Blaug, in his "Introduction to the Economics of Education", makes the observation that no country has ever operated an educational system merely to secure economic objectives. In the Western World traditionally, he adds, the non-economic objectives of education have been regarded as by far the most significant.(25) Indeed, the essentialist schools of thought went as far as to reject any idea that "true" education ought to be geared, in any direct way, towards preparing people for work. The latter was looked upon as "training", a narrower concept than education, only fit for artisans (a model similar to that of Plato's Republic). Training could, thus, be educational, but it could never be "education".

It is interesting to note that if we accept R.S. Peters' definition that "education implies the transmission of what is worthwhile", (26) then according to the liberal tradition, the teaching of skills through which people would make a living, cannot be deemed as "education". Thus, according to the essentialists, the main aim of the school is to produce the educated man, the cultured man, the gentleman. Furthermore, education is reserved for the elite.

When, as a result of industrialisation in Western Europe, it became imperative that the masses received education so that the system would function more efficiently, they were given a different type of education, which was nearer to the concept of "training", rather than the "all round development of their personality". This discrimination was severe against the "blue-collar" workers, who were offered the minimum of education and their education was carried out "on the job" as part of apprenticeships. It is obvious, therefore, that training for productive work has been regarded by the elitist groups, who have naturally been the dominant force in our system, as not really being an important purpose of education. (27)

Today, at least in the official pronouncements, there is a shift from this position. Thus, in most official statements on educational policy the functions of education are grouped into two distinct categories. The

first group of functions covers initiation or cultural transmission (socialization, indoctrination, acceptance of values and norms of the society) and the second are the cognitive functions (knowledge and skills, both general and specific). (28) All types of "training" for work naturally fall mainly in the second category.

A typical example of the definition of the function of education appears in the OECD paper "Education Policies and Trends":

(a) Education is a decisive factor in the development of physical, emotional and moral capacities of individuals.

(b) Education should be a powerful means of socialising individuals.

(c) Education is a factor for innovation and for improving the quality of life.

(d) The expected evolution of production and employment structures together with changes in the interim division of labour, imply that education will remain an important factor of production, (29).

The above type of definition of the purposes of education seems to present a departure from the aim of liberal education. This new direction in education came about as a result of the socio-economic situation in the world which prevailed after the second world war and which produced the theory of "technological révolution."

The theory had its roots in the "battle of production" and the cold war between the West and the Soviet block. It advocated that education should be used to produce the scientists, engineers and technicians needed to develop industry which would bring about economic growth and prosperity.(30)

The theory gained momentum, but it was not until 1960 that the formal linking of manpower demands, economic growth and the educational system came about. It is attributed to T.W.Schultz who introduced the theory in his 1960 American Economic Association presidential address entitled "Investment in Human Capital" and later described as the "human investment revolution in economic thought". Schultz and his contemporaries were thus seen to have achieved "the incorporation of educational decisions by individuals and societies into the core of microeconomic theory".(31)

What initiated the theory of human capital was empirical investigations in the United States that revealed that output was growing much faster than inputs as conventionally measured. The part of the growth of output unaccounted for by conventional inputs came to be known as the "residual". The researchers explained the "residual" in terms of the quality of labour inputs. This led to the creation of a new field in economics

known as the "economics of human capital", or "economics of education", bringing about a shift in development planning from physical to human capital as the major source of growth.(32)

Dealing with the same subject Williamson points out that the theory of "Investment in Human Capital" ripened in the post-war economic climate which witnessed the economic miracles of Japan and Germany, whilst poor economies failed to respond to massive injections of physical capital. This raised the question of the extent to which growth depended upon the availability of people with knowledge and skills to exploit new technology.(33)

These ideas had a profound effect on the planning of the economies of the newly independent countries. Education was seen as the way to development and prosperity. Dore quotes the opening sentence of a Report of the Indian Education Commission which is typical of the views that prevailed in the early sixties. "The destiny of India is now being shaped in her classrooms. This we believe is no mere rhetoric - it is education that determines the level of prosperity, welfare and security of the people."(34)

The vision, unfortunately, did not materialise. In spite of heavy investment, which came out of limited resources, the results were disheartening to economic

growth. The educational policies did not lead, to the expected outcome. Education did not create jobs, neither did it create wealth, but on the contrary, it created a great number of disillusioned educated unemployed and educational inflation.(35)

As Blaug remarks, "everywhere there is deep dissatisfaction with the quality of education, the examination system, the standards of the teacher training etc. "(36)

According to P.J.Foster, the main reasons for this failure were:-

(a) Too much money was spent on higher and secondary education at the expense of primary education. Thus, instead of raising the general standard, a qualification inflation was created which brought about high job expectations, educated unemployment and discontent.

(b) Manpower and educational plans were highly optimistic. As time went on, it became clear that the targets for education were more easily realisable than those for the economic expansion in general.

(c) The structure and incentives within the economic system were not conducive to the success of vocational education, because there were either no suitable jobs

for the vocational school leavers or the jobs available were not rewarding. So, the students realistically chose an academic education.(37)

After disenchantment came scepticism. "Are nations rich because they are better educated or are they better educated because they are rich? Can we infer from the higher earnings of the better educated that education renders people more productive, or are educated people simply exploiting their less fortunate contemporaries? (38). Bluestone suggested that the poverty problem cannot resolve into a technical exercise of finding the right combination of manpower programmes or human-resource-development schemes.(39)

All this brought about an appeal by theorists for change in the policy. Thus, the slogans of the 1960's calling for "universal primary education", "manpower planning" and "investment in human capital" are not so prevalent. Instead, we have a demand for "basic education", "earning while learning", "lifelong education" (40)

The demand obviously implies a shift away from the formal system of education so that more money is available for the basic educational needs of all the people. However, the actual political decisions for the implementations of such policies are not easy because of pressure groups and vested interests.

This change in direction is reflected in the World Bank Sector Policy Paper 1980, which calls for a tempering of the "inflation" of qualifications and a modification of the supply and nature of educational opportunities.

Current educational plans of developing countries invariably call for re-orientation of schools towards vocationally biased education. There are many, however, who doubt the wisdom of such a measure. Typically, Oxtoby expresses the view that mere re-orientation of secondary schooling, so as to give greater emphasis to technical and vocational education, is unlikely to lead directly to the creation of new jobs. He suggests, instead, the consideration of policies for educational reforms which would improve the links between the world of work and the world of school. (41) A similar point, nearer to the heart of the matter, is made by A.R. Thompson who stresses that "Schooling will only be an effective investment in national development when the products of the schools have the opportunity to apply their education in productive activities." (42)

In order to achieve this aim, educational policy "must be integrated within the economic and social policy" (43) Unfortunately, there is a strong resistance to the achievement of this aim from an unexpected source- the educators themselves. (44) This is because, though

economists and policy makers associate education with economic needs, educators in the developing countries still operate within the paradigm of liberal education which, deep down and ultimately, rejects the association between education and work. Liberal education ideas have been transplanted from the West (a) through the models provided by the colonial administrators who were invariably examples of the most classical products of this kind of education, (b) through the schools established by the missionaries, and (c) through the newly established elite class which, again, went through a liberal education usually in the West. As a result, the majority of the educated classes and the educators, themselves, have developed a deep-rooted prejudice against manual work - an attitude of mind shared by most educators in the West. This prejudice is reflected in their teaching and greatly influenced the young who felt that unless they obtained admission to the university they would be regarded as failures.(45)

Another problem that the liberal tradition has created, is the attitude of teachers that school is a microcosm which has to be insulated from the harsh realities of the world, like a greenhouse which gives protection to the tender seedlings from the rough weather conditions outside. Schools today, however, are required to be open-ended and receptive to the environment, so that they can respond to the needs of the society which they

serve. (46) Such an adjustment is not easy because educationalists are themselves products of the liberal tradition which regards external interference as an intrusion. This attitude is the main cause of what Blaug describes as "the lack of adequate appreciation in developing countries of the direct links between the educational system and the labour market." (47) The remark is made more obvious in the case of many technical schools in developing countries which, though created to cater for the needs of local industry and the community, remarkably, operated within a world of their own without considering what was happening around them.

Yet, selecting people for jobs is the latent function of education (48) and if this function is to be carried out efficiently, such selection should use criteria that will be relevant to the requirements of the various jobs. Unfortunately, however, though the relationship between schooling and jobs is more explicit in the third world (49), not only is schooling most inefficient as a screening device, (because it uses criteria which are irrelevant to their subsequent employment needs), but even worse, it often promotes and cultivates the wrong type of knowledge, skills and attitudes for future employment

have?

As for the quality of education offered, Dore argues that "the so-called educated unemployed have not, in

fact, been educated". Nor indeed have the educated employed. They have certainly been schooled, but they are the victims of a system of schooling without education (50). Dore goes on to quote Cyril Beeby's book "Quality of Education in Developing Areas" which suggests that their educational systems are now going through a Victorian rote-learning stage.

Yet, in spite of weaknesses and past failures, education in one form or another has to play a vital part in a nation's development. Furthermore, education assumes an even more important role if the concept of the "New Meaning of Development" is adopted. In the neo-classical paradigm of the 1960's "economic growth" was equated with "development". In order to achieve development inequality however regrettable, was necessary in order to generate savings and provide incentives. With the new concept, growth in itself is deemed, quite rightly, to be insufficient. Development, obviously, has to be associated with a decline in inequality, underemployment and poverty. The emphasis, now, is on the redistribution of the products of growth(51). The GNP per capita is now regarded by many as not a reliable indicator of either development or economic progress. Other indicators like the Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI) and the Disparity Reduction Rate(DRR) which are based on life expectancy, infant mortality and literacy amply show the shift in matters

of development. The per capita GNP, indicatively, is not taken into consideration. Of course, this does not imply that economic growth is not significant, but it emphasises that if economic growth is to contribute towards development, it should be associated with fair distribution, which would raise life expectancy, lower infant mortality and increase literacy, i.e. raise the standard of the people as a whole (52).

In the new definition of development education assumes a more important role, for, obviously, education can contribute more directly and significantly towards raising the P.Q.L.I. than it could contribute towards the raising of the per capita G.N.P. Also, the P.Q.L.I. in a very simple, yet unambiguous way, points out the basic needs towards which education should be directed, i.e. literacy, health and nutrition. Yet, for all this to be possible and effective, education will need to help cultivate egalitarian values which will make a fairer distribution of the wealth possible.

4.4 The Controversy over Technical and Vocational Education.

As the World Bank Education Sector Policy Paper very aptly states, twenty-five years of experience has not resolved the controversy about the formation of skills within the formal system, called by its opponents the "vocational school fallacy".(53) The main conflicting

points of view are as follows:

The advocates of technical education within the formal system believe that one of the functions of the educational system should be to provide the labour force with manpower that matches the needs of the economy. P.W.Musgrave, for example, argued that "the connection between the economy and the educational system must be so arranged that what is taught at school matches what industry requires." (54) It was therefore essential to establish through surveys and forecasts the manpower requirements and then plan the educational system accordingly. (55) It was further argued that the availability of well trained people would not only satisfy the existing need of industry, but also create new jobs. (56)

According to the educational planning paradigm, the training requirements of a country are best served inside the formal educational system. (57) This was particularly important in the case of developing countries where, it was believed, industry did not have the capacity to offer adequate training. (58) The erection and the equipping of Technical Schools was therefore not only justified, but essential for the industrial development of a country. (59) It was further

argued that by building such schools it would be possible to offer an acceptable alternative to the elitist academic education and thus combat the liberal tradition which starved the economy of skilled manpower.(60)

The provision of vocational education within the formal school system was challenged by P.J.Foster in his celebrated paper "The Vocational School Fallacy in Development Planning"(61). In this paper Foster, though agreeing that training which is closely related to work situations is very desirable (62), expressed scepticism as to the degree to which formal educational institutions may institute change and disagreed with the view that vocational education and general education are substitutes.(63) Furthermore, he claimed that, contrary to popular notions academic education is in fact pre-eminently vocational as it provides access to those occupations with most prestige and highest pay.(64) As for the products of technical institutions, he said that they often experienced difficulties in obtaining employment and frequently entered occupations unrelated to the training they had undergone(65). Foster also disagreed with the general tendency to accord schools central position in strategies of economic planning. Schools, he claimed, do not function in the way planners expect and childrens' vocational aspirations cannot be altered by curriculum changes. Aspirations , he

claimed, are determined by factors outside the schools.

Foster's views received widespread support. Authors such as Coombs (66), Jolly and Colclough (67), Blaug (68), Carnay (69), Oxtoby (70), Sobel (71), Ducci (72), Lillis and Hogan (73), and Okwuanaso (74) have offered illustrations as to the futility of vocational training within the formal system.

There are however voices of dissent. In a recent paper, for example, Theodore Lewis and Morgan Lewis cite various successes of vocational education and identify the following alleged shortcomings in the vocational fallacy literature.

(a) The way questions pertaining to the efficacy of vocational education tend to be framed is slanted.

(b) The literature failed to examine the historical role of vocational education in developed countries.

(c) The research base for much of the literature is weak.

(d) The vocational literature has been dominated by the viewpoints of metropolitan scholars without ample rebuttal from their counterparts in the Third World.(75)

The conflicting views seem to have had their effect on policy makers. Psacharopoulos in a paper for the World Bank noted that a reassessment is taking place, both within the Bank and in developing countries of the advantages and disadvantages of vocational and general education(76).

It is obvious from the above, that the debate on such a complex issue as the vocationalisation of education cannot be easily resolved, as there can be no one universal answer to the problem. The following observations by David Metcalf illustrate the point.

The social, corporate and private returns to vocational training are sufficiently high to justify expanding training activity; studies which relate to Africa and Asia indicate that informal and formal in-firm training is more cost effective than institutional training; but this finding is not replicated in studies which relate to South America. But really it is not sensible to make generalisations; authors persistently (and correctly) point out that circumstances vary from place to place and over time. For example, there is no consistent evidence to confirm or refute the so-called vocational school fallacy. It is a pity that no generalisation can be made, but it is a fact of life. Certainly, it is not possible to draw out any strong conclusion concerning the relative merits of training done inside the plant (on or off the job) or outside it.(77)

Another significant contrast in the points of view is presented by T. Lewis and M.U.Lewis.(78) They say that the critics of vocational education contend that vocational instruction prepares young people for only a few possible jobs and prevents them from acquiring

increased competence and understanding in more basic principles of communication, computation and science that underlie all work. Radical critics further argue that vocational education is mainly a way of continuing the capitalist structure. On the other hand, the writers say, the advocates of vocational education see an entirely different process. They see a large proportion of young people who are bored and frustrated in an academic classroom. For such young people learning becomes meaningful when it can be applied. However, on the debit side there seems to be wide consensus in the literature, that vocational education bears the stigma of "second class" education and is only appropriate for those who cannot perform in the academic programmes. Furthermore, research shows that vocational students are drawn predominantly from families of lower socioeconomic status.(79)

5. The Current Situation

For the purposes of this study, it is deemed that of most relevance are the developments in Europe and in the developing countries. This is because ,(a) Cyprus politically is part of Europe, it is a member of the Council of Europe and it is currently negotiating to enter into full customs union with the European Common Market, and (b) Cyprus, though strictly speaking not classed as a "developing " (80) country, still suffers from some of the problems of the developing nations.

5.1 The Situation in Europe.

The Council of Europe paper "Panorama of Technical and Vocational Education in Europe" points out that unlike general education, which has a long tradition, technical and vocational education in Europe is relatively new. Brought into being gradually in the last century, in response to urgent economic needs, it had to find its own way and often sought it in various directions. These differences in early growth, also conditioned by the demands of the local economy and labour market, led to a host of very disparate forms and structures in this type of education.

According to the paper, there are two main systems in Europe and opinion is divided as to the value of each.

(a) The integrated systems in which technical and vocational subjects are combined with general subjects in a comprehensive secondary education containing various options and courses, one or more of them technical or vocational.

(b) In parallel systems, technical and vocational education proceeds independently of general secondary education. Some are intensely specialised, even though there is a very definite trend today towards postponing specialisation at least until the end of compulsory schooling. In the parallel systems in some cases

vocational education, both practical and theoretical, is provided entirely in school and almost always on a full-time basis; in other cases practical training is furnished in a firm. Supplementary vocational and general instruction is provided by a vocational school on a part-time basis. The school may be run by the state, a firm or a group of firms. This form of vocational education is found in all countries possessing a contract apprenticeship system (B1).

Nolker and Schoenfeldt summarise the relative merits of factory training and school training as follows:

(a) Points that can be made in favour of vocational training in the factory:

1. The training is close to life and practice.
2. The training can be quickly adjusted to new labour market requirements.
3. Learning takes place well amidst the serious business of factory work.
4. The fact that the trainees are working makes the cost of training lower than in other institutions.

(b) Points that can be given in favour of vocational training in the school:

1. At a distance from the working world it is possible to make a comprehensive connection with general

educational contents.

2. The training enables multiple application and is not tied to the particular needs of an individual factory.

3. The training is planned and takes place according to educational principles.

4. As in the case of other school education, the training is financed by society as a whole (82).

5.2 Apprenticeship in Europe.

The OECD publication "Policies for Apprenticeship" notes that although apprenticeship has proved its value in a number of countries as a system of training and employment, its future development raises complex and difficult problems of policy. It is pointed out that the interests and responsibilities of the apprentice and of the qualified craftsman, of the enterprise and of the economy, do not always coincide and may conflict. In another part of the publication it is predicted that in some countries the future of apprenticeship is uncertain (83).

The prediction, at least in the case of Great Britain, has proved to be accurate. In the government paper

"Education and Training for Young People" it is stated that though in the U.K. apprenticeship has traditionally provided the main source of occupational skill training, in recent years apprenticeships have failed to provide an adequate response to the emerging skill needs of the country. The paper explains that in many instances rigidities have discouraged entry and linked skilled status to time-serving rather than competence. Partly as a result of this and partly as a result of the recession, the number of apprentices recruited has dropped sharply so that only 40,000 were recruited in 1984 (84). It is interesting to note that in 1974 there were 740,000 craft apprentices (85).

The above paper gives details of many other programmes which have taken over the role of the apprenticeship for the training of the young in the 16-19 group. Some of these are the Youth Training Schemes (Y.T.S.), the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (T.V.E.I.) and the Certificate of Pre-vocational Education. The most characteristic feature of these programmes is that they combine work experience and education in some form of educational institution (secondary school or college of further education) (86).

5.3 The Situation in the Developing Countries.

Whilst the evidence of the effectiveness of vocational

programmes seems to be inconclusive, vocational education, at least in the rhetoric, continues to receive government support in the developing countries. A Unesco comparative study among twenty-three developing countries, for example, found that government pronouncements indicated that the coordination of in-school technical and vocational education with manpower requirements and employment, is closely linked to general provision for policy making and planning.

The survey shows that vocational training in the developing countries is provided within the formal system, either in technical schools or in diversified programmes offered in schools giving a general education. Training is also offered outside the formal system in industry. A combination between the two approaches are the apprenticeship schemes and various other forms of educational programmes which include work experience. There is thus a similar pattern to the European model described earlier. The World Bank Sector Policy Paper also notes that many developing countries incorporate work within the educational process. Attempts to interrelate education and work are fundamental to education policy in socialist countries (87).

It is of interest to note that the same Unesco survey identified the following development problems in

technical education. These in many ways are similar to problems faced in the industrialised countries.

(a) Traditional systems of education, reinforced by traditional attitudes towards the role and function of education, hinder the process of reform.

(b) The examination and selection process within the educational system aggravate the maladjustment between education and employment.

(c) The recruitment and training of teachers remain a major hindrance to the expansion and improvement of technical and vocational education.

(d) The curricula used are outdated or not properly adapted to indigenous educational needs.

(f) There are inadequate teaching materials and equipment as well as lack of facilities.

(g) Traditional educational systems combined with attitudes on the part of educators and the public relegate technical education and the occupations for which it prepares to a low status form.

(h) Often vocational education becomes a second-class education for the less able students rather than a positive alternative for the majority of young people.

Notes and References.

1. J.T.Humbert and C.A.Woloszyk: Cooperative Education The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, U.S.A. 1983 p vii.

2. Ibid pp 7-8.

3. R.J. Miguel etal: Experiential Education Policy Guidelines The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1979.

4. Leaflet (Information to the Press) issued by the World Council and Assembly on Cooperative Education C.N.A.A.-London (April 1985).

5. For educational projects of this type see Ian Jamieson and Martin Lightfoot: Schools and Industry. Schools Council Working Paper 73. Methuen Educational 1982.

6. The term was used a number of times in the "Country Papers" of the Commonwealth Educational Conference held in Nicosia in June 1983.

7. Unesco:Technical and Vocational Education and Training, Paris 1973, p18.

8. Planning Bureau, Nicosia: The Second Five Year Plan (1967-1971) -p42.

9. 1978 Technical Education Dept. Yearly Report, Ministry of Education.

10. Details of the reactions against the scheme are given in Chapter 8 of this work.

11. For details see chapters 8 and 9.

12. Apprenticeship Law (13/1966).

13. See Appendix 5.3.

14. See Appendix 4.2.

15. Gurr C.E. Cyprus Educational Planning and Administration, Final Report, UNESCO 1968 .

16. As will be shown later, industry is anxious for the cooperative programmes to be extended.

17. Evidence of this problem will be given later in the course of this study.

18. The problem of the educated unemployed, especially among university graduates, is extremely serious in the island. Thus in a paper delivered at a conference in January 1986, the Director of Planning of the Ministry of Finance had the following to say on the subject: Although the level of unemployment in Cyprus in the last few years is about 3%, for the occupational groups with high academic qualifications unemployment is more than double, in spite of the fact that many university graduates are employed in occupational areas different to the ones in which they have been educated. Research has shown that the percentage of unemployment among university graduates in our country is the highest among countries classified by the World Bank in the group with per capita income in the "middle high" category. What is more worrying is that the problem is getting worse because, whilst the percentage of the working population occupied in professions which require high academic qualifications is only 14%, the percentage of university students in their respective age groups is as high as 30% (S.Matsis: The effects of Mass Education, Planning Bureau, Jan. 1986).

19. This was first announced in a speech by the Director General of the Ministry of Education in June 1984 during a convention of the Philoxenia Hotel. Also in Nicosia the Minister of Education in a phone-in radio interview on the 23.10.85 stated that the Ministry is considering the possibility of unifying secondary education.

20. Evidence of the gulf that separates the two Departments not merely over administrative matters but also on matters of philosophy and educational policy, will be shown later on in the course of this thesis.

21. The nature of the educational ties between Greece and Cyprus is explored in Chapter 3.

22. Education Sector Policy Paper: World Bank, April 1980, p.12.

23. Ibid. p.14.

24. Ibid. p.13.

25. Blaug M. Introduction to the Economics of Education Penguin 1970 p.xx.

26. Peters R.S. (ed.) The concept of Education. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967, Chapter 1.

27. The developments are documented in D.S.Londes "Industry, Skills and Knowledge" in B.R. Cosin (ed.) Education. Structure and Society Penguin, 1972.

28. This is evident on most official documents on

- educational planning. See B. Williamson Education Social Structure and Development, Macmillan Press 1979.
29. OECD Education Policies and Trends, Paris 1977, p.24.
30. Karabel J. and Holsey A.H. Power and Ideology in Education, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977.
31. Irvin Sobel "The Human Capital Revolution in Economic Development: its current history and status." Comparative Education Review, June 1978.
32. Psacharopoulos G. Returns to Education. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Netherlands, 1973.
33. B. Williamson. 1979. op.cit. p.147.
34. Dore R. The Diploma Disease Unwin Ed. 1976 p.1.
35. Ibid.
36. Blaug M. "Economics of Education in Developing Countries - Current trends and new priorities " Third World Quarterly, No.4, 1977.
37. Foster P.J.: "The Vocational School Fallacy in Development Planning " in C.A.Anderson and M.S. Bowman (eds) Education and Economic Development Aldine Publishing Company, 1966 p.364.
38. Blaug M. 1970 op.cit. p.100.
39. Bluesdone B. "Education and Economic Equality" in Karabel and Halsey op.cit.
40. Blaug M. 1970 op.cit. p.74.
41. Oxtoby R. "Vocational Education and Development Planning : emerging issues in the Commonwealth Caribbean", Comparative Education, Vol.13 No.3, October 1977.
42. Thompson A.R. "How Far Free? International Networks of Constraint upon National Education Policy in the Third World " Comparative Education Vol.13, No.3. October 1977
43. Hollistair R.A Technical Evaluation of the First Stage of the Mediterranean Regional Report, OECD Paris 1977.
44. For example see: Unesco "Developments in Technical and Vocational Education -a comparative study." Paris 1979 p.10.
45. See Williamson B. 1979, op.cit.

46. See Bernstein B. "Open Schools- Open Society" New Society 14th Sept. 1967.

47. Blaug M. Education and the Employment Problem in Developing Countries, International Labour Office, Geneva, 1970.

48. Dorries Iowan.^o "The management of knowledge: a critique in the use of typologies in the sociology of Education" in M.F.D. Young Knowledge and Control Collier Macmillan Ltd., 1971.

49. Blaug 1977, op.cit. p.83.

50. Dore 1976, op.cit. p.7.

51. Seers Dudley: "The Meaning of Development" International Development Review, 1977 p.3.

52. The PQLI and the DRR were developed at the Overseas Development Council under the direction of Morris D. Morris and James P. Grant respectively. Further refinement and analysis of both concepts continued as part of a project under the direction of James P. Grant. For more extensive discussion of these concepts see Morris D. Morris: Measuring the Condition of the World's Poor: The Physical Quality of Life Index (New York, Pergamon Press) Also James P. Grant: Disparity Reduction Rates in Social Indicators: A Proposal for Measuring and Targeting Progress in Meeting Basic Needs Monograph no. 11 (Washington, D.C., Overseas Devel. Council, Sept.1978).

53. World Bank, 1980 op.cit. p.45.

54. P.W.Musgrove: The Economic Function of Education Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1972 p.323.

55. Two Nobel prizes were awarded recently to A. L. Lewis and T.W. Schultz for their research on human capital.

56. For example see Blaug M. Introduction to the Economics of Education Penguin, 1970 pp. 137-168. Also, Martin O'Donoghue: Economic Dimensions in Education, The Open University, Gill and Macmillan, 1971 pp. 118-148.

57. For example see Sobel I. "The Human Capital Revolution in Economic Development: Its Current History and Status" Comparative Education Review June, 1978.

58. For a very good treatment of the subject see: Baldwin G.B. "Some thoughts on Education, Industrial Technology, and Economic Progress" in Education within

Industry " World Year Book of Education 1966 p.66

59. For example, in 1968 World Year Book of Education Brian Holmes et al wrote: "The economic value of vocational education is recognized, and government spending on this form of education could be justified on national grounds. No longer is training thought to benefit only employers. It benefits all." (Evans Brothers Ltd. London 1968 p.4.

60. For example, Thomas Ballogh said "The academic systems of formal education are the chief determinants of attitudes hostile to the practice of rural agriculture" Unesco Conference of African States on the development of education in Africa. ED/181, Addis Ababa, 1961.

61. In C.A. Anderson and M.S. Bowman (eds): Education and Economic Development Aldine Publishing Co. 1966 pp.142-163.

62. Ibid.p.414.

63. Ibid.p.398.

64. Ibid.p.401.

65. Ibid.p.401.

66. Coombs Philip H. The World Educational Crisis : a systems analysis New York Oxford University Press 1968 p.77.

67. Jolly R. and Colclough C. "African manpower plans: an evaluation" International Labour Review Aug.1972 pp.207-264.

68. Blaug M. Education and Employment Problems in Developing Countries Geneva I.L.O.1974.

69. Carnay Martin: Education and Employment: a critical appraisal UNESCO, 1977 p.66.

70. Dxtoby Robert "Vocational Education and development planning" Comparative Education 1977,13 pp.223-242.

71. Sobel I., 1978 Op.cit.

72. Ducci Maria A. The Vocational Training Process in the Development of Latin America Montevideo, 1980.

73. Lillis Kevin and Hogan D. "Dilemmas of diversification problems associated with vocational education in developing countries. Comparative Education 19(1), 1983.

74. Okwuanaso Sam "The fallacy of vocational education

in developing nations " C.U.A./A.C.F.P. Journal (1984) pp.16-18.

75. T.Lewis and M.Lewis: "Vocational Education in the Carribean and the U.S." Comparative Education Volume 21 No.2 1985.

76. George Psacharopoulos and Maureen Woodholl Education for Development: Analysis of Investment Choices. (Discussion Draft). Education Department, World Bank, May 1984 p.4-41.

77. David Metcalf: The Economics of Vocational Training: Post Evidence and Future Evaluations (Draft) Education Department World Bank, March 1984.

78. T.Lewis and M.Lewis "Vocational Education in the Carribean and the U.S." Op.cit.

79. See: Unesco: Developments in Technical Education a comparative study. Paris 1979.

80. The G.N.P. per capita in Cyprus in 1985 was \$5328.

81. Council of Europe: Panorama of Technical and Vocation Education in Europe. Doc CCC/EGT 75/19.

82. H.Nolker and E.Schoenfeldt: Vocational Training Expert Verlag. W.Germany, 1980.

83. O.E.C.D. Policies for Apprenticeship Paris 1979.

84. Education and Training for Young People Her Majesty's Stationery Office April 1985.

85. O.E.C.D. Policies for Apprenticeship op. cit. Table 11 p. 101.

86. Wallace R.G. Introducing Technical and Vocational Education Macmillan, 1985.

87. Unesco Developments in Technical Education : A comparative Study op.cit.

CHAPTER 2

THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH AND THE METHODS USED.

1. Introduction

E.R.Ponse and S.J. Franchak suggest that, traditionally, evaluation of education for work programmes has relied upon methods used in the natural sciences. These methods make it possible to quantify and generalize results and to present evaluation findings to information users. However, the writers go on to say, the under-utilisation of qualitative methods by evaluators has been under criticism because their results tend to be over-simplified, and consequently they are sometimes misleading. Therefore, they conclude, in many cases it becomes necessary to use qualitative measures as complex situations are better understood when dealt with in terms of the dynamics of the social pressures involved.(1)

Other researchers expressed similar views. For example, N.L.Caslin, in a paper delivered at the "Second Conference for Directors of Educational Research Institutions" organised by Unesco in Madrid in September 1979, stated that "multiple criteria of effectiveness should be used in evaluating education for work

programmes" (2).

As the writer is in agreement with the above views, the approach adopted in designing this research was essentially eclectic, drawing from a range of research traditions and not following closely any one predetermined model.

2. Overall Design.

2.1 During the planning phase of the research the following two broad areas of interest were identified.

(a) The historical development of Cyprus vocational education in general, and the cooperative programmes in particular.

(b) The quality of the cooperative programmes as perceived by teachers, students and employers.

The intention was of course to examine, through the above, the main hypothesis that cooperative vocational education in Cyprus could offer significant economic, social and pedagogical benefits but failed to do so, because of internal and external dysfunctions and inefficiencies.

Preliminary exploration revealed that there was a complete absence of extensive detailed studies of any aspect of vocational education in Cyprus. The subject

was of course touched upon in a few serious studies related to education, mainly doctoral dissertations, but this was done in a very general way. As far as is known, therefore, this constitutes the first attempt in the field. Consequently the material is derived mostly from primary sources, namely government reports and documents, parliamentary reports, minutes of various bodies etc.

Having decided to focus on the two areas, and with the above limitations in mind, the next task was to elect the appropriate research strategies. In doing so a number of practical and theoretical considerations needed to be taken into account.

2.2 For obvious reasons the approach to the study of the first area, that is the historical development of Cyprus vocational education in general, and the cooperative programmes in particular, would be necessarily historical. The reason for including this area of study, and consequently adopting this methodology, is that it was considered that the approach would yield insight into issues and problems related to the subject, in a way that would probably not be achieved by an empirical survey alone. Thus, the following remarks by Hill and Kerber as to the value of historical research were thought to be very apt in the present case:

Historical research (a) enables solutions to contemporary problems to be

sought in the past, (b) throws light on present and future trends, and (c) stresses the relative importance and the effects of the various interactions that are to be found in all cultures> (3)

The main sources of information in the historical section were official documentation and personal recollections of people directly involved in various capacities in cooperative education. It should be noted that in his quest for information the researcher was extremely fortunate in that, as a government officer, he was granted permission to examine many government documents that would otherwise be difficult to obtain. The researcher was also able to use much material related to the subject, which he had personally collected in the course of his work during his many years of service in the Ministry of Education as teacher, lecturer, assistant headmaster, headmaster, and school inspector. On the other hand, because of his personal involvement in vocational education, it was necessary for the researcher, right from the outset, to make a conscious and determined effort to guard against preconceived ideas and opinions he might have had on the various issues, and to base his presentation on evidence.

Most of the official reports and documents were of course at a high level of generality. Others were obviously produced by government departments or other bodies, to support specific points of view, so the case

they presented could not be accepted unquestioningly. Such documents therefore were, whenever possible, examined in parallel with other documents from other sources which perhaps put forward a different point of view.

A frequent dilemma in dealing with documents, which is perhaps faced by many historical researchers, is how many of such documents should be included in the study and in what detail. For, obviously, it is fascinating for any researcher to dig up documentary evidence which throws light on his subject, however indirect this light may be. And there is always of course the feeling that if a document is ignored, it would be unlikely to be uncovered again by somebody else, so it will be lost for ever as a source of information, hidden away in the dusty files of some government office shelf. In spite of such sentiments however, the wise researcher needs to guard against burdening his presentation with material which is not directly relevant to the issues under examination.

Thus, in the course of gathering material it was necessary to plough through enormous amounts of bureaucratic material, most of which was quite irrelevant to the subject of this dissertation. So when some information was found which had some bearing on the issues that were being examined, there was a strong

temptation to use the information. It needed therefore a conscious effort to resist the temptation unless the information helped support or refute the hypothesis that was examined.

There were of course instances when decisions on the strategy to be adopted as to the kind of material that would be included in the thesis were not easy. For instance, after long deliberation, it was considered that a chapter on technical and vocational education in Cyprus in a historical context, which aimed at exploring the effect that the cultural tradition in Cyprus has had on vocational education in the island, would be extremely useful in "setting the scene" for much that would be discussed in subsequent chapters. What tilted the balance, in this case, for including such a chapter, was the discovery of much documentary evidence supporting the thesis presented in the chapter.

Similarly, as one of the most important hypotheses examined in this work was that a constant source of dysfunction in vocational education and training was the rivalry between the Ministries of Education and Labour over control in the field, it was considered necessary to present much documentary evidence to support this thesis.

In the course of presenting the various facets of the struggle for control, and in order to illuminate the magnitude of this struggle, it was also deemed relevant to deal in some detail with a number of projects that the Ministry of Labour tried to initiate, in spite of the fact that some of these never left the ground.

It may be noted at this point that practically all documents were in Greek. Thus, even if any part of these documents is quoted, the quotation is in fact a translation of the Greek original.

As indicated earlier, a very valuable source of information was the oral testimony of participants in, or witnesses of, the events. Among these were ministry officials, school administrators, employers, trade unionists, past students etc. In this respect the researcher was very fortunate in that many of these people were his personal friends, colleagues, fellow members of committees, or acquaintances. This relationship, coupled with the fact that the writer met many of these people frequently, either at work or socially, dictated in a way the research strategy. Thus, it was considered that it would be more useful to hold informal conversations with them, often on a casual basis, on various issues, rather than hold formal interviews. In this way it was thought that the people

concerned would be more at ease, frank and forthcoming. The researcher also felt free to raise issues with them whenever he thought such conversations would be useful. It needs to be noted, though, that for ethical reasons persons questioned in this manner were warned, before they expressed any views, that the writer was gathering material for research purposes.

The material collected in this way provided rich interpretive perspectives. Thus these casual conversations, which occurred whenever opportunities presented themselves, allowed the researcher to explore in depth, and clarify, some of the issues raised in documents. Consequently the examination and interpretation of official documentation which provided the main source of data for the historical analyses, was undertaken concurrently with the interviewing procedures identified above. The synthesis that resulted represents the best judgement of the researcher of the nature of the events that occurred and their implications and consequences.

2.3 The second main area of interest, the perceptions of teachers, students and employers on the quality of cooperative programmes was approached mainly through quantitative methods, supplemented again through interviews and conversations with members of the above groups.

The decision to seek the opinion of these particular groups and not of other groups whose views might have also added to an even fuller treatment of the subject, was taken after careful consideration of the merits, but also of the difficulties of adopting alternative strategies. For example, much consideration was given to whether it would be advisable to carry out a follow-up or tracer study of one or more groups of students who graduated a certain cooperative programme or programmes. In studying this possibility, it was recognized that follow-up studies are often used to evaluate education for work programmes.(4) However, after careful consideration of the subject, it was decided that if such methods were used, inevitably the whole philosophical base and structure of this work would have to be changed. It was considered therefore that if the system was to be evaluated through longitudinal studies, more emphasis needed to be given to quantitative approaches, and consequently some of the material included in the present work would by necessity be left out. Once faced with opting for one of the two alternatives, it was decided to adopt the historical approach supplemented by quantitative surveys confined to the three target groups mentioned above.

This of course was only one of the multitude of methodological considerations that had to be resolved

before decisions could be taken on the most appropriate research strategy. For example a very significant method of evaluating any education programme is of course through a detailed evaluation of its curriculum, including the curriculum materials. It was with great regret, therefore, that it was considered that, if in the present case such a task was undertaken, the size of the study would exceed by far the limits prescribed. In fact, after due consideration, it was deemed that such an undertaking merited a separate study of its own altogether. Of course, the above in no way implies that the writer has not included, whenever possible, issues relating to curriculum which were considered to be more directly relevant to the present work. No claim is made, though, that these references constitute a systematic study of the curriculum.

Having decided that the quality of the programmes would be examined through the perceptions of the three target groups, various theoretical and practical considerations needed to be taken into account. A very useful framework to deal with major problems in evaluating education for work is provided by R.L.Darcy. He suggests that in evaluating findings related to education for work, one is immediately faced with questions regarding the "outcomes" of such programmes. "Outcomes" are defined as "the consequences of vocational programmes". These are viewed as multidimensional in nature, that is they occur

jointly and not as a single effect caused by participating in a programme. The main outcomes commonly associated with education for work programmes identified by the author are the following: (a) Employment; (b) educational attainment; (c) earnings; (d) student satisfaction with education ; (e) job satisfaction and (f) job performance. (5)

Writing on very similar lines in his book "Vocational Education Outcomes _ An evaluative bibliography of empirical studies", K.A.Bollard cites a number of studies related to the above outcomes and gives an overview of the various problems encountered in evaluation practices.(6)

Finally, a number of publications on the subject produced by researchers working with the National Center for Vocational Research in Ohio provided a most valuable insight into philisophical, theoretical and methodological approaches to the research in cooperative or work experience programmes.(7)

3 The Surveys

3.1 The Samples

As indicated earlier, large scale surveys were conducted among three target groups, students, teachers, and

employers. The sample in each case was drawn from the total population of the respective groups which was directly involved in the cooperative programmes. This in effect meant that the sample was drawn, in the first case, from students who, at the time of the survey, were actually attending cooperative programmes, in the second case from teachers who taught cooperative classes and in the third case from employers who employed students who were registered in cooperative programmes. In selecting the samples both "stratified" and "systematic" methods were used.

In the case of students they were treated as three distinct groups - apprentices, vocational programme students and hotel and catering students. The total population of apprentices during 1984/85 was 270 in the first year, 212 in the second year and 221 in their third and final year. As the final year included apprentices from all geographical areas and practically of all specialisations, it was deemed that this group was representative of the total population and could therefore be used as the sample. Another consideration for administering the survey to final year apprentices was that being more mature, and having had experience of the programme, they were more likely to provide reliable information.

The second sub-group of students was the vocational students. The obvious choice for inclusion in the survey, in this category, were those students who attended their final year (sixth grade) as they were the only vocational students who participated in the programme. Their number was 572, half of which (286) were requested to fill in questionnaires. In this case there was a systematic selection of the sample with every other student in the class lists being picked.

Finally, the target population among the hotel trade students were those in their second year and final year of specialisation. The reason again was that these were the only students of this type who had had experience of industrial training programmes. The total population was 152 students, a number which was considered small enough to allow the survey to include all of them.

3.1.2 The second target population was that of the teachers who taught cooperative education classes during the year the survey was carried out (1984/85). The total number of teachers was 485. The number of teachers was such that it was considered appropriate to request half of them to participate in the survey. The selection was made by using the schools' staff lists, with every other teacher on the list being requested to fill in a questionnaire. As teachers in the staff lists are grouped according to their specialisation, the above

method ensured that the various subject groups were represented evenly.

3.1.3 Finally the third group included in the survey was the employers. At the time of the survey there were 610 establishments all over Cyprus which employed cooperative students. Of these a stratified random sample of 150 was selected to represent establishments of all trades and geographic regions.

3.2 The Questionnaires

3.2.1 Four questionnaires were designed for the survey. Their form and content developed from the central concerns of the research and from experience gained in pretesting draft questionnaires on representative groups.

All questionnaires to students were administered by the researcher personally. The questionnaires to teachers were handed to them personally and sometimes discussed with them. In order to preserve anonymity, however, they were encouraged to fill them in later, in their own time, and return them through the school office. In this way it was hoped that teachers would be encouraged to express their views without any reservations. Finally, the questionnaires to employers were partly administered personally by the researcher and partly by teachers

after briefing.

All questionnaires were in Greek.

3.2.1 The Students' Questionnaires

Two types of questionnaire were administered to students, the first one to apprentices and "sixth vocational" students, and the second to hotel and catering students. Originally it was intended that the same questionnaire would be given to all students. However, on further consideration, it was decided that, since some of the main issues relating to hotel trades differed from the other programmes, it would be wiser to give them a slightly different questionnaire.

The first student questionnaire included 62 questions dealing with students' characteristics and their socio-economic background, students' perceptions on the industrial training programme relevance and effectiveness, their attitude towards work and school, their job satisfaction, their perceptions of the social climate at the place of work, and their future aspirations.

The second student questionnaire included 24 questions and was divided into three parts, the first part eliciting biographical data, the second part dealing with the students' industrial experience in the hotels

and the third part seeking the students' views on school and curriculum.

3.2.2 The Teachers' Questionnaire.

The teacher questionnaire comprised 41 questions which sought to investigate teacher characteristics and biographical data and to explore their views on matters relating to curricula, student performance, the quality of the industrial training programme, the employers' role in vocational education, and more generally to gauge their attitude towards technical and vocational education in general, and cooperative programmes in particular.

3.2.3 The Employers' Questionnaire

Finally the employers' questionnaire included 21 questions which aimed at exploring the employers' perceptions of students, technical schools, vocational curricula and also at obtaining their views on a number of general training policy issues.

All four questionnaires together with the responses are included in the Appendix.

3.3 Questionnaire Response Rates

Questionnaire	No.	No. returned	Response Rate %
Apprentices	221	218	98.6
Voc. Students	286	282	98.6
Hotel Students	152	150	98.7
Teachers	243	226	93.0
Employers	150	120	80.0

3.4 Statistical Analysis

Data from the questionnaires were coded and put on computer file. The first stage in data analysis was a frequency count of all responses to all coded questions. Subsequently, in those cases where it seemed plausible that relationships might exist of explanatory value to the research, variables were cross-tabulated. Simple non-parametric statistical procedures were used in the analysis. This was in line, as indicated earlier, with a deliberate decision to avoid over-concentration on quantitative procedures.

Notes and References.

1. E. R. Ponce and S.J. Franchak Evaluating Student Satisfaction (Measurement of Training and Job Satisfaction) National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The Ohio State University, Columbus, U.S.A. 1981 p75.
2. Unesco Institute of Education Educational Research in Europe: A New Look at the Relationship Between School Education and Work 1980 - Swets and Zeitlinger - Lisse, p103.
3. Hill, T.E. and Kerber A. Models, Methods and Analytical Procedures in Educational Research Wayne State University Press, Detroit 1967 - cited in L. Cohen and L. Manion: Research Methods in Education Croom Helm, London, 1980.
4. For a full and detailed study of the subject, see Psacharopoulos G. et al: Tracer Study Guidelined World Bank, Education Department, Sept. 1983.
5. Darcy, R.L. Vocational Education Outcomes: Perspectives for Evaluation Columbus National Center in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1979.
6. Published by Columbus, Ohio National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1979.
7. The publications were the following:
 - (a) R.J. Miguel et al "Experiential Education Policy Guidelines" - 1979
 - (b) L.F. Jipp et al "Priority Concerns of Five Groups Involved in Experiential Education Programs" - 1979
 - (c) E.M. Asche and D.E. Vogler "Assessing Employer Satisfaction with Vocational Education Graduates - 1980
 - (d) S. J. Franchak "Evaluating Employer Satisfaction" - 1981
 - (e) E.R. Ponce and S.J. Franchak "Evaluating Student

Satisfaction" - 1981

(f) R.L.Dawis and L.H.Lofquist "Job Satisfaction and Work Adjustment" - 1981

(g) J.D.Humbert and C.A.Woloszyk "Cooperative Education" - 1983

(h) L.F.Fitzgerald "Education and Work - The Essential Tension" - 1985

CHAPTER THREE

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1. Introduction

The hypothesis that will be examined in this chapter is that cultural and political reasons affected adversely the development of adequate and relevant technical educational programmes in Cyprus. In this chapter it will be argued that the historical environment constituted a source of major dysfunctions in technical education. Furthermore, it will be shown that the basic causes that adversely affected technical education during the colonial administration continued to be relevant even after independence.

It is a universally accepted axiom that education is a value-laden process which "seeks to consolidate in each successive generation the values, norms and habits of thought which are embedded in its culture" (1) It is for this reason that Durkheim suggests that in order to gain a deeper understanding of an educational system we need

to know as a preliminary the social and political background of the system. (2) The need for such an understanding is particularly important in the case of Cyprus which, throughout its modern history, has had the misfortune to be afflicted with deep rooted political, social and philosophical conflicts.

A further point that needs to be made is that: though the purpose of this work is to deal with cooperative education in technical education, the treatment of the subject in this chapter is more general and covers the whole spectrum of technical education. This is deemed necessary as it sets the context in which the specific issues associated with cooperative education will be dealt with in subsequent chapters.

2.0 THE PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Educational links with Greece.

For historical national and cultural reasons education in Cyprus has always been closely linked with that of Greece. The Greek Cypriots, who constitute 80% of the population, regard themselves as Greek and the effort to preserve the "Greek character" of the island has a very long history, going back to Byzantine times. In this effort the Church, in the person of the Archbishop, has

always regarded that its most important role is to be the custodian of Greek culture and Greek nationalism. In fact "Greek culture" and "Greek Christianity" were blended into an inseparable unity, and the main aim of the schools has always been to nurture the "Greco - Christian" ideals. (3)

Even after independence the preservation of the "Greek cultural tradition" has been the formal aim of all Cypriot governments. The following statement is typical of government pronouncements: "Our education remains true to the ideal and values of our Greek national tradition and to the teachings and heritage of our long history" (4)

2.2 The Nature of the Greek Educational Tradition

The roots of the system are to be found in the legislation of the new Greek state which was established after the War of Independence in 1821. In 1834, the basic law on primary education enacted was practically a translation of the French Law (the Loi Guizot). Two years later, in 1836, the law on secondary education was passed and the apex of the pyramid was added in 1837 with the law establishing a university in Athens. Both secondary and university education were modelled on the German pattern. Moreover, the German influence must have been complete, as the reason that the French primary

legislation was adopted was that the "Le Guizot" had been composed under the very strong influence of Victor Cousin, a great admirer of the Prussian school system.
(5)

The German idealistic ideas of the early nineteenth century were readily accepted by the newly independent country, as the Greek nation could identify with the classical Greek humanism on which the German education was based and in which Greeks found their own "golden legacy". The Greeks were very proud of the fact that classical Greek language and classical Greek ideas were so highly esteemed in the great seats of learning in Europe. The feeling must have had a very positive psychological effect on a nation which had been under Turkish domination for four hundred years and was trying to rediscover its national identity.

As a result the Greeks, in their educational system, tried to outbid everybody else in intellectualism and the adoption of idealistic principles. For them knowledge and the real world was not to be found in the day-to-day experience of change, of becoming and of irregularity, but in the realm of ideas, of eternal qualities, of permanence, of regularity, of order, of absolute truth and value. So this fundamental value judgement - that that which is of the mind, is of a higher rank than that which is of the world of things -

has been deeply embedded into the Greek educational system. The subject matter of ideas, literature for example, has been considered to be of higher rank and greater importance than the subject matter of physical things. This is illustrated by the fact that until very recently there were no workshops of metalwork or craft, in the Greek schools. Furthermore there were practically no technical schools in the state system of education. (6)

Probably there could be no better way to define the vital keynote of the epistemology of modern Greek education than in what Plato, himself, portrayed in his doctrine of contemplation:

True knowledge comes only from the spiritual world of eternal and changeless ideas, and this knowledge is innate in the immortal soul, which has dwelt in the spiritual world before being incased in the mortal body. Knowledge is thus acquired, not by sense experience, but by a process of reminiscence, by which the intellect remembers what it knew before its association with an imperfect body. To remember perfectly, the intellect must rigorously close the windows of the body to the external world and open only the windows of the intellect, so that it may look upon and contemplate eternal truth. Intellectual discipline of the strictest kind, achieved by means of mathematics and philosophy, is the only true road to knowledge. (7)

The Greek educationalists seemed to take Plato so literally and closed "the windows of the body to the external world" so effectively, that as a result "since its establishment in the 1830's the modern Greek

educational system has been characterized by structural and philosophical stability". (8) Dimaras illustrates the situation, by pointing out that the percentage of time allocated to mathematics and the sciences in the weekly compulsory and uniform secondary school timetable was, in the early 1970's, the same as it was in 1836, i.e. 19.2 per cent. (9)

2.3 The Effects on Technical Education

It follows from the above that the cultural environment in Greece has been hostile to the very concept of technical education. In fact, the idea of state technical education has only been possible to consider in the post 1974 climate, which followed the fall of the junta, in the wave of the great social upheaval.

However, though the legislation for state technical education in Greece has now been passed, full acceptance of the concept is still difficult. This difficulty is exemplified by the following statement of none other than the Director of Technical Education of Greece himself, when he spoke of how he personally faced the concept of technical education:

It is especially difficult for someone speaking on technical education to be free of the way of thinking he has acquired in the educational system in which he was brought up and in the system that he lived during his further studies.(10)

This surprisingly frank statement is typical of the struggle that goes on inside many educationalists. However, it is a matter of great concern that this official who is expected to be the "flag bearer" and "warrior knight" (11) in the fight for the advancement of technical education is, himself, unsure and a captive of the idealist tradition.

In the course of this work it will be shown that the same kind of ambivalence characterises most officials in Cyprus, though they would not admit it. There is, naturally, much lip service paid to technical education.

Invariably the first visit to a school by a new Minister of Education, is to the Technical School in Nicosia. Naturally, they all stress that technical education is "in no way inferior" to secondary general education. This theme has often been repeated by the Director of the Ministry, the inspectors and the school administrators. However these officials, including most of the teachers, are products of the liberal tradition, so it is difficult for them to perceive technical education as an "equivalent alternative" to liberal education. As a result, at best, they develop a condescending attitude. It is even worse, however, when they try to improve the "image" of technical education by making it more "intellectual". This tendency, which is very detrimental to the quality of technical

education, is manifest in the organisational structure, the curricula, the books and the teaching methodology of the technical secondary schools in Cyprus.

It is obvious from the above that the cooperative programmes in technical education, by incorporating industrial training in their courses, constitute the very antithesis of the idealist view of education. As a result, it is very hard for the traditional idealists to accept it as a valid form of education.

3.0 TECHNICAL EDUCATION PRIOR TO INDEPENDENCE

3.1 The British Colonial Rule and the Demand for "Enosis".

Great Britain took over the administration of the island in 1878 as a result of the "Convention of Defensive Alliance" between Great Britain and the Ottoman Empire. Under this Convention Sultan Abdul Hamid II undertook to assign the island of Cyprus "to be occupied and administered by England" under the suzerainty as a "place d'armes" in the Near East. The purpose of the base was to enable Great Britain to fulfill her engagement to support the Sultan in the case of further Russian aggression.

The Convention of 1878 remained in force until the 5th November 1914. With Turkey's reluctant entry into the First World War on the side of Germany, her allies annulled it and brought about the annexation of Cyprus to the British Crown. The annexation was recognised by Turkey in 1923 in article 20 of the treaty of Lausanne. The cession of Cyprus to Britain was received with enthusiasm by the people of Cyprus. The long centuries of Ottoman tyranny were over and everybody looked forward to a brighter future. Britain was the friendly Christian power which fifteen years earlier had voluntarily ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece. These feelings were expressed from the very outset on behalf of the Cypriot people by Archbishop Sofronios. In his welcoming address to the first British High Commissioner, Sir Garnet Wolseley, the Archbishop expressed the wish that "the sorely tried island may enjoy the fruits of a true civilisation and a just rule". After paying tribute to the British nation, the Archbishop reputedly added "We accept the change of Government inasmuch as we trust that Great Britain will help Cyprus, as it did the Ionian Islands, to be united with Mother Greece with which it is naturally connected.

(13)

The Greek Cypriots persisted with the demand for Enosis (union of the island with Greece) throughout the whole period of British administration. (14) In another

historic occasion, for instance, after the annexation in November 1914 Archbishop Cyril II expressed to the High Commissioner, Sir Hamilton Gould-Adams, "our satisfaction over the annexation of the island to Great Britain. For we consider this event as a stage from which it may more easily return to the arms of its Mother Greece". (15) Ironically for the Cypriots the British government offered the island to Greece 12 months later, if Greece helped Serbia, then invaded by Bulgaria. Greece refused to help Serbia and the offer lapsed.(16)

The campaign for enosis intensified after Archbishop Makarios III took office in 1948. There was increasing political agitation and anger at the British for their refusal to grant the right of self-determination to the Cypriot people which would lead to Enosis. Passions ran high and the peaceful struggle turned violent when, on the 1st April 1955, the Eoka underground organisation started an armed struggle against the British. The Turkish minority, however, (18% of the population), strongly opposed the union of the island with Greece. Finally a compromise solution was reached in 1959. This was followed by a transitional period of one year and in August 1969 Cyprus was declared an independent Republic.

3.2 The conflict over Education during the Colonial Period.

The Colonial period was marked by a continuous conflict over education between the Government and the Church.(15) For centuries, since the Byzantine era, the Archbishop of Cyprus had enjoyed full ecclesiastical independence and certain political privileges. These were granted to him by Emperor Zeno in 488 A.D.(16) During the Ottoman occupation of the island the Turks saw, in the face of the Archbishop, a useful ally to subdue and control the people. So they recognised him as the representative of the whole nation, and they called him the "Millet Pasha", or the Ethnarch. The Archbishop was granted wide powers in the field of self-government which included responsibility for public institutions and education (17). William Turner, in his "Journal of a Tour in the Levant" (London 1820), wrote: "Cyprus though nominally under the authority of a Bey appointed by the Quapudon Pasha(18) is in fact governed by the Greek Archbishop and his subordinate clergy."(19)

When the British took over the island they naturally felt that it was their right and their duty, as governors of the island, to take control of education. As might be expected, however, they met with strong resistance from the Church. The Government handled the problem with great caution. As Persianis argues, the Government was reluctant to interfere too much with

Greek education because of the opposition that this might arouse, both in England and in Cyprus(20). This argument is supported by the following statement by J.Chamberlain.

I am not at all sure that some measures may not have to be taken to stop the pan-Hellenic propaganda, though it is difficult to see how it is to be done.If children are educated in it, in a few years time it will become a very considerable and annoying force though less dangerous in respect of the Greeks than in any other nationality.

I think that this question wants very careful watching and, if necessary, control over education must be obtained by legislation or in the last resort by order in Council.(21)

Gradually, though the conflict continued until the British left the island in 1960, a modus vivendi was reached. The Government reserved by law overall responsibility for all education, and it directly administered Elementary Education, including the training of primary school teachers. It left, however, most of Secondary Education in the hands of voluntary bodies or private individuals. Thus the secondary sector was left almost completely open for the Church, which took full advantage of the opportunity to establish, either directly or indirectly, secondary schools in all the towns and big villages(22). All these schools, with no exception, were classical gymnasia run on exactly the same lines as the secondary schools in Greece. The schools were governed by "town committees" which were presided over by the Archbishop

or the Bishop of the town.(23)

3.3 The Development of Technical Education in Cyprus during the British Colonial Administration.

The first known official reference to technical education in Cyprus was made in 1902 when the Inspector of Schools reported "Technical, Commercial and Agricultural education have not at present advanced beyond the stage of suggestion." (24)

Eleven years later the Talbot and Cope Report suggested that the establishment of trade schools might be considered by those persons of means who were willing to render public service. The Report stated that the writers felt obliged to express regret "that in the field of higher education more has been done hitherto to train boys for a commercial career than to equip them with a practical proficiency in the various trades and handicrafts for which there is so great a demand in Cyprus." It was also pointed out that native engineers were scarce, "yet the only provision made in the Island at present for any form of technical education is to be found in the Government Prison at Nicosia, where juvenile offenders are instructed in shoe-making and tailoring."(25)

Years later, in the Report for the Department of Education for the Year 1934-35, it was stated that "there are no technical schools proper in the island."
(26)

The first steps towards the establishment of a formal technical education system in the island were initiated in 1944 when the British Governor appointed a Committee to study the subject and make recommendations. The Committee submitted an interim report in 1944 and completed its investigations in April 1945. The committee recommended inter alia:

1) The introduction of a combined Government and private employers apprenticeship scheme offering five years' training in electrical and mechanical engineering and allied trades. ^

2) The establishment of an Apprentices' Training Centre providing half time theoretical instruction for all apprentices employed under the Joint Scheme. ^

3) A Preparatory Technical School offering a three years' course of instruction to pupils leaving the elementary school at the age of 12_13 years before entering upon more advanced technical training in the Apprentices Training or elsewhere. Such a school would also provide an alternative to the academic type of

education offered by most of the secondary schools.

4) A Building Trade school offering a four years' course to masons, joiners, plumbers and village contractors.

5) Evening classes for young craftsmen too old to enter the apprenticeship scheme.

6) The introduction of handiwork in the elementary schools. (27)

Recommendations 1 and 2 were approved and a small group of 17 apprentices commenced training in the Autumn of 1945, but the scheme was hampered by lack of premises and adequate financial provision. (28)

Conditions improved with the establishment of the "Apprentices Training Centre" in Nicosia in March 1946. The Centre offered a five year theoretical course parallel with the practical training given under the "joint government and private employers' apprenticeship scheme". This was described as a joint scheme which offered training in the workshops of the Public Works Department and of certain approved private employers.

The course was restricted in the first two years to Mathematics, simple mechanical drawing and English which

was the language of instruction. The "Technical Education Committee" which drew up the course of instruction recommended the adoption of English because "it was the only language common to Greeks, Turks and Armenians, and because there was a more satisfactory range of text books and trade journals in English than in the other three languages."

In the first year, since only one class had been recruited, only one master was required. An experienced English teacher with a degree in engineering was seconded part-time, from the staff of another government school. In the second year a full-time English headmaster was appointed and an experienced teacher in English with special qualifications in Mathematics. In addition two technical officers of the Public Works Department were appointed, part-time, to teach architectural and machine drawing. (29)

The apprentices were selected at the age of fifteen by written and oral examinations and they had to have completed elementary school. They were required to work half the week in the workshops and the remainder of the time in the Apprentices Training Centre, and they received an allowance varying from 60 pounds in the first year to 96 pounds in the fifth year. Apprentices also enjoyed the benefits of the social security scheme. The apprentices were trained as fitters, turners,

foundry workers, pattern makers, plumbers and electricians. To encourage private employers to accept these conditions and bring both aspects of the training under government supervision and direction, the government paid half the allowance of apprentices working with private employers.

However in spite of government incentives, it seems that the introduction of the scheme did not proceed as smoothly as might have been expected. The 1945 Department of Education Report warned that progress in the early years of the scheme was bound to be slow and suggested that "public opinion must be educated to an appreciation of the value of systematic training _ theoretical as well as practical" The same Report explains that difficulties were only to be expected as this was the first programme of indentured training ever to be implemented in the island. The following were pointed out as hindering the success of the programme:

(a) Private employers were conservative and they wanted to see the results before they committed themselves,

(b) youths could earn very high wages on unskilled and semi-skilled work and preferred the immediate cash to ultimate trade qualification,

(c) the policy of insisting on a sound foundation of

Mathematics etc. as a preliminary to advanced technical training did not produce immediate and spectacular results, and

(d) in an attempt to keep the standard high unsatisfactory trainees were dismissed.

As a result there was a fairly heavy wastage in the first two years. Enrolment, wastage and employment in the various trades were as follows:

Year of enrolment: 1945-46. 17 enrolled, 10 graduated (7 electricians, 1 turner, 1 mechanic, 1 fitter, 1 blacksmith)

Year of enrolment: 1946-47. 20 enrolled, 16 graduated (5 electricians, 1 turner, 1 mechanic, 8 fitters, 1 blacksmith) (30)

In the succeeding years the Centre continued to operate on the basis of an annual intake of approximately 20 students. (31) In 1948 the places available for technical education constituted 1% of the places available for academic type courses. However there was keen demand for places in the apprentice training centre indicating a need for further provision of technical education. In 1951 a technical school was established at Lefka to provide a three year course in carpentry, metal work and elementary engineering to 60 Turkish

boys. (32)

3.4 The Establishment of an "Integrated" Scheme of Technical Education.

In 1952 Dr. F.J.Harlow, M.B.E., Adviser on Technical Education to the Secretary of State for the Colonies visited the Colony and advised on the future development of technical education. (33) As a result of Dr. Harlow's recommendations, the Government decided to introduce an ambitious and comprehensive plan of technical education at three levels _ the Preparatory Technical School, the Technical Trades School and the Technical Institute. (34)

(a)^a The Preparatory Technical School, Nicosia".

In 1956 the Apprentices' Training Centre was reorganised to operate as a preparatory section of the technical education system. The school was open to boys of 12_14 years of age who had successfully completed elementary school. There was an entrance examination for the selection of candidates. The curriculum included English, Mathematics, Science, History, Geography, Greek or Turkish, Art, Handicraft and Music. After a two year course the students who had the ability could enter the secondary technical stream of the Technical Institute, Nicosia.

(b) Secondary Technical Schools.

Apart from the Technical Secondary Schools which operated within the Technical Institute in Nicosia, there were two more which started work in 1956, one in Limassol and the other at Lefka. Both the Limassol and Lefka schools had a preparatory section which was run on the same lines as the Preparatory Technical School in Nicosia.

In the Secondary Technical School there were three sections:

1) General Education Section: The students who entered this section followed a four or five year course with a particular emphasis on scientific subjects, leading to examinations for entry to British Universities.

2) Technical Education Section: The students who entered this section could again follow a course which would enable them to take examinations to enter British Universities. If, however, they did not wish to go to university, they were given the option to enter one of the post-secondary courses offered in the Technical Institute, Nicosia.

3) Craft Section: This section offered a three year course which aimed at preparing students to work in the industry as skilled craftsmen. The curriculum for this

course included English, Mathematics, Science, Technology and Geometrical and Technical Drawing. Boys were also taught skills in the school workshops. The students could take examinations of the City and Guilds of London Institute. (35)

(c) "The Technical Institute, Nicosia".

Building work on the new Technical Institute started in May 1956 and by September most of the Department of Engineering had been completed and had started work with 60 students. The plan was that by 1959, four main Departments would be established, those of Engineering, Building, Commerce and Art and Industrial Crafts. When the Institute finished it would provide accommodation for 800_1000 students. (36) The intentions of the Government went according to plan and the institute was in fact completed in 1959.

The Technical Institute was by far the best designed and well equipped educational establishment in the island. Since it was intended to be the only institution of high technical education, it was provided with laboratories of a very high calibre. The workshops which covered a wide range of specialisations, were also lavishly built and equipped. Among its other facilities, the Institute also had a very well_stocked library, which is still the best technical library in the island, two projection

theatres, a large exhibition hall, a wood panelled board room, comfortable offices etc.

3.5 Training of Students in Industry.

The intergrated programme of technical education provided for the building of workshops in all the technical schools. These facilities were deemed to be adequated for the training of students. Thus the arrangements by which students were sent to workshops of the Public Works Department were abolished and a programme of full-time school-based education was adopted. The fact that the government had not met with the cooperation of local industry for training purposes, probably contributed to the government's decision to adopt the new policy, as the increase in the number of students envisaged in the new programme, would render it impossible to train them in the limited space of the P.W.D. workshops.

3.6 Teaching Staff.

The new technical schools required a large number of technical teachers to staff them. As there were not enough qualified Cypriots available, the government recruited experienced instructors from the U.K. At the same time it set up a scheme for the training of young

Cypriots in the U.K. To this end, '100,000, out of the total '240,000, allocated to the Education Department for the period 1956_1961 for scholarships, was used to train teachers for Technical Schools. 32 scholarships, out of the total of 77 awarded in 1956, were given to candidates interested in teaching at Technical schools. The scholarships offered included the disciplines of Mathematics, Architecture, Civil, Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, Building, Commerce and English. The scholarships were conditional on the candidate returning to Cyprus on completion of the course, and serving as a teacher for a period of five years. (37)

3.7 Concluding Remarks.

Dealing with the new technical education system a Colonial office Report described it as "of a standard never seen before in Cyprus" and added that "the pupils from these schools will be able to take a part in the development of Cyprus in the coming years". (38) The statement was not an exaggeration and it is certainly not challenged today. However, it was unfortunate that the British Administration almost ignored Technical Education earlier and tried to deal with the problem so late in their rule of Cyprus. Furthermore, since the erection of the Technical Institute and other Technical Schools took place after the underground militant

nationalist organisation EOKA started its campaign to expel the British in 1955, the British were accused that they were using Technical Education for propaganda purposes. The Church leaders, predictably, asked the parents to refuse to send their children to the Technical Schools. (39) As a result the Technical Institute was boycotted.

In spite of the apparent failure of the British to establish a sound Technical Education system in the island, it needs to be stressed that, irrespective of the motives of the Colonial Government, the Technical Schools proved to be one of the most valuable "leaving presents" that the British gave to the Cyprus people. The great number of British instructors who were brought over, however, were hardly used. It was sad therefore that politics made it impossible for Technical Education to benefit sufficiently from the expertise of these experienced people.

4.0 TECHNICAL EDUCATION AFTER INDEPENDENCE

4.1 The Continuing Conflict after Independence.

In the previous section it was argued that the conflict that underlay the the development of technical education during the colonial administration, stemmed from political and philosophical differences between the

government on the one hand, and the nationalists spearheaded by the Church, on the other. The nationalists adopted the idealistic view of education in order to cultivate the national, moral and cultural qualities among the young. The colonial government, on the other hand, implemented a positivist utilitarian policy which was not only in accord with the traditional English educational philosophy, but also served the government's political expediencies. It is the purpose of this section to examine the hypothesis that the two ideologies, with slightly different protagonists, continued to clash over education even after independence(40)and that this new clash adversely affected technical education in general, and the cooperative programmes in particular. The new protagonists were the nationalists of the extreme right who were not happy with the compromise solution of independence, and opposing them were the moderates or utilitarians. The nationalists advocated that the struggle for the right of self-determination should continue, believing that the exercise of this right would lead to the union of the island with Greece. For this purpose they deemed it was essential to preserve, and if possible strengthen, the educational ties with Greece. They thus strived to keep education as close as possible to the Greek idealistic model.

In the second camp belonged all those who wanted to see

education undertake a more moderate utilitarian role and train much needed manpower for the development of the country. The utilitarians predictably were strong advocates of technical education which they regarded as a significant factor in the effort to improve the ailing economy of the country. A brief review of the state of the economy of the island on the eve of independence would help the reader appreciate the reasons for the concern voiced by the moderates.

4.2 The Economic Situation in 1960.

The decade preceding independence was an abnormal period. The years from 1950 to 1957 were years of intensive economic activity and rising incomes. The rapid economic activity was mainly due to the increase in British military expenditure. The favourable prices of the two most important exports, copper ore and citrus fruit, also contributed to economic expansion. Between 1957-1960, however, the economy took a turn for the worse as military expenditure declined, copper prices dropped, and the emergency due to the underground EOKA struggle disrupted economic activity. During the period of the three years the Gross Domestic Product dropped by 10%, the number of registered unemployed and the number of emigrants rose sharply. Also because of the unstable political conditions and the prevailing economic

uncertainty there was a flight of capital.(41)

Thus, the economic situation in 1960 was gloomy. There were limited resources and heavy dependence on agriculture which, though it employed 47% of the nation's manpower, contributed only 18% to the national product. About 85% of exports consisted of mineral ores or agricultural products.(42)

4.3 The Dilemma over Educational Policy After Independence.

Educational policy in the new Republic was greatly influenced by the agreement for the establishment of the Republic. This agreement, which formed the basis of the constitution, provided that, apart from the main intercommunal House of Representatives, two Communal Chambers would be set up. The Chambers, Greek and Turkish, had jurisdiction over (i) all religious matters, (ii) all educational, cultural and teaching matters, (iii) personal status and (iv) matters where the interests and institutions were of purely communal nature. (43) The separative provisions of the constitution affected the educational policy, for each of the two Chambers saw that its main task was to preserve and uphold the national identity of their respective communities. The following statement by Dr. Spyridakis, the Chairman of the Greek Communal Chamber,

does not allow any room for doubt as to his own intentions.

The Greek Communal Chamber is the assignee of the Greek Cypriot people in their high national mission, that is the preservation and furthering of Greek Education, Greek culture and Greek National spirit in the island.(44)

Dr. Spyridakis has been described as the soul of Greek Cypriot education.(45) He was an eminent classical scholar and headmaster of the most prestigious and historic secondary school in the island, the Pancyprrian Gymnasium in Nicosia. Dr. Spyridakis was elected the Chairman of the Greek Educational Board which was established on 1st May 1959 in order to administer Greek Education during the transitional period between the signing of the London-Zurich agreements on 19th February 1959 and the proclamation of Independence on 16th August 1960. In the new Republic Dr.Spyridakis was elected as the Chairman of the Greek Communal Chamber. After the inter-communal riots and the Turkish withdrawal from the government and the House of Representatives, the Greek Communal Chamber was dissolved on 31st March 1965. The legislative powers of the Chamber were then passed on to the House of Representatives and its executive jurisdiction to the newly established Ministry of Education.(46) Dr. Spyridakis was appointed as Minister of Education and held this post until July 1970.

Thus, for a period of over ten crucial years, the educational policy of the island was shaped by a scholar

steeped in the classical Greek education tradition. It was, therefore, not surprising that, with the full backing of the Greek Government, he established an educational policy very similar to that of the Church leaders during the British administration. As a result, the secondary schools in Cyprus used the same curricula, the same syllabuses, the same text-books and even the same laws and regulations as the corresponding schools in Greece.(47)

The adherence of Cyprus to the Greek System has been the most characteristic feature, and the guiding principle, of Cyprus educational policy since independence. This policy has, since the very beginning, been opposed by many who regarded the Greek system as antiquated and not serving the needs of the island. The most overt manifestation of the conflict was evident between 1966 and 1970, when a big section of public opinion, including politicians, industrialists and trade unionists, openly criticised the government educational policies. A typical example of such criticism, delivered by Mr. Koshis, member of parliament during a debate in the House of Representatives, was the following:

We are not over critical of the Minister of Education when we say that he bears the responsibility for the non-existence of educational policy to deal in a realistic and comprehensive way with the present and future needs of the country. It is well known to everybody that education represents the most productive sector and the basis of the economic

development of the country. There is nobody in this house who is less concerned than the Minister of Education about the need for Cyprus Education to be based on humane and national ideals. However, do these ideals necessarily conflict with the need for our youth to be educated for life? The justification offered that the present course is necessary for national reasons cannot be accepted as it leads our secondary school graduates to a life of unemployment and destitution, whilst the economy is robbed of precious manpower.(48)

Another M.P. called for "the need to reform and modernize the Cyprus educational system and put aside the outdated ideas of the Ministry of Education and, if necessary, the bearers of these ideas."(49) On a similar line the Pancyprian Federation of Workers made the following statement.

The Pancyprian Federation of Workers, as well as the whole working class, lay great importance on the educational affairs, for education constitutes a decisive factor for the progress and prosperity of the people. The working class is especially interested in the adaptation of our educational system to the contemporary needs of life. The galloping technical and scientific progress demands the general raising of the educational standard and upgrading of the vocational and technical training of the working class.(50)

The Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, Mr.Savvides, who was also a member of the House of Representatives joined the other critics when he said:

In drafting the educational policy of the island we must take into consideration the needs of the island. In this way we can on the one hand secure the necessary skills, and on the other hand we can secure employment for all the graduates of our schools.(51)

The conflict divided even the members of the Cabinet. The Minister of Labour, the main critic of the education

policy, openly accused the Minister of Education:

The way education is offered today in Cyprus does not prepare the youth for production or for any economic activity and unfortunately it does not even cultivate the personality. It simply burdens the youth, in the few cases it succeeds, with a great volume of useless knowledge.(52)

The Minister of Finance was also equally critical:

The backward view that "education for the sake of education" is the only way to raise the cultural standard of the country - a view which prevails as a result of the lack of regular manpower surveys - is due to a tragic misunderstanding of the aims of education. I also regard as outdated and naive the theory which explains economic development through the universal provision of liberal education. I have, thus, no doubt at all that Cyprus secondary education is in many aspects divorced from Cyprus reality and that it urgently needs a radical reform in both the curricula and its teaching methods in order to be adopted to the present social and economic circumstances of the island.(53)

However, Dr.Spyridakis was adamant. A typical reply to his critics is the following extract from his "Statement of Educational Policy" delivered in the House of Representatives.

Cyprus education succeeded in the past in repelling the threat to change its national character and sever its links with Greece, and turn it towards other directions and orientations. There was such a danger during the colonial period, when the foreign government tried to change the aim of our education through special economic incentives and by offering the excuse that such a change would serve the economic needs of the country. The abortive deviation however

did not merely aim at bringing about superficial changes ,but to alter its national character. Our secondary education however defended itself successfully, because I believe that nobody can deny that the national character of education is that which maintains the national spirit and regulates the future of the people of a nation.(54)

In the same statement Dr.Spyridakis criticised the suggestion to make Education in Cyprus more independent of that in Greece.

I believe in the need for national orientation of our education and its link with the education of Greece. Some people wonder which is our educational policy. My answer is that the Cyprus educational policy has always been the educational policy in Greece. The criticism that we have no educational policy in Cyprus has no sound basis, I cannot agree with the view that we must change our educational policy, because this would be a blow against our national policy in general. What, after all, is linking us with Greece? Is it not common blood, common language, common future and, in future, after the realisation of Enosis, a common life? Are we not asking and striving for our union with Greece in the very near future? Why then do we want separate education and describe Greek education as out-dated, thus undermining the people's confidence in Greece? What will be left to link us with Greece if the link of education and therefore the cultural and historical traditions are abandoned? (55)

In addition to the local opposition the Minister's views met with little sympathy from foreign education experts who visited the island. Dr.W.Bakamis, a Greek American expert, wrote the following in his report "Education in Cyprus"

It is doubtful if any real reform can be achieved unless the leaders free themselves completely from the prejudices and ancient values inherent in the present systems. (56)

Another expert, Mr. Bimon Sen, who spent two years in Cyprus under the Unesco Participation Scheme stressed in his report the need to reappraise the system taking into consideration "the best interest of the country from the point of view of socioeconomic development and not on political consideration of narrow national sentiments"(57)

4.4 Consequences on Technical Education.

In spite of the above, it would be wrong to assume that Dr. Spyridakis followed a hostile policy towards technical education. This is shown by the fact that, as the Chairman of the Communal Chamber, he used all the financial aid given by Greece to the Greek Community of Cyprus to build and equip new technical schools.(58) Perhaps the pressure for more technical education was such that he would not have been able to resist it, anyway.(59) Whatever the reason, the expansion of technical education after independence was very rapid.

With the declaration of the Republic, the Technical Schools in the island were shared between the Greek and Turkish communities. The Nicosia Technical Institute and the Limassol Technical School were given to the

Greeks and the Nicosia Preparatory School and the Lefka Technical School to the Turks.(60)

As has already been explained, when the technical schools were administered by the Colonial government, they attracted very few students. This situation changed with the establishment of the Republic. This was as a result of a universal demand by interested parties, industry, the trade unions and most government departments, for rapid development and expansion of technical education. Consequently, the new government set the development of technical education as one of its top educational priorities because of the expected need for craftsmen and technicians needed to satisfy the plans for industrialisation. The Second Five Year plan speaks, for instance, of the particular emphasis that was given during the first five years of independence to Technical and Vocational Education. As a result of this policy, the number of technical schools increased from 3 in 1959/1960 to 11 in 1965/1966. In the former year there were 710 students and 54 teachers, by 1965/1966 these figures rose to 3282 and 220 respectively.(61)The upward trend in the number of students continued until it reached its peak in 1977/1978 when the number of students was 6723. Subsequently the numbers started to decline slightly.(62) It is of interest to note that the original target was for technical education to attract 25% of the total pupil population. For reasons that

will be dealt with later, this objective was never reached, as the highest percentage ever achieved was 19%.

In spite of the expansion, Dr. Spyridakis did not seem to be sure of the role of technical education, and he was certainly unhappy that there was no technical education in Greece on which he could model the one in Cyprus. During an interview he said:

As for technical education, I cannot say that we follow the Greek policy, because this matter has not yet been organised, or regulated by law, in Greece.(63)

This fact however did not stop him from trying to bring technical education in line, as far as this could be possible, with the mainstream of Greek educational philosophy. In a policy statement he said:

In the past I referred to the need to offer real technical education in the context of general secondary education and not in the form of technical training. Because it is only thus that we can produce good craftsmen. I do not underestimate, at all, the value of technical education for the development of which I made every possible effort. However, I cannot agree with the attempts to underestimate the humanistic education for all the world, and especially for us Greeks.(64)and (65)

However, Dr. Spyridakis' critics, quite unimpressed by the increase in numbers, held a very different view of what technical education programmes should offer. A typical critical statement was the following from the

Minister of Labour, Mr. Tassos Papadopoulos.

Neither the types of the technical schools nor the content of their programmes are of any relevance to the needs of industry. The contribution of these schools, in their present form, to the manpower needs of industry, is minimal.(66)

The Minister of Labour tried to take over control of Technical Education. The Minister of Education fought back. Not only was he not prepared to relinquish control over technical education, but he even tried to challenge the right of any other Ministry to run their own educational institutions. He was particularly bitter about the decision to place the Hotel and Catering Institute under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour. In a statement in the House of Representatives in 1969 he said:

It would be right to place the whole of education, including further and continuing education, as well as all the state cultural programmes, under the unified responsibility of the Ministry of Education, which would co-operate, whenever necessary, with other ministries.(67)

In another statement in a press interview he said:

There is no doubt that the fragmentation of education under many ministries is basically wrong both from the educational point of view as well as for financial reasons. I have in the past raised this matter in the Cabinet.(68)

When the Minister of Labour was not able to take control of the technical schools, he tried to impose his policies through proposals in the Cabinet. Again the

Minister of Education fought back. In a letter to a newspaper he wrote:

The Minister of Education, and nobody else, is by law the person responsible for submitting proposals to the Cabinet on matters of educational policy.(69)

It would seem strange to an outsider that differences of such intensity on an important matter like education could exist within a Cabinet for so many years, without one side or the other leaving the government in protest.

One would expect such resignations or even sackings, especially since the protagonists of the conflict aired their differences in public. One possible explanation for this state of affairs, was that the President of the Republic, Archbishop Makarios, with his very strong personality and the overwhelming support he enjoyed, had the power and authority(70) to treat his cabinet ministers like "naughty schoolchildren".(71) Makarios thus acted like a father figure and treated the squabble among his ministers not as a conflict on a vital matter of policy, but rather as inconsequential family differences. In this way Makarios practically ignored not only the voices of protest from within his own government, but also resisted the great pressure from public opinion to sack the Minister of Education and change the government policies on education.

Thus, by keeping silent, Makarios covertly supported his Minister of Education. It was obvious that Makarios lent this support rather unwillingly, otherwise he would have easily silenced the critics, especially those within his government. The reason that Makarios seemed to back the policies on Education was that he could not afford to antagonise Greece. Makarios was in a delicate position. Since the declaration of the Republic there was always a small minority right wing group which pressed him to continue the struggle for Enosis. This group became increasingly militant. On the other hand, there were always differences between Makarios and the Greek governments. These differences reached their climax when the junta came to power in 1967. Eventually, in 1974, the junta overthrew Makarios. Thus, understandably, especially after 1967, Makarios was very reluctant to rock the boat by making any changes on such a sensitive and explosive issue as education.

Eventually in 1970, in a Cabinet reshuffle Dr. Spyridakis was not included in the cabinet. However, significantly, he was succeeded by somebody with almost exactly the same background as Dr. Spyridakis. He was Mr. Frixos Petrides, a classics scholar, and the successor to Dr. Spyridakis as the Headmaster of the Pancyprian Gymnasium. Mr. Petrides, however, tried to be a little more independent. As a result, he was

sacked two years later. In his book "Cyprus, Nationalism and International Politics", Dr. Michael Attalides writes the following on the subject.

Significantly, in one of the few incidents of open conflict with the Greek dictatorship in 1972, the Cypriot President sacrificed his Minister of Foreign Affairs and his Minister of Education for the sake of limiting the overt break with the National Centre. They were critics of the Dictators' Foreign and Educational Policies respectively. Both could be stamped in terms of official Greek culture as "anti-Hellenes" much as American could be stamped as un-American during the MacCarthy era in the United States.(72)

The conflict over education continued even after the fall of the junta and the reinstatement of Makarios. Characteristically, one of the Ministers of Education(1975 - 1977) lost his job as a result of an intense campaign from the right, when he attempted to make changes in the educational system. These changes were considered dangerous because they might have led to the "de-hellenization" of education.(73)

5. CONCLUSION

It is obvious from the above, that the political climate and the ensuing dominant educational philosophy, adversely affected technical education. In the chapters that follow it will be shown that what suffered most were the cooperative programmes, which by definition represent the antithesis of the idealist model of

education. The most significant of the cooperative programmes were the Apprenticeship schemes, which were run jointly by the Ministries of Education and Labour. Thus these programmes suffered on two counts; firstly they did not constitute what the Ministry of Education regarded as a true or valid form of education, and secondly they were torn apart by the deep-rooted differences that existed between the two Ministries.



NOTES AND REFERENCES.

1. Bill Williamson: Education, Social Structure and Development Macmillan 1979 p4.
2. Emile Durkheim: "On Education and Society" in J. Karabel and A. H. Halsey Power and Ideology in Education New York, Oxford University Press. 1977 pp92-104.
3. Persianis P. K. Church and State in Cyprus Education M.A. Thesis (London) Printed at Violaris Printing Works Ltd. Nicosia 1978.
4. Minister of Education: Basic Issues of Educational Policy Nicosia, 1978 p11.
5. Dimaras. A.: "The Movement for Reform - a Historical Perspective" Comparative Education Review February 1978 p3.
6. In the school year 1958-1959 for example, there was only one public technical school in the whole of Greece. The need for technical education was covered by voluntary bodies and entrepreneurs. In the same year there were 64 such private schools in the country. (From the Introductory Note on the Bill on Technical Education tabled in May 1965.- Taken from P.Persianis op.cit.).
7. Butts R. F. A Cultural History of Western Education McGraw Hill Book Co. New York 1955 p49.
8. Kazamias A. Education and Modernization in Greece Office of Education, Bureau of Research Washington D.C. 1974 7-1111.
9. Dimaras A. op. cit. p11.
10. Hadjioannou P. The Role and Significance of Technical and Vocational Education in the Modern World Paper of the OLTEK convention Nicosia 1977.
11. These two terms are taken from: Simpkins W. S. "The Credibility of Leaders" Studies in Educational Administration Commonwealth Council of Educational Administration Dec. 1979 p2.
12. Sir Harry Luke: A Portrait and an Appreciation of Cyprus George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd. London 1965 pp86-87.
13. Doros Alastos: Cyprus in History Zeno Publishers 1955 pp307-308.

14. For an excellent analysis of the "enosis" campaign see: Sir George Hill: A History of Cyprus Volume IV Cambridge University Press 1972 pp488-568.

15. Sir Harry Luke: A Portrait and an Appreciation of Cyprus op. cit. p89.

16. Doros Alastos: Cyprus in History op. cit. pp341-342.

17. The historian Sir G.Hill pointed out that "these privileges, expressing recognition of temporal authority, seem somewhat excessive and have had frequent repercussions down to the present day." (Sir G.Hill op.cit.vol.1 p.278).

18. The Admiralissimo of the Ottoman Navy.

19. Taken from Sir Harry Luke.A Portrait and an Appreciation of Cyprus.op.cit.p.80.

20. For a full analysis of this subject see P.K.Persianis"Church and State in Cyprus Education"op.cit.

21. Conf. Despatch 4 August, 1900. c.O.67/124. Cited in P.K.Persianis, *ibid*.

22. See P.K.Persianis. Church and State in Cyprus Education"*ibid*.

23. In his book Cyprus Under British Rule(Zeno Publishers, London 1972) Captain C.W.J.Orr quoted the following from the 1913 report for the island's Legislative Council: "As regards secondary education, this is not at present directed or controlled by Government. ...The Greeks possess, in the Cyprus Gymnasium, founded in 1893, the largest and most important of the higher educational institutions in the island. It is managed by a committee of which the Archbishop is President and is supported by school fees paid by the pupils, by voluntary contributions especially from the Church and principal monasteries and by individuals, and by a levy on the amount assessed in support of village elementary schools throughout the island. It also receives a grant of £200 per annum from the Government in consideration of the services rendered by it in training masters for the elementary schools. The programme of studies has been framed with a view to preparing students for the University of Athens. Modelled on the Cyprus Gymnasium are five high schools, in the principal towns of the island."

24. See A.Michaelides Dysfunctional Consequences of the Environment on Technical Education in Cyprus (M.A.Thesis) published by the Pedagogical

Institute, Nicosia, Nicosia 1982.

25. Report of the Department of Education for the school year 1935-6 p.17.

26. F.D.Newham (Inspector of Schools). "The System of Education in Cyprus" April 1902. Contained in Board of Education - Special Reports on Education Matters Volume 2, Part 1 Printed for His Majesty's Stationery office by Wayman & Sons Ltd. p.424.

27. J.E.Talbot and F.W.Cope. Report on Education in Cyprus. Printed by Waterloo and Sons Ltd, London, 1913 p.38.

28. Report of the Department of Education, Nicosia, 1935 p.11.

29. Report of the Department of Education for the Period 1942-1945. Nicosia p.18.

30. Sleight G.F. Report of the Department of Education 1942-1945.

31. Sleight G.F. Report of the Department of Education 1945-47. p.17.

32. Ibid. p.19.

33. Sleight G.F. Report of the Department of Education, 1950-1951. p11.

34. Ibid. p.12.

35. Ibid. p.13.

36. Colonial Reports, 1956 p.49.

37. Cyprus Gazette, Nicosia 1957 (239-31).

38. Tudhope W.B. Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year 1955-65 p.49.

39. A.Kouros: Education in Cyprus under British Administration(unpublished PhD Thesis) London 1959, p.236.

40. This view was also shared by P.K.Persianis in The Political and the Economic Factors as The Main Determinants of Educational Policy in Independent Cyprus(PhD Thesis) published by the Pedogogical Institute, Nicosia, 1981.

41. Ministry of Finance: The Second Five Year Plan (1967-71) p.2.

42. A.Patsalides (ex Minister of Finance): Phileleftheros, 30.8.85.
43. Articles 87,88 and 89 of the Constitution.
44. Minutes of the Greek Communal Chamber, 19 February 1963.
45. L.Koullis Greek Education in Cyprus The Education Office, Greek Communal Chamber, Nicosia 1964.
46. Law 12/1965 Cyprus Gazette, No 396, 31 March 1985.
47. Dr. C.Spyridakis: "Statement of Educational Policy" delivered at the House of Representatives 16.6.69.
48. Minutes of the House of Representatives, 23.3.67.
49. Minutes of the House of Representatives 26.7.68.
50. Report of the Pancyprian Federation of Workers (PEO). Nicosia 1965, p.59.
51. Minutes of the House of Representatives, 6.4.67.
52. Speech by the Minister of Labour of the House of Representatives, 23.6.67.
53. Minutes of the House of Representatives 30.3.67.
54. Ibid. 30.3.67.
55. Ibid. 30.3.67.
56. Dr.W.Bakamis, Education in Cyprus 1968, p.9 (Report to the Minister of Education).
57. Bimon Sen: Report on the Development of Technical Education in Cyprus. 1968 p.69.
58. For a list of Technicals Schools and the years of their establishment see Appendix 4.1.
59. The Second Year Plan, p.236, for example, stated "In spite of the expansion, there is still much to be done in the way of promoting technical education, if this is to serve adequately the needs of accelerated economic development."
60. Ten Year Technical Education Review- Ministry of Education, 1971.
61. The Planning Bureau, Nicosia, Second Five Year Plan, p.236. See also Appendix 4.2.

62. See Appendix No.4.2.
63. Television interview by Dr. Spyridakis broadcast on 21.3.67 by the Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation.
64. Minutes of the House of Representatives, 20.3.67.
65. The curriculum in both general and technical schools has always been very broad based. For the subjects taught in both types of school see Appendix 5.
66. Minutes of the House of Representatives, 4.11.69.
67. Minutes of the House of Representatives, 16.6.69.
68. Press interview by the Minister of Education 22.4.70.
69. Letter to the newspaper ELEFTHERIA by the Minister of Education 21.11.69.
70. Mr. A. Papandreou, the present Prime Minister of Greece, wrote the following about Makarios. "He was not just a president, not just an archbishop; he was a chief in the tribal sense. He was identified with the cause of independence and self-determination. But beyond that, he was considered by the Cypriots as the most infallible personification of their country. (A. Papandreou, Democracy at Gunpoint, Penguin Books, 1975, p141).
71. This characterisation, often used during Makarios' presidency, is attributed to a former mayor of Nicosia and opponent of Makarios, Dr. Themistocles Dervis.
72. Q. Press, Edinburgh 1979 p.124.
73. At the time it was reported in the newspapers that Dr. Sophianos was offered another Ministry so that he would be placated, but he refused.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE INTRODUCTION OF APPRENTICESHIP IN CYPRUS

1. Introduction

This chapter addresses itself to the first stages of the implementation of the apprenticeship system in the island and the issues related to its initial development. The most important of these issues centre around the enactment of the apprenticeship law and the subsequent fruitless efforts to implement it.

The hypotheses that will be examined in this section are the following:

- a) There was great initial enthusiasm for the establishment of an apprenticeship system. This enthusiasm waned with the inability to implement the main provisions of the apprenticeship law.
- b) The serious weaknesses in the law were due (i) to the lack of experience of local officials in such matters, and (ii) the failure of these officials to seek the advice of foreign experts, two of which were serving as advisors to the Ministry of Labour at the time of the enactment of the law. (iii) The failure of the Ministry

of Labour to implement the Law determined the subsequent nature and development of the apprenticeship scheme in the island.

2. The Initial Report on the Introduction of Apprenticeship.

Soon after the declaration of the Republic, it was felt that it was desirable to explore the need for establishing an apprenticeship scheme for the training of young craftsmen. Such a scheme would be in accordance with the current practice in most countries and would supplement the training offered on a full-time basis in the technical schools.(1) In order to study the matter further and learn from the experiences of other countries in this field, two delegates were sent to attend a regional seminar on Apprenticeship Systems, organised by the I.L.O. in Cairo between the 8th and the 20th December 1962. The delegates were the Director of Technical Education for the Greek Board of Education, Mr.Syrimis, and the Headmaster of the Technical School, Nicosia, Mr.Hadjinicolos.(2)

The proceedings of the seminar must have helped convince the Cypriot delegates as to the effectiveness of apprenticeship as a system of training young craftsmen, because, only a few days after they returned,

Mr. Syrimis submitted a report recommending that a system of apprenticeship should be set up. The report, (3) dated January 13, 1963, after noting that apprenticeship constitutes an essential part of technical training in every developed country, suggested that "in Cyprus the needs of the expanding industry and the lack of truly trained technicians, made it necessary to introduce an Apprenticeship Scheme immediately". The report further recommended that a very essential provision for the successful application of the scheme would be the close cooperation of all interested parties, i.e. the Ministry of Labour, the Technical Schools, the Employers and the Trade Unions. In the report there were also quite detailed recommendations as to the entry requirements of students, the role of industry, and the setting up of an apprenticeship committee.

The report further suggested that although eventually the system should operate at three levels, for Technicians, for Craftsmen and for Operatives, initially it should start with the Operatives' level where there was the greatest need.

Since there was subsequent debate as to whether it was the Office of Education of the Greek Communal Chamber, or the Ministry of Labour, who initiated the apprenticeship scheme in the island, it may be opportune

at this stage to make some preliminary observations.

On the strength of the above document it seems that the initiative for setting up the scheme of apprenticeship came from the Office of Education, and in particular from its Director Mr.S.Syrimis. This inference is reinforced by the interviews that the researcher had with people who were involved with the introduction of the system.(5) However, it is pertinent to say that Mr. Syrimis tried from the very beginning to involve the Ministry of Labour. In his report in the section on the Apprenticeship Committee, not only did he place the Ministry of Labour first on his recommended list of participants, but he also suggested that:

The committee will be of a permanent nature and will deal with every problem which refers to the system of apprenticeship. The decisions on questions of general policy must be verified by the Productivity Council .(6)

Thus, the recommendation effectively placed the Apprenticeship Committee under the control of the Productivity Council which was an institution set up and dominated by the Ministry of Labour.(7) An obvious question that therefore arises, is why the Office of Education did not choose to keep for itself control of the system, especially in view of the fact that the Ministry of Labour had no training centres of its own. The researcher put this question to the present Director of Technical Education, Mr. Hadjinicolas, who actually worked with Mr. Syrimis in the writing of the report.

Mr. Hadjinicolas' answer was that for political reasons it was the wish of the government that the apprenticeship scheme should be of an inter-communal nature. As such, the responsibility for the scheme could not possibly be given to the Greek Communal Chamber. On the other hand, Mr. Hadjinicolas added, the scheme could not be undertaken by the Ministry of Labour alone, because this Ministry did not have the required facilities. The only solution, therefore, was to create a joint project which would be administered by the Ministry of Labour and operated by the Communal Chambers.

As it happened, the Turkish Communal Chamber never showed much interest in the project. So, in effect, the apprenticeship scheme was eventually run jointly by the Ministry of Labour and the Greek Office of Education, afterwards to become the Ministry of Education. This arrangement, as will be shown in the course of this work, proved to be dysfunctional and a source of friction between the two Ministries.

3. The appointment of the First Apprenticeship Board.

The report by Mr. Syrimis was submitted to the Productivity Council which discussed it at its meeting of the 30th January 1963. The Council agreed in

principle with the main recommendations of the report and decided to appoint from amongst its members an Apprenticeship Board, with the specific task of reporting on the feasibility and advisability of introducing the apprenticeship scheme. The Board was also requested to draw up a plan for the scheme, provided of course it decided that such a scheme should be implemented.(9)

The Board which was under the chairmanship of Mr. Syrimis, Director of Greek Technical Education, consisted of three representatives of the Employers Consultative Association (two Greeks and one Turk), three representatives from the Trade Unions (two Greeks and one Turk) , five representatives from the Technical Schools(all Greeks), one representative from the Ministry of Commerce, two representatives from the Public Works Department, and one representative from the Ministry of Labour.(10)

It may be noted that although government policy was to make apprenticeship an intercommunal project, the constitution of the Board shows that this objective was not really achieved, for in spite of the presence of representatives from the Turkish Employers and Turkish Trade Unions, the group that really mattered, that is the Turkish Technical Schools, were not represented. As a result the apprenticeship scheme was not implemented

on the Turkish side. On the positive side, it may be said that the first apprenticeship Board was a very high-powered group, as the various bodies were represented at the highest possible level.(11)

4. Activities of the First Apprenticeship Board.

Keeping strictly to its terms of reference, the Apprenticeship Board carried out an "investigation"(12) on the training conditions in industry. The Board found that there were no proper training facilities within industry. Also, in the majority of cases trainees were left to learn their trade by watching others, and the time of training was neither specified nor was it governed by contract. As a result of these observations, the Board had no hesitation in recommending that a proper system of training through apprenticeship was badly needed in the island.(13)

Having established that there was need for apprenticeship, the next task of the Board was to make recommendations as to the form apprenticeship should take. For this purpose a subcommittee from among the members of the Board was appointed.(14) The subcommittee held seven lengthy meetings between the 5th March 1963 and the 18th April 1963 during which they prepared a "Plan for the Apprenticeship Scheme".(15) The plan was submitted to the Productivity Council for

consideration on the 23rd April 1963.

Thus, in just over three months from the time the first draft proposal was submitted to the Productivity Council, the complete plan for apprenticeship was prepared and ready for consideration,(16) The plan was a very comprehensive document which eventually formed the basis of the Apprenticeship Law. It is therefore considered useful to give a brief outline of this plan.

5.The Plan for the Apprenticeship Scheme.

The main provisions of the plan were as follows:

5.1 The system of apprenticeship would be under the auspices of the Productivity Council. The basic characteristic of the system would be that the training of the apprentices would be carried out partly at the Technical School and partly in Industry. A special contract would be signed by the apprentice, the employer and the school, binding all concerned and setting out the terms and conditions of apprenticeship.

5.2 The highest body which would direct and supervise the application of the apprenticeship system would be the Apprenticeship Board which would be appointed by the government at the recommendation of the Productivity

Council. The Apprenticeship Board would appoint Joint Apprenticeship Committees for each trade or vocation to which the system of apprenticeship was to be introduced.

5.3 For the introduction of the apprenticeship system to any trade or vocation, there needed to be a proposal to this effect by the Joint Apprenticeship Committee after it had examined the subject in the light of the following four points:

(a) The existence of a satisfactory number of young craftsmen in the trade,

(b) the expected demand for a large number of new craftsmen by industry, (c) the existence of qualified staff and the required equipment at the Technical and Vocational Schools for the theoretical and practical training of the apprentices.

5.4. The Apprenticeship System would be open to young craftsmen from industry (Industry Based Apprentices) and to students of the Technical and Vocational Schools (School based Apprentices) who had completed the basic (two years) course.

Young people who had finished the Eight-Grade Elementary Schools, or who had been for at least two years in any other secondary school would only be accepted if they previously had worked in Industry for at least one year. Apprentices coming from industry with only six year

Elementary Education had to complete their general education by attending supplementary evening classes. An industry-based apprentice could join the Apprenticeship System only if he had been proposed to the Vocational Guidance & Selection Committee by his employer.

A school-based apprentice could enter the Apprenticeship System at the recommendation of the Principal of the School.

School-based apprentices would normally be between 14 - 16 years of age and the industry-based apprentices between 15 - 18. Nevertheless, the maximum age limit for both groups could be extended at the recommendation of the Joint Apprenticeship Committee, if there were special reasons for doing so.

The Industry-based apprentices needed as a rule to have at least one year's industrial experience before they were allowed to enter into the apprenticeship system. This, however, as well as the duration of the apprenticeship course and the distribution of the time of training between the school and industry for both groups of apprentices was to be finally determined by the Joint Apprenticeship committee in accordance with the special needs of each particular trade.

5.5 During the apprenticeship period reports on the progress of the apprentice would be submitted regularly to the Joint Apprenticeship Committee by the school and the employer concerned. Special government inspectors

would also follow the progress made by the apprentices and report on the standard of training offered to the apprentices.

5.6 At the termination of the period of apprenticeship the Apprenticeship Board would confer a Certificate of Completion of Apprenticeship to those who had successfully done so, at the recommendation of the Joint Apprenticeship Committee.

5.7 The Joint Apprenticeship Committee would also hold examinations for the issue of certificates of Proficiency in the trade. These certificates would be issued jointly by the Productivity Council and the Apprentices Board.

5.8 For the application of the Apprenticeship System the following contribution would be required.

(a) Apprentice's Contribution:

The acceptance of wages lower than the normal ones earned by other people of his age and education.

(b) Employer's Contribution:

i) The apprenticeship allowance paid to the apprentice.

ii) The release of the apprentice to attend lessons at the technical schools.

(c) Government's Contribution (Directly or through the Comm. Chambers.)

- i) The provision of classrooms and workshops.
- ii) The teachers' and the instructors' salaries.
- iii) The supply of materials, work uniforms etc.,

6. The Introduction of Apprenticeship on a Voluntary Basis.

The Productivity Council at its meeting of May 1963 approved in principle the plan tabled by the Apprenticeship Board and instructed the Board to introduce, as soon as possible, apprenticeship in a number of occupations "of which industry was in dire need". These were carpentry and joinery, electronics, automechanics, welders, hotel and catering, building and agriculture.(17)

Following the Council's instructions, the Board proceeded with the appointment of the Joint Apprenticeship Committees in the apprenticeable trades. The main task of these committees, which were composed of representatives of the employers, the trade unions, the Labour Office and the technical schools, was to construct the courses. These were duly completed and approved by the Board before the commencement of the school year on 15th September 1963.

The public announcement of the introduction of apprenticeship was made by the Minister of Labour,

Mr. Papadopoulos, at a press conference on the 18th November 1963, (18), outlined the nature and the aims of the scheme and urged youth to enrol in the apprenticeship classes in order to pursue a career in the technical field as skilled technicians and craftsmen. Otherwise, he said, there was real danger of their remaining in the ranks of the permanently unemployed, since the chances for a secondary school graduate to secure a clerical job in the government or industry were very dim indeed.

At the press conference it was also announced that the question of legislation to regulate apprenticeship would be left for consideration at a later stage, after industry had time to acquaint itself with apprenticeship and understand its significance". Meanwhile the scheme would be run on a "voluntary basis", mainly by the Apprenticeship Committees, with the Ministry of Labour "serving as the coordinator and supervisor of the whole scheme".(19)

Although the original intention was to set up seven schemes in as many schools as possible, eventually only four classes were formed, goldsmiths-silversmiths, welders and electricians in Nicosia, joiners-cabinet makers in Limassol. It would be interesting to note that the schemes introduced did not coincide with the original list of trades that the Productivity Council recommended. Goldsmithing, for example, was not included

in the original list of priorities. Also, it would seem rather incongruous that there were classes of welders and electricians in Nicosia and not in the other big centre, Limassol, or for that matter, that there was a class of joiners in Limassol and not in Nicosia. Since both Nicosia and Limassol Technical Schools could cope with any of the above courses, (20) and since in both areas there was great need for craftsmen (21), the criteria or reasons for choosing the first trades are significant as they might shed light on how the system worked at the time.

On this subject the researcher interviewed Mr. Syrimis, who in his twin role as the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board and the Director of Technical Education, seemed to be the initial architect of the scheme. When questioned Mr. Syrimis said that from the very beginning it was obvious to him that the way the first apprenticeship classes were established and run, would be crucial to the success of the whole scheme. Thus his main preoccupation at the time was not so much how to find the "right" trades, but how to find the "right" people to initiate the programmes. He directed his efforts, therefore, towards finding such instructors as would have both the ability and the will to put in the enormous amount of work that was needed to get the programmes off the ground.

It was obvious Mr. Syrimis added, that though we had set up joint apprenticeship committees to draw up the curricula, most of the work involved would have to be done by the instructors themselves. Mr. Syrimis was also sure that at the end of the day it would be the instructors, as employees of the state, who would have to find the apprentices and convince them to enrol, as well as persuade the employers to release them to attend school. Therefore, Mr. Syrimis continued, the choice of the pilot schemes was based on the availability of the best and keenest instructors. These instructors were nominated as members of the joint apprenticeship committees and they were also appointed as inspectors, so that they would be able to follow the progress of apprentices, both at school and in industry. Furthermore, steps were taken so that these instructors would be elected as chairmen of the joint apprenticeship committees. Thus, at the initial stages, Mr. Syrimis concluded, the success of the scheme literally depended on a handful of select technical school instructors. Looking back he believed that, under the circumstances, this was the best possible policy that could have been followed. Of course, he admitted, he might not have been able to pursue this course of action had he not been able to act in a dual capacity of Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board and Director of Technical Education.

The other important point, of course, was that by having his own instructors acting as inspectors, and also by exercising control over the apprenticeship committees, Mr. Syrimis, and through him the Ministry of Education, kept apprenticeship under his control.

As for the syllabi, it may be noted at this stage that they were officially described as "prepared on the lines of the City and Guilds Institute (craft level) adapted to requirements of Cyprus Industry".(22) There was some effort to set uniform standards, subjects and duration. For example, all apprentices were taught Greek, Mathematics, English, Technical Drawing, Workshop Technology, Technical Physics and Workshops. Also all trades followed a three year course. However, at the initial stages the number of hours of courses varied.(23) This "weakness" was removed later on as the objective, from the very beginning, was to make all courses equivalent.(24)

In concluding this section it should be mentioned that doubtless the scheme met with success at the initial stages, at least as far as such success could be judged by the proliferation of apprenticeship trades, classes, and centres. Thus, from the humble beginnings of four trades and 54 students in two centres in 1963, by 1967 there were seven trades, four centres and 259

students.(25) This was undoubtedly due to the early enthusiasm for the scheme of everybody concerned, especially the teachers. It is also pertinent to point out that at the initial stages there did not seem to be any antagonism over apprenticeship between the Ministries of Labour and Education.

7. The Enactment of the Apprenticeship Law.

It took over two years after the approval of the Apprenticeship Plan by the Productivity Council, and the commencement of the first classes of apprentices, for the Bill for Apprenticeship to be tabled at the House of Representatives. This period seems rather long in view of the initial haste with which the Apprenticeship Plan was drawn up and approved. There are several obvious explanations for the delay. Firstly, the Bill was a much more exacting and comprehensive document than the Plan, so it needed more time to prepare. Secondly, the office of the Attorney General, whose responsibility it was to turn the Plan into a legal format did not feel the same sense of urgency as either the Ministry of Labour or the Ministry of Education. A third explanation is that as the apprenticeship classes were already operating, most of the pressure was off. The delay generally made the Ministry officials feel uneasy. At the same time, however, it was considered by some as a blessing in disguise, as it allowed the idea of

apprenticeship to be more widely accepted, whilst the Ministry of Labour was being given the opportunity to receive feedback from the apprenticeship schemes which were already in operation.(26)

The Bill was introduced to the House of Representatives on the 9th Dec. 1965. In his introductory speech, the Minister of Labour Mr. Papadopoulos stated that in his opinion the Bill was one of the most important, if not the most important, legislative measures ever introduced by the Ministry of Labour.(27) The Apprenticeship Law was enacted unanimously, with the warm acclaim of public opinion(28) on the 28th April 1966.(29)

B.Differences between the Apprenticeship Plan and the Apprenticeship Law.

At first glance one could get the impression that the Apprenticeship Law was drawn up on the same lines as the Apprenticeship Plan, as it incorporated some of the main characteristics of the Plan, like the establishment of the Board of Apprenticeship and the Apprenticeship Committees, the duration of apprenticeship, the appointment of inspectors and so on. However, closer examination reveals that the Law constituted, in fact, a significant departure from the plan; for, whereas the Plan clearly intended in the matters of apprenticeship the two Ministries to be equal partners, in the Law the

sole responsibility over apprenticeship was given to the Ministry of Labour.

Thus, in the preliminary section of the law it is stated that the "Minister" means the Minister of Labour and Social Insurance. There is no mention in the Law of the Minister of Education. The Minister of Labour is vested with the authority to determine policy and exercise control over apprenticeship.

These powers in the plan belonged to the Apprenticeship Board which, as the highest body, "would direct and supervise the application of the apprenticeship system". In this way, the Plan provided that through the Apprenticeship Board the two Ministries, being equally represented, would have equal power. In the Law, however, the role of the Apprenticeship Board was relegated to being an advisory body to the Minister, both on general matters of policy, as well as of general administration. The Law even provided that the appointment of the Board would be made by the Minister and not by the Council of Ministers. The Minister also appointed the Apprenticeship Committees and the inspectors, both of which in the Plan were to be appointed by the Board. With these changes, therefore, the control of the Minister of Labour over apprenticeship became, according to the law, almost

absolute.

In this way apprenticeship, which started with the initiative of the Education Department, and in which the Ministry of Labour was requested to participate for matters of political expediency, was practically taken over by the Ministry of Labour. It was, therefore, amazing, especially in view of the antagonism that started to develop between the two Ministries at the time (30), that the Ministry of Education made no effort to redress the balance, whilst the Bill was being debated in the House. One would have expected that, at least, the Department of Technical Education, which had put so much work in initiating the system, would have tried to maintain greater control over apprenticeship.

The explanation for the passive acceptance of the Law by the Ministry of Education, lies in the personal relationships of the protagonists at the time. By the time the Bill was drafted Mr. Syrimis had left the island(31) and his job was taken over by the Headmaster of the Nicosia Technical School, Mr.Hadjinicolos, who was a friend and collaborator of the Minister of Labour Mr. Papadopoulos .(32)

Therefore, it seems that Mr. Hadjinicolos, who had jurisdiction over apprenticeship in the Ministry of Education, was convinced not to oppose the Law. Furthermore, in view of the highly compartmentalised way

in which the Ministry of Education operated, it would be unlikely for anybody else to raise the matter.

After all the efforts of the Ministry of Labour to gain control of apprenticeship, it seems therefore ironical that the major provisions of the Law, through which such control would become effective, were never implemented. In fact, the articles of the Law that were implemented were the ones that had already been in operation under the voluntary scheme since 1963. These were the articles relating to the establishment and functions of the Board, the appointment of the Apprenticeship Committees and the appointment of inspectors. Other important articles relating to the issuing of industrial training orders, the contracts of apprenticeship, the engagement and training of apprentices and the designated standards were never implemented. Most damaging of all, however, was the inability of the Ministry of Labour to implement the article which provided for the payment of a levy of one per cent. on the part of the payroll of any industry engaged in activities specified as "apprenticeable industry". Without the levy, the Ministry of Labour simply had no money to carry out its plans.

The non-implementation of some of the most crucial provisions of the law could be considered, therefore, as the most significant single factor in determining the

nature of apprenticeship in the island. The failure to implement the Law was naturally a serious blow to the prestige of the Ministry of Labour. The reasons for this failure will be the subject of the next section.

9. Problems in the Implementation of the Law.

Only seven days after the enactment of the Law, on the 6th of May 1966, there was a meeting of officials and foreign experts of the Ministry of Labour, under the chairmanship of the Director General, to discuss the implementation of the Law. The minutes of the meeting give the impression that the Director General was concerned with problems of purely procedural nature such as the appointment of the Board and the Apprenticeship Committees, the drafting of the apprenticeship Orders and the contracts of apprenticeship.

However, at the meeting Mr.S.M.Jacob, the Employment Services' Adviser to the Ministry, came out with an amazing statement that must have shaken the other participants, that in his view the Law was impracticable to implement. Even more amazing was the fact that he had expressed this concern at an earlier date and soon after his arrival on the island, at a time when the Apprentices Bill was still being considered at the House of Representatives. The Law, Mr.Jacob explained, was

based partly on the United Kingdom Industrial Training Act of 1964, but, departing from its major points of principle, included parts of legislation from other countries. The result was such that the law was impossible to interpret or implement. Moreover, he added, even if this were possible, it would impose a much larger demand on the administrative machine and on the available staffing and training resources than had been realized. The Director General, after hearing the remarks of Mr. Jacob, suggested a deeper study of the law, section by section.(33)

As a result of the eye-opening revelations of the above meeting, much time was spent in urgent discussions among the officials of the Ministry of Labour (including the experts), and the office of the Attorney General, in order to ascertain whether there were in fact any weaknesses either in the law itself, or in the scheme in general. These deliberations led to certain conclusions contained in a document of the Ministry of Labour.(34) The main findings and recommendations contained in the document were as follows:

9.1 Apprenticiable Industries.

Most of the provisions of the Apprenticeship Law could not become fully operative until "Industrial Training Orders" had been made. These orders specified

activities of industry and commerce, which would then become known as "apprenticeable industries" . When an Industrial Training Order was made, the "apprenticeable industry" that was created became subject to other sections of the Law including levy orders. Levy orders specified, among other things, the part of the payroll of "every industry engaged in activities covered by the apprenticeable industry" on which a levy was to be imposed.

Thus the Law could not become effective unless the various orders to be under it could be applied to those persons whom it was designed to affect, i.e. the apprentices and the skilled workers with whom they were associated. Difficulties, however, arose with the term "industry". The definition of "industry" provided in the law included business, trade, manufacture, handicraft, calling, occupation and any branch thereof. Presumably, therefore, it would have been legally permissible to use any of these divisions for defining the activities of industry and commerce but the main criteria had to be whether the definitions used conformed with industrial and commercial practice and whether they could be precisely and easily interpreted so as to make administration feasible.

During the deliberations on the possible methods of defining the "activities of industry and commerce" the

following internationally accepted ways of classifying workers were considered:

1. By the economic activity of the establishment in which they are employed i.e., as it is usually termed, by INDUSTRY.
2. By the trade, profession or type of work performed by the individual, i.e. by OCCUPATION.
3. By economic status, i.e. whether employers, employees, self-employed etc.

Of the above three methods of classification, it was decided that Nos.(1) and (2) were relevant for the Apprentices Law. The relevance is very significant because as apprentices are associated with occupations and not with industries, the part of the payroll on which the levy was to be imposed would have to be determined on an occupational basis. As the law stood it was not at all clear whether it was envisaged that separate levy orders would be made for separate occupations or even for separate establishments. Both points were, however, extremely relevant for the administration and enforcement of the law.

9.2 Industrial Training Orders.

Related to the above, was the issue of the Industrial

Training Orders. It was not easy in reading the law to appreciate the basis on which it was intended that Industrial Training Orders should be made. This section was a virtual reproduction of U.K. Industrial Training Act in which orders established Industrial Training Boards on an industrial basis. In the U.K. the application of the Act was not limited to apprentices and no such term as "apprenticeable industry" was used. The use of this phrase, together with the definition given to the word "industry", suggested that it was intended that apprenticeable industries would be on an occupational basis. Many provisions of the Law supported this view. On the other hand the provisions indicated that Industrial Training Orders would be on an industrial basis. Thus, the law stated that before making an industrial training order, the "Council of Ministers shall consult any organisation or association of organisation appearing to it to be representative of a substantial number of employers engaging in the activities concerned.....". Employers' Associations are normally organised on an industrial basis, i.e. they could be representative of the hotel and catering industry but not of waiters or cooks. The same point arose in the establishment of Apprenticeship Committees. A decision had to be taken, therefore, as to the principle on which Training Orders were to be made.

10. Other Weaknesses in the Law.

In addition to the above fundamental deficiencies, the following weaknesses in the law were also identified:

10.1 Originally when the Law was drafted there was a provision for grants to be paid to those employers who provided training of a standard approved by the Apprenticeship Board. This provision was later omitted from the Law.

The objective of the grant was to induce employers to make their own arrangements for training. Thus, the original idea was that an employer who provided no training would have to pay a levy, but would get no grant. On the other hand an employer who provided training would pay the levy but would receive grants towards the cost of training.

In the Law, however, it was provided that "good" employers would have to

- (a) pay the levy,
- (b) provide adequate facilities for training,
- (c) provide instructors,
- (d) pay the stipend of apprentices.

Thus the tendency would be that employers would not offer training since they would pay the levy in addition to bearing the cost of training. The effect of this provision could be to deter industry from undertaking training and therefore the main aim, i.e. the incentive

of industry to provide training, would be defeated.

10.2 If the levy was imposed on every employer with employees coming under this Law, the establishments which did not have access to a technical school because of the distances involved, would be penalised, as they would not benefit from the training offered to apprentices.

10.3 Section 14 of the Law, which gave the right to the Trade Unions to negotiate collective agreements with the employers for the stipend and conditions of employment of apprentices, was against the spirit of the Trade Union Law, which provided that apprentices between the age of 14-16 were not permitted to be members of the Trade Unions.

10.4 The Law provided that the Levy would be collected, as any other tax of the Republic, under the Tax Collection Law. This was considered to be wrong. Psychologically it would give the impression that the Government was after inflicting extra taxation on the Industry, rather than sharing with the Industry the expense of training the skilled workers that the Industry needed.

10.5 In Section 5(i)(b) of the Law it was provided that the Board, in co-operation with the Productivity

Centre, would make recommendations to the Minister aiming at accelerated training of apprentices who needed to acquire industrial competence quickly. This, however, was incompatible with section 9(2) which required the period of training to be not less than two years.

11. Despondency and Doubts over the Need for the Law.

The serious mistakes committed over the drafting of the law brought about a feeling of disappointment and despondency in the Ministry of Labour.(35) Inevitably there were also doubts as to the competency of the Ministry of Labour, with the means it had at its disposal, to deal with the complicated issues involved in the Apprenticeship Scheme. These doubts were expressed by Mr. Jacob in his Report to the Cyprus Government on his departure from the island, as follows:

Up to date the work of considering and preparing legislation and in planning and in administering existing training schemes has fallen mainly on the small and inexperienced staffing resources in the employment section of Headquarters. It has been additional to the employment service work already undertaken. The lack of sufficient staff with adequate time to study the many new problems which would ensue from complicated training developments has been a major factor in causing difficulties which have arisen over industrial training. (36)

In the same report Mr. Jacob also put in writing the doubts that were in many people's minds at the time, as to the urgency, or even usefulness, of the Law. Mr. Jacob wrote the following:

For reasons made clear on a number of occasions during the period of secondment, this law seems impracticable to implement; moreover it is doubtful whether, in fact, apprenticeship training at the time needs to be dealt with by legislation.

If there is a need for legislation it is probably more in relation to industrial training and retraining as a whole rather than any specific aspect of it. It is recommended that action to implement the Apprenticeship Law should at present be confined to the establishment of the Apprentices Board. This is, in fact, all that is immediately required by the Law. It is further recommended that technical assistance should be obtained to advise on what administrative measures of legislation, if any, are appropriate in the overall context of Government's participation in industrial training. (37)

As a result of the above developments the idea ripened in the Ministry of Labour that the best course of action would be to shelve the Apprenticeship Law and continue operating the scheme on a voluntary basis. However, the embarrassment of the Ministry of Labour over the matter was such, that it kept the difficulties over the implementation of the law to itself.(38)

Consequently the other "partners" in the scheme became impatient, as they could not understand the apparently inexplicable delay of the government. The following extract from a letter, dated 12.1.67, and sent from the general secretary of the largest trade union in the island, P.E.O., who was a member of the first Apprenticeship Board and an enthusiast of the scheme, speaks for itself.

The implementation of the Law is being delayed and because of this delay serious problems have been created in the operation of the Apprenticeship System. We have had information that there are differences regarding the

remuneration of apprentices and confusion as to the standard of apprentices, the curriculum and the responsibilities of the inspectors. We would request you, therefore, to enlighten us on the present situation as to the implementation of the law.(39)

Other parties followed suit in putting pressure on the Ministry of Labour to take action, so eventually it became impossible for the Ministry to let the matter lie. However, instead of disclosing the fact that it had already been shown that the Law was impracticable, the Ministry, rather diplomatically, decided to pass on the matter to the Apprenticeship Board, which was requested to study the Law and report on its implementation. In this way the Ministry got out of revealing its previous actions which, unavoidably, would lead others to realize that things had been concealed from them. The Apprenticeship Board set up a committee to study the Law which, in due course, with the obvious help of the officials of the Ministry, reached the same conclusions as the ones described above.(40)

12. The Harburger Report.

Before the Ministry of Labour made up its mind on the course of action to be taken, the Minister personally requested technical assistance from the Israeli Government, which in the Minister's view had wide experience in the field of apprenticeship training.(41) The government of Israel responded promptly to the

request by sending to the island Mr. Peretz Harburger, Director of the Department of Youth and Technical Training in the Ministry of Labour of Israel. Mr. Harburger submitted a report (42) which was significant in two ways. It helped the Ministry to decide upon the immediate course of action and also it pointed towards alternative long term solutions to the problems at hand.

The main comments and recommendations in the report were the following:

(a) The Apprenticeship Law was passed by the House of Representatives only 3 years after the Government started dealing with apprenticeship on a voluntary basis — much too short a time for gaining the experience needed for conceiving and implementing an effective law.

It seemed that no measure of intelligent effort could take the place of practical experience. The Danish Apprenticeship Law was on the agenda of Parliament for ten years until it was confirmed and the Israeli Apprenticeship Law passed Parliament after 25 years of voluntary apprenticeship, supervised and regulated by the public authorities.

(b) If an Apprenticeship Law is necessary or not depends upon the social, economic and technological level of development of a country. In a country with tradition and history in training, where both the Employers and the Unions have for a long time been conscious of the

importance of apprenticeship, it might be advisable to proceed without a Law. On the other hand, in developing countries where the above three factors do not exist, it is generally preferable to have a Law. In the case of Cyprus a Law would be useful.

(c) In view of the difficulties over the implementation of the Law, there were three options:

- (i) to disregard the Law
- (ii) to implement the Law
- (iii) to change the Law.

Mr. Harburger did not advocate the disregarding of the Law. There were a number of developing countries which had on paper ambitious compulsory educational Laws with only 10% or 20% of the Law implemented. He did not recommend the third course, to change the Law, for two reasons: Firstly he was sure that most of the provisions of the Law could be implemented, and secondly not enough experience had been gained in trying to implement the Law. Therefore his recommendation was to try, during the following two or three years, to implement as much as possible of the Law in its present form. Then after gaining more experience, the question of making changes in the Law could be considered.

(d) The levy was a thorny problem. The first question that was raised was how direct could taxation for apprenticeship and generally for vocational and

technical education be , in view of the fact that the whole of society benefits from vocational training. However, it seemed doubtful that the public would accept general indirect taxation for partial or total financing of apprenticeship. On the other hand it would be unfair to burden particular employer with the tax according to their need for skilled workers. A good solution would be to raise part of the necessary money as a percentage of the total payroll of the whole economy. This was successfully done in Europe.

13. The Implementation of the Law is Shelved.

Soon after the Harburger Report was submitted, a meeting was convened at the Productivity Centre under the chairmanship of the Minister of Labour.(43) The meeting, which constituted the climax of the deliberations on the future of the Apprenticeship Scheme, was attended by the members of the Apprenticeship Board, representatives of the employers and trade unions, government officials, including a senior counsel from the office of the Attorney General, and two foreign experts. These were Mr. Harburger and Mr. Elf Breck, Senior Executive Officer of the Building Construction Training Board in the U.K. The British expert Mr. Jacob was not present as he had already left the island.

At the meeting the Minister, after reviewing the weaknesses and limitations of the Law, said that it was open to debate whether it was advisable to proceed with the existing voluntary apprenticeship scheme and ignore the Law, or whether the Law was necessary and consequently efforts had to be made to alter or amend it, where necessary, so as to render it workable.(44)

The Minister further admitted that the legal drafting of the Law was not up to the standard required for the statute. After a careful study of the Law,(45), and on the advice of his assistants and the experts, he came to realize that the Law in its present form could not be implemented. He would like, the minister said, to hear the views of the parties present, and if all agreed that the Law needed alterations or amendments, he would not hesitate to submit them to the House of Representatives.

He emphasised, however, that it was absolutely necessary to make sure that with the proposed amendments the Law would be workable.

In spite of the frankness of the Minister and his open invitation to all parties to submit their own proposals, it was obvious that nobody expected the serious problems facing apprenticeship to be resolved at a meeting. In this respect it is significant that the government representatives, although they had already studied the matter in depth, did not venture to table a plan of

action. Therefore the meeting could be considered as a public relations exercise which aimed at absolving the Ministry of Labour, at least partially, of its failures, by involving all interested parties in the final decision-making.

The meeting was of course inconclusive. After a long discussion, the Minister, in order to give a "last chance" for the problems to be resolved, requested the Senior Employment Officer of the Ministry of Labour and the representative of the Attorney General to study the Law further and submit a report.

After the meeting of the 20th May, 1968, the implementation of the main provisions of the Law, was effectively shelved. About a year later, in a memorandum to his Director General, the Senior Employment Officer wrote the following:

Irrespective of the difficulties we have had in our efforts to implement fully the Law, Apprenticeship has improved considerably, and the number of apprentices has increased. Furthermore we expect greater progress when the section on Industrial Training operates in the following year.(46)

The above statement indicates that by 1969 the Ministry had given up any hope of implementing the Law, and would try to improve as much as it could the "voluntary" system of apprenticeship. However, in taking the option, the Ministry must have been fully aware that the scope of apprenticeship on a voluntary basis would be

seriously diminished. The reason that the Ministry of Labour took this policy decision, seemingly without being unduly bothered by this unfortunate turn of events, was that it had already started to turn its attention to other "grander" designs. The nature of these designs and their effect on the apprenticeship system will be the subject of the next chapter.

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

1. Report of the Director of Technical Education - Greek Education Office, May 1962.

2. Both these officials were to play a very prominent part in the development of the Apprenticeship System in the years to come.

3. S. Syrimis: A Proposal of the Director of Technical Education for the Introduction of Apprenticeship. Ministry of Education, January 1963.

4. There seemed to be some confusion over the terms "craftsmen" and "operative" because, although it was proposed that the greatest need was for the operative's level, the schemes that were eventually set up, judging by the City and Guilds standards, were definitely of the craft level.

5. The researcher had interviews on the subject with Mr.N.Hadjinicolas and Mr.G.Christodoulides, who participated in the initial planning of Apprenticeship in the island.

6. Op.cit. S.Syrimis: A Proposal of the Director of Technical Education for the Introduction of Apprenticeship.

7. The Productivity Council was a body appointed by the Council of Ministers. At the Council, which was chaired by the Minister of Labour, were represented, at a very high level, Employer Associations, Trade Unions, and Government officials.

8. The speed with which the report was considered, only two weeks after it was submitted, and the immediate decision to take further action, is in itself an indication of the enthusiasm and the commitment of all concerned to implement an apprenticeship scheme as soon as possible.

9. Minutes of the Productivity Council, 30th January, 1963.

10. 1963 Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance p.13.

11. The members of the first Apprenticeship Board included the general secretaries of the two largest trade unions in the island, the president and the secretary of the Employers Association and high ranking government officials.

12. The researcher found no evidence to show that the

Board carried out a systematic survey to ascertain the training conditions in the industry. It may be safely assumed, therefore, that the findings of the Board were based primarily on the very extensive knowledge of the industry of the members of the Board.

13. 1963 Ministry of Labour Annual Report p13

14. The subcommittee included three officers of the Technical Education Department, two officers of the Ministry of Labour, two trade union representatives and three representatives of the employer associations.

15. Members of the committee during interviews revealed to the researcher that the meetings, which were often stormy as some very controversial issues needed to be resolved, often went on late in the night.

16. As will be shown later, the great haste with which the plan was prepared, in order to have a scheme ready for apprenticeship classes to start in September 1963, led to serious mistakes.

17. Minutes of the Productivity Council: Date: 25th May 1963.

18. The fact, that the announcement of the introduction of the scheme was made one and a half months after the commencement of lessons, is indicative of the haste with which the scheme was established.

19. Statement by the Minister of Labour and Social Insurance, Mr. Tassos Papadopoulos, on the introduction of Apprenticeship Schemes in Cyprus, Ministry of Labour, 18.11.1963.

20. At the time all these courses, apart from goldsmithing, were taught at the school to regular students.

21. A tentative projection of additional labour requirements by occupational category for the period 1963 - 1966 showed that an increase of 39.8% in skilled and semi-skilled workers were needed for the period. (Source: Dept. of Statistics).

22. Ministry of Labour 1963, Annual Report.

23. The electricians and the welders attended school all day Friday and Saturday mornings. The goldsmiths had three afternoons (Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday), and the cabinet-makers one full day (Thursday).

24. "Plan for Apprenticeship", Ministry of Education, 1963.

25. See Appendix 4.2.

26. Comments expressed by the former Apprenticeship Officer, Mr. Demetriou, in an interview with the researcher.

27. Minutes of the House of Representatives of 9th December, 1965.

28. All newspapers welcomed the introduction of the scheme. Also there were favourable comments in the bulletins of the two main trade unions, P.E.O. and S.E.K.

29. For full text of the Apprenticeship Law please see Appendix No.

30. For the antagonism between the two Ministries, see chapter 6.

31. Mr. Syrimis took up appointment as an education expert at the Unesco head office in Paris.

32. The friendship between Mr. Papadopoulos and Mr. Hadjinicolas is a well known fact among the officials of the Ministries of Education and Labour.

33. Minutes of the meeting, 6th May 1966, Ministry of Labour.

34. "Difficulties which will be encountered of the Implementation of the Law." Ministry of Labour, 25th May 1966.

35. Almost all officials of the Ministry of Labour, who were interviewed by the researcher, described the mistakes over the Apprenticeship Law as the greatest blunder ever made by the Ministry of Labour.

36. Jacob: J. "Craft Apprenticeship in Cyprus", Ministry of Labour, January 1968

37. Idem.

38. Indicative of the secrecy with which the affair was handled was the fact that, as the Director of Technical Education revealed to the researcher, not even the Ministry of Education had any knowledge of the problems.

39. File on Apprenticeship: Ministry of Labour.

40. The report of the subcommittee was submitted to the Board on the 9th November, 1967.

41. A statement by the Ministry of Labour published in the Cyprus Mail on 17th May, 1968 included the following:

"Israel's experience in Apprenticeship and Vocational Training is considered by the International Labour Office as one of the most advanced in the World."

42. P.F.Harburger: Apprenticeship in Cuorus and the Apprenticeship Law 1966 Ministry of Labour, Jerusalem, 1968.

43. The meeting was held on the 20th May, 1968.

44. The researcher has based his report of the meeting on the official minutes.

45. The Minister of Labour was himself a lawyer by profession.

46. Ministry of Labour File 4/67 of 9.5.69.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE INDUSTRIAL TRAINING AUTHORITY

1. INTRODUCTION

After the disappointment of the Apprenticeship Law, the Ministry of Labour, quite undeterred by its failure, set out with undiminished fervour to seek new and more effective avenues through which it could gain control of manpower training in the island. There seems to be no doubt that, at the time, the guiding principle which determined the Ministry of Labour policy in this field, was that manpower training was far too important a matter to be left in the hands of the Ministry of Education.(1)

The quest of the Ministry of Labour for an alternative way by which it could control manpower training culminated in the establishment of the Industrial Training Authority in 1974. The creation of the I.T.A. was therefore the last, and most successful, of a series of schemes through which the Ministry of Labour tried to further its designs. In the pursuance of this policy, the Ministry of Labour, as expected, met with strong resistance on the part of the Ministry of Education. The resistance grew, as the Ministry of Education felt

increasingly threatened by the actions of the Ministry of Labour, until it became yet another open struggle between the two Ministries over the control of Technical and Vocational Education.

The researcher has chosen to insert this chapter, before proceeding with further examination of the various aspects of the apprenticeship system, mainly for two reasons. Firstly, because the actions leading to the creation of the I.T.A., as well as its subsequent operation, lend support to the hypothesis that the non-cooperation between the two Ministries has had a detrimental effect on Technical and vocational education in the island, and secondly, because the I.T.A. itself was, by law, required to take over responsibility for apprenticeship in the island. In the light of the above this chapter will (a) outline the various attempts of the Ministry of Labour to set up training institutions or structures, and (b) examine the initial intentions and the actual effect of these attempts on the training of apprentices in the island. More specifically it will be shown that, although initially the prime purpose in the efforts that led to the establishment of the I.T.A. was to create a better framework for Apprenticeship, when this objective was realized, the I.T.A. shied away from any responsibility over apprenticeship as it showed greater interest in other more "prestigious" projects.

2.0 THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAMME

2.1 The Nature and Objectives of the Proposed Programme.

The first attempt of the Ministry of Labour to introduce a nation-wide, comprehensive programme of training was initiated in April 1967. This was envisaged as a very ambitious project to be jointly financed by the Cyprus Government and the United Nations. The initial total estimated cost of the project amounted to \$2,318,286. Of this sum the Government contribution, which would cover mainly the cost of land, buildings, and salaries of the local staff was estimated as \$1,250,461. The assistance to be requested from the United Nations special fund was \$1,067,825, which was intended to cover expert services, fellowships and equipment.

The Ministry of Labour presented its case with a very detailed and lengthy document- it ran to over 150 pages- under the title "Request to the United Nations Special Fund for Assistance in the Establishment of a National Training Programme".(2) The document, which included an analysis of the current economic situation in the island and the target of the Second Five Year Plan, presented a great number of arguments as to why the proposed project would greatly help in the achievement of the targets of the Plan by increasing productivity. The objectives of the Programme were the following:

(a) To cooperate with the Ministry of Labour and Social

Insurance in the establishment of a training division and to coordinate all training activities of that Ministry.

(b) To provide training Advisory and Consultancy Services in Management, similar to those being followed at the Cyprus Productivity Centre with special emphasis in the field of the smaller enterprises, through the establishment of a small-scale Industries Service Unit.

(c) To provide vocational training facilities in selected trade skills as was currently being done for the upgrading of skilled industrial workers.

(d) To provide training facilities for the training of industrial foremen, supervisors and industrial trainers.

(e) To establish a systematic and regulated apprenticeship programme, based upon predetermined trade and training standards and the training of the supporting staff for the apprenticeship programme.

The document also suggested the creation of an Industrial Training Section within the Ministry of Labour which would be responsible, inter alia, for the overall training policy, planning, coordination of all training activities carried out under the Ministry. Finally, the document suggested the establishment of a "National Manpower Advisory Board."

2.2 Expression of Doubts as to the Adequacy of the Technical Schools.

In the document there was an attempt to justify the request by raising doubts as to the efficiency of the technical schools and their ability to meet the demands of industry. In this respect the following quotation leaves no doubt as to the intentions of the authors of the document:

.....attention is forcibly drawn to the fact that, as in many other countries, the technical and vocational schools are not in a position to meet the changing needs of industry. They cannot offer accelerated forms of training to adults, and furthermore, the training which is being offered leans heavily on theory rather than practice. The curriculum is not flexible and timely changes cannot be made to meet the demands of industry created as a result of expansion, development and technological change. (3)

In order to support the above claims, the Minister of Labour revealed in the document that "because of the urgency to gear better the production of skills to industrial improvement" the Council of Ministers appointed during 1966 a sub-committee, consisting of representatives from the Ministries of Labour, Education, Finance, Commerce and Industry and from the Productivity Centre, to study the possibility of the establishment, in the future, of training facilities separate from those existing in the technical schools, and to submit accordingly recommendations to the Council. According to the document, the sub-committee consulted with representatives of industry and recommended, inter alia, that "the whole educational

system should be studied and readapted to meet the developing needs of the economy", and that "the upgrading systems and apprenticeship schemes should be further developed and expanded".(4)

2.3 Proposal for a New Form of Apprenticeship.

After outlining the existing scheme of apprenticeship the document stressed the difficulties that the system was facing. Particular emphasis was placed on the following:

(a) The great majority of industrial concerns in Cyprus were too small to provide adequate industrial training to the apprentices in their employ.

(b) Experience in conducting the apprenticeship scheme showed that, although there was full cooperation from industry and from the Ministry of Education in conducting the day-release classes, "in no one instance in the case of the smaller industries has it been discernible that the apprentices are receiving training which at the end of their apprenticeship could qualify them to be classified as true craftsmen."

Therefore, the document argued, the Ministry of Labour should have its own training facilities in which the apprentices would be able to receive a full 12 months basic trade-training. This would be followed by 2-3 years of supervised training in industry, coupled with day release attendance at a training institute for further technological instruction. The whole training

would be based upon predetermined trade and training standards.

2.4 Discussion of the Programme.

The document with an accompanying letter(6), was first submitted to the Director General of the Planning Bureau for consideration. In the letter it was stated that the idea of establishing the programme originated from the I.L.O. Regional Vocational Training Advisor, Hugo Lane, after he had consulted with private and government individuals, including the Director General of the Planning Bureau himself. The Ministry of Labour subscribed fully to the Advisor's conclusions. In this way, the letter gave the impression that all concerned, especially the I.L.O., were already in agreement with, if not committed to, the project.

For the initial review of the scheme, a meeting was convened on the 9th May, 1967 under the chairmanship of the Minister of Commerce and Industry, and the Manager of the Research Department of the Central Bank.(7) At the meeting it was decided that the whole project called for further detailed examination and it was thought desirable to invite Mr. Hugo Lane, who by that time had left the island, to visit Cyprus in order to elaborate on the whole project and to discuss it further with

those concerned.(8)

A much wider meeting to discuss the subject was convened on the 3rd August 1967, again under the chairmanship of the Minister of Finance. At the meeting were present all the participants of the previous meeting. In addition, the meeting was attended by the Director of the Department of Agriculture, three U.N. experts including Mr. Hugo Lane, and three officers of the Planning Bureau. Again, very conspicuous was the absence of the Ministry of Education.

Before considering the outcome of the meeting, it is relevant to refer to the matter of the non-participation of the Ministry of Education. According to the minutes of the meeting(9), the question arose as to whether the Ministry of Education had been consulted in the preparation of the proposal under discussion, and whether its views had been obtained on the general training programmes as envisaged in the request. It was pointed out that there was little doubt that the educational system of any country contributed, or should contribute, to the development of man-power skills; this was the case in Cyprus at least as far as Technical Schools were concerned. For this important reason the Ministry of Education should have been consulted on the proposed project. It was impossible to dissociate manpower training completely from the educational

system.

The Director-General of the Ministry of Labour stated that the Education Authorities had not been consulted on the formulation of the request under discussion, but that in the proposed National Manpower Development Advisory Board to be established under the project, a representative from the Ministry of Education would participate.

The consensus of opinion was that it was advisable that the Ministry of Education should be consulted and be given the opportunity to express its views on the project, with the object of avoiding duplication of efforts and activities especially as far as training in the technical schools was concerned.

During the meeting various amendments and changes to the original plan were proposed. However, although an in-depth discussion of the project took place, the meeting was inconclusive. As the Chairman of the meeting stated, the consensus of opinion was that, as the proposal under discussion was a major project involving considerable government expenditure, it had to be further studied by the Ministry of Labour, and the other Ministries concerned.(10)

Following the meeting, and in line with the above recommendation, the Ministry of Labour requested a number of Ministries to express their views on the

subject.

2.5 Reaction of the Ministry of Education.

In replying to the request to comment on the Programme, the Ministry of Education stated that in principle it agreed with the proposal. However, it pointed out that in the actual implementation of various programmes envisaged in the paper, it was necessary to consider the relative responsibilities of the existing activities and plans, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts and infringement of their jurisdiction. Taking these principles into consideration, modifications in the Programme were necessary before it was submitted for final approval.

More specifically, the Ministry of Education suggested that in the national interest the Ministry of Labour should concentrate its efforts on adult training schemes, apprenticeship and retraining schemes for upgrading of skilled workers. Policy and planning of education, including the training of craftsmen and technicians, as well as Technical and Vocational Schools, should be left to the Ministry of Education. As for the establishment of more systematic and regulated apprenticeship, the proposal was welcomed.

Finally, the Ministry of Education stated that it was in full agreement with the establishment of a National Manpower Advisory Board. The Minister felt that the establishment of this Board should be given the highest

priority in a planned economy.(11) It further added that all aspects of manpower study were essential, as "they had a direct bearing on reorientation and reorganisation of educational systems." (12)

2.6 Apprenticeship is dropped from the Programme.

The initial reaction of the U.N., as well as the outcome of the deliberations between the Ministries concerned, were presented in a memorandum prepared by the Ministry of Labour and sent to all parties concerned.(13) In the memorandum it was stated that the Draft Request to U.N. Special Fund for assistance in the establishment of a National Industrial Training Programme, appeared to have received approval. The U.N., however, made the following two recommendations:

(a) Increased emphasis should be placed upon the developmental aspects of the Vocational Training Workshops, and

(b) Increased emphasis should be placed on the "multiplier effect" brought about through Vocational Training activities.(By "multiplier effect" the U.N. meant the benefit that would be derived from training people who would pass on their knowledge to others - for example training instructors)

The memorandum further stated that the Government considered the financial implications of the request to be too high, and that the request should be cut back by approximately 33%, the cut being made only to the

Vocational Training component, leaving both the Management Development and Small Scale Industries components as presented in the request. However, the memorandum pointed out, there had already been severe pruning of the programme during the drafting stage, so that further cutbacks would be impossible without upsetting the viability of the project. The decision, therefore, needed to be taken by Government to delete a major section of training activity, either, for example, the assistance needed for the apprenticeship, or the assistance needed for the continuation of the existing activities.(14)

The developments outlined in the memorandum pointed, therefore, towards abandoning the part of the request to improve apprenticeship. This option would be in accordance with the U.N. recommendations, because, by suggesting that the emphasis should be placed on the "developmental aspects" and "multiplier effect" of the vocational training activities, the U.N. implied, in effect, that the project should give priority to upgrading and further training of the existing manpower, rather than to initial training.(15) Furthermore, by leaving apprenticeship out of the programme, it would be possible to achieve the financial cuts demanded by the Ministry of Finance.

Thus, the Ministry of Labour, very unwillingly, was

forced to drop the apprenticeship part of the Programme.(16) In spite of the reversal, however, the Ministry fought back in order to salvage even a small part of its original plans to boost the apprenticeship programmes. Thus, by using the U.N. recommendation regarding the "multiplier effect" of vocational training, the Ministry suggested that 24 man-months be added for an expert in instructor training to meet the retraining and new needs for workshop instructors within the Ministry of Education's technical training programme. Additionally, all the other experts who were to be used for the upgrading programmes were to be used to train the instructors who taught apprenticeship.

After the necessary modifications were made, the government Working Committee, on the 9th October, 1967, recommended the approval of the project. According to the minutes of the meeting the D.G. of the Ministry of Education stated that the Ministry of Education supported the proposed project wholeheartedly.(17) As a result of the modifications, the government's contribution towards the cost of the project was reduced from \$1,250,461 to \$1,062,810. The saving was almost entirely made on apprenticeship. In this way, apprenticeship, which, according to all indications, was the prime reason for initiating the programme, was left out, and a great opportunity for the

Ministry of Labour to set up training centres of its own was lost.

The modified programme was approved by the Council of Ministers of the Republic on the 12th October, 1967(18)

2.7 Further Curtailing of the Programme.

In spite of earlier optimistic indications, when the request was submitted to the U.N. for official consideration, it met with heavy weather. A letter from the United Nations Development Programme headquarters in New York, suggested that cuts should be made, both in the number of experts and in the requested assistance for the purchase of equipment.(19) In the circumstances, and in the light of assurances from U.N. quarters that a less ambitious request might be better accommodated, a new request was worked out. With the changes, the U.N. contribution was reduced from \$1,035,629 to \$454,825. Following the reduction of the U.N. contribution, it became necessary to revise the corresponding government contribution in local counterparts. The changes in foreign experts and local counterparts created consequential changes in all aspects of the proposals and affected the government contribution. Thus, whilst under the original request the government would contribute \$1,097,810, the new government contribution was decreased to \$412,416.(20) This time the Programme was approved. On the vocational

side, the programme provided for a number of advisers, namely in Vocational Training Organization, Methods and procedures (1/2man/years), Machine Shop(2m/y), Sheet metal and Plumbing(1m/y), Maintenance and Repair(1m/y), Building Trades(2m/y) and an Apprenticeship adviser(2m/y).(21) When the programme eventually got under way, (1969-1970), these advisers did in fact contribute towards the improvement of apprenticeship by organising courses in which a number of the technical school instructors participated, and from which they benefitted.

2.8 Comments on the Institution of the National Industrial Training Programme.

The National Industrial Programme, as it happened, turned out to be a much smaller programme than the Ministry of Labour originally intended. As for its final impact on Apprenticeship, this was only marginal, as it was limited to the opportunity it afforded to a number of instructors for in-service training. In view of the fact that one of the prime factors for initiating the request for the Programme was to improve apprenticeship, one would conclude that, in this respect, the endeavours of the Ministry of Labour failed completely.

However, irrespective of the results, both the original

document and the procedure that was followed are very significant. Firstly, the document itself reveals the philosophy and designs of the Ministry of Labour on apprenticeship. It is obvious that this Ministry aspired to give apprenticeship a much higher status than it ever enjoyed hitherto. It is also obvious that, had the Ministry succeeded in offering apprentices a full year of training in a training centre followed by three years of supervised training, this objective would have been achieved. The failure of the Ministry of Labour to obtain the funds with which to build its own vocational workshops in all the main towns, not only put an end to its plans to change the character of training, but also meant its continued dependence on the Technical Schools. The second important dimension, that of the procedures and deliberation followed in the discussion of the document, is also revealing. The antagonism and mistrust between the two Ministries was again very apparent. Thus, the Ministry of Labour tried to keep the Ministry of Education as much as possible out of the picture, to the point where this behaviour was regarded by the other government Ministries as a flagrant violation of procedural etiquette. An example of the antagonism between the two Ministries, is the fact that the Ministry of Labour had no qualms about making defamatory remarks on the work carried out in the technical schools. As the document was not really an intra-governmental document, since it was primarily

addressed to the U.N.D.P., the insinuations of one ministry against the work of another ministry could only be considered as being out of line.

The reaction of the Ministry of Education, on the other hand, considering the provocation, was rather mild. It seems that at the time its only preoccupation was to safeguard its jurisdiction over full-time secondary technical education. As for the apprenticeship programme, the Ministry of Education was at the time more than willing to let it go. The Ministry of Finance, however, intervened to stop the erection of new vocational workshops for apprentices, because it deemed it to be an unnecessary extravagance, as the apprentices could easily be accommodated in the technical schools. So, in conclusion, it could be said that the Ministry of Education won a victory that it did not aspire to win, and the forced bond, through apprenticeship, between the two ministries continued to exist, contrary to the wishes of both sides.

3.0 THE NATIONAL MANPOWER ASSESSMENT BOARD.

3.1 Introduction.

Almost immediately after the failure of the attempt to establish the "National Training Programme", the Ministry of Labour tried to find alternative ways to achieve its long term objective to gain control of

technical education. As it was pointed out in the previous section, the Ministry of Labour had already gained jurisdiction over the upgrading programmes. Apparently, however, the Ministry was not satisfied in confining itself to this field alone, and set its sights on gaining control of the much more significant initial training programmes.

The lesson that the Ministry of Labour had learned from its previous unsuccessful attempt was that the Ministry of Finance was determined not to allow the creation of new vocational workshops or training centres for the Ministry of Labour. This was because the Ministry of Finance considered the lavishly equipped vocational workshops at the technical schools(22) as more than adequate to cover the training needs of the island. Reluctantly, therefore, the Ministry of Labour reached the conclusion that since it could not set up its own training centres, the next best thing would be to direct its efforts towards gaining control over all policy making processes pertaining to industrial training, including the all-important initial training.

The first attempt to achieve this objective was through the creation of the "National Manpower Assessment Board".

3.2 Functions and Constitution of the Board.

3.2.1 The scheme provided a long list of functions of

the Board. The most significant of these were the following:

(a) Advise the Minister of Labour on a National Manpower Development Policy. In so doing, the Board would have the widest possible coverage.

(b) Act as the General Training Council in the island and prepare a National Industrial Training Programme, having in view the present and future manpower needs in all economic activities (private and public) in Cyprus.

(c) Study all the relevant data and statistics provided by the specialised services of Government and ask for the initiation of any research work which might facilitate the Board in carrying out its functions.

(d) Advise on ways and means to finance industrial training in order to meet the expenditure required for the implementation of the National Industrial Training Programme.

(e) Follow up and ensure that both the National Manpower Development Policy and National Industrial Training Programme are effectively implemented.(23)

3.2.2 The Board would consist of the following members appointed by the Minister of Labour and would be under the Chairmanship of the Minister of Labour (24)

(a) The Director-General of the Ministry of Labour.

(b) The Director-General of the Ministry of Education.

- (c) The Director-General of the Ministry of Commerce.
- (d) The Director-General of the Planning Bureau.
- (e) The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Higher Technical Institute.
- (f) The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Hotel and Catering Institute.
- (g) The Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board.
- (h) The Director-General of the Cyprus Employers Federation.
- (j) The General Secretary of P.E.O.(25)
- (k) The General Secretary of S.E.K.(26)
- (l) The General Secretary of the Federation of Turkish Trade Unions.(27)

3.3 The scheme is dropped.

3.3.1 The scheme was submitted by the Minister of Labour Mr.A. Mavrommatis to a number of Ministers, including the Minister of Education, Mr.F. Petrides, for consideration(28) In the accompanying letter, dated 16th Nov. 1970, the Minister of Labour requested the support of his colleagues for the implementation of the programme. In his letter, the Minister of Labour noted that similar schemes were working satisfactorily in countries where technical training was planned "on a scientific basis". Therefore, he concluded, the adoption of the scheme would greatly benefit the country.(29)

The immediate reaction of the Minister of Education was one of scepticism. In a note to his Director-General he

wrote the following:

"The idea could be a good one. However, it seems to me that the jurisdiction over its application belongs to the Ministry of Education which has (or ought to have) the responsibility for all forms of education"(30)

3.3.2 Meanwhile, the Ministry of Labour did its utmost to have the scheme accepted. It was, therefore, with great surprise that all concerned received the information that, in less than three weeks after it was submitted, the proposal for the creation of "The National Manpower Assessment Board" was withdrawn. The reason given for the withdrawal was that the Ministry of Labour decided to replace it with a more comprehensive plan. The following is an extract from a letter sent to the Ministry of Education by the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour:

I forward to you a note together with App. concerning the subject of industrial training and the proposed Industrial Training Bill. It is hereby clarified that the "National Manpower Assessment Board" forwarded to you under cover of my letter M.L.182/69 of 16th Nov. 1970 is withdrawn."(31)

The withdrawal of the proposal raised many questions among the circles outside the Ministry of Labour. Characteristically, the Director of Technical Education in a note to his D.G. wrote the following: "The withdrawal of the document has caused some

confusion"(32) Later on, however, in the same note, the Director of Technical Education offered the following explanation: "The scheme titled "National Manpower Assessment Board" has been withdrawn after the representative of the Ministry of Education expressed his disagreement with both the context and the title of the proposal." (33)

The real reason for the abandonment of the scheme, however, seemed to be different. As will be made evident later, the decision was taken after an intense struggle between two opposing points of view inside the Ministry of Labour itself. On the one hand there were those who advocated the establishment of the Board which would operate within the Ministry so that it would be under the Ministry's direct control. The other side adopted the views of a U.N. expert, Dr.Cronin, who had proposed the creation of an autonomous Industrial Training Authority. The holders of the latter view, it needs to be stressed, pointed out that through the establishment of the Authority the Ministry of Labour would not abandon its plans to become the arbitrator of training policies. On the contrary, they believed that the creation of the Authority would be a safer way to achieve this objective than the mere establishment of a Board. As it happened, the advocates for the creation of the Authority prevailed.

3.4. Comments on the Attempt to establish the National

Manpower Assessment Board.

3.4.1 Irrespective of the outcome, the attempt to establish the Board is another indication of the intentions of the Ministry of Labour. These are manifest in the way the functions of the Board were defined. Thus, although it was intended to act as the general Training Council in the island, the Board was not to be autonomous. In fact its main function was to advise the Minister of Labour. In this way the Minister would become defacto the chief arbitrator of the manpower training policies in the island.

3.4.2 Judging from the long list of top officials and representatives that were to be members of the Board, it is obvious that the Ministry of Labour intended the Board to be a highly prestigious body so that it could speak with authority. On the positive side, of course, it may be assumed that, through the Board, the Ministry of Labour would be able to gather valuable ideas and feedback on its training policies. In this respect, the Ministry should of course be credited with a genuine desire to get things "right" in its training policies. On the other hand, it may be thought, with reason, that with such a high powered group of people on the Board, it would not be easy for the Minister of Labour to get his own way. It needs therefore to be pointed out that at the time, the working relationship between the Ministry of Labour on the one hand, and the Trade Unions

and the Employers' Federation on the other, were extremely good.(34) These non-governmental bodies, which were naturally extremely effective pressure groups, were regarded by the Ministry of Labour as very useful allies in its eternal arguments with the Ministry of Education.

3.4.2 All the above support the hypothesis that the Ministry of Labour's intention was to wrest the jurisdiction over training policies from the Ministry of Education. It is for this reason that the opposition of the latter over the creation of the Board was only to be expected. Thus, once again, another attempt of the Ministry of Labour did not succeed, though this time the scheme was withdrawn by the Ministry itself, as it had something else up its sleeve. For the purposes of this work, however, the attempt to set up the "National Manpower Assessment Board" was significant because it brought to the surface, once again, the antagonism between the two Ministries. Furthermore, the rapid presentation of one scheme after another by the Ministry of Labour, leaves no doubt as to the deep preoccupation, nearing to obsession, of the Ministry of Labour over matters on training at the time.

4.0 THE INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY.

4.1 Developments that led to the Creation of the Industrial Training Authority.

Almost quite independently from the attempt to establish the National Manpower Assessment Board, certain other developments, initiated by the Ministry of Labour, led to the creation of the Industrial Training Authority.

In view of the fact that the Apprentice's Law had proved inapplicable in practice, the Ministry of Labour requested the U.N. expert Dr.Cronin to "draft for the Ministry's consideration and approval a draft Industrial Training Law to satisfy actual needs and conditions in Cyprus industry." (35) Dr.Cronin submitted his proposals, through the Resident Representative in Nicosia, on 26th May, 1970. The Minister of Labour requested and obtained the comments of its Directors and Section Heads on the Bill, and subsequently appointed a sub-committee consisting of the Director-General of the Ministry, the Directors of the Cyprus Productivity Centre and the Higher Technical Institute, the Senior Employment Officer, the Senior Industrial Training Officer and the Director of Technical Education (36) to study the Bill and submit concrete proposals to the Coordination Committee (37) for consideration and approval.(38)

The initial draft of the recommendation had the title "National Manpower Development Board"(39) The functions of the Board in this document were strikingly similar to those of the "National Manpower Assessment Board" which had been withdrawn. The only significant change was that whilst in the old form the Board would "advise the Minister of Labour on a National Manpower Development Policy", in the new document it was stated that the Board would "advise the Council of Ministers, through the Minister of Labour of National Manpower Development Policy". The constitution of the new Board was also practically the same as the older one, the only difference being that in the new version the Minister of Labour was not included as one of the members of the Board. This implied that the Minister could not be the Chairman of the Board. Thus the essential difference between the two was that the new Board would be more autonomous than the previous one.

Among the interested parties consulted on the draft recommendation was the Ministry of Education. On receiving the proposal the Minister of Education reacted against the plan strongly and immediately. In a policy directive addressed to his Director General he recorded the following:

The Ministry of Education is opposed to the establishment of the National Manpower Board in the form that it has been presented by the Ministry of Labour. I have already explained this to the Minister of Labour in person, who suggested that the matter could be examined by the two

Ministries at a later date. The Ministry of Education is not prepared to accept the establishment of any body or organisation which would lead to the reduction of its jurisdiction and responsibilities. Neither would our Ministry agree to a situation by which any such organisation would acquire authority to decide, even in part, on matters of educational policy under the pretext of research on manpower.(40)

Almost simultaneously with its proposal for the establishment of the "Manpower Development Board", the Ministry of Labour circulated among the interested parties another document with the title "A Law to establish a Cyprus Training Authority with Powers to provide for the (Skill) Training of Employees to raise a Levy to defray the Expenses of the Authority's Operation".(41) The draft Law was a more comprehensive document which incorporated most of the suggestions included in the paper on the Manpower Development Board, the powers of the Board being taken over by the Authority.(42) In addition the draft Law made the following provisions:

(a) The Cyprus Training Authority would be established as an autonomous body.

(b) As from a date to be fixed by the Council of Ministers every employer (of more than 5 persons) would pay to the Authority a training levy of one per cent of the total wages paid by him to his employees.

(c) The income and property of the Authority would be applied solely towards the promotion of the objectives of the Authority as set out in the Law.

(d) The Apprentices Law 1966 and any orders made there

under was to be repealed.

The Ministry of Labour retained a certain degree of control over the Authority through a provision that the Chairman of the Board of the Authority would be the Director of the Ministry of Labour

4.2 Discussion of the Draft Law.

As usual, the Bill was first discussed internally among the Directors and Section Heads of the Ministry of Labour. Surprising though it may seem, especially in view of the efforts of the Ministry to set up the Authority, not all officials of this Ministry agreed with the Bill. Of particular significance, in this respect, were the views of the Senior Employment Officer of the Ministry of Labour, who, in a memorandum, submitted the following:

I do not agree with the suggestion put forward that a Cyprus Training Authority as an autonomous body be established. A lot of problems will be created vis-a-vis the relations of the body with the Ministry of Labour and other departments, as well as administrative difficulties. We lack both the administrative staff as well as the experience needed to act independently. The experience of the Ministry of Labour and of the other sections of the Ministry are indispensable at this juncture. The most appropriate body to undertake the task of training would appear to be an Industrial Training Board within the Ministry of Labour.(43)

Of course it would be nearly impossible to assess how genuine the above fears were. One cannot help suspecting, however, that when the officers responsible for training in the Ministry of Labour sensed that the creation of an independent authority would curtail their

own powers, they reacted against it very strongly. In spite of the opposition, however, the Ministry of Labour adopted the Bill in principle.

Subsequently the Minister of Labour appointed a subcommittee chaired by the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour to study the Bill. Members of the committee were four officers of the Ministry of Labour, that is Directors of the Cyprus Productivity Centre and the Higher Technical Institute, the Senior Employment Officer, the Senior Industrial Training Officer and one officer of the Ministry of Education, the Director of Technical Education.(44) There were four meetings of the committee during which the representative of the Ministry of Education registered strong disagreement with the rest of the committee.

The first important issue, over which there was a divergence of views, was that of the autonomy of the Authority. Oddly enough, although the minutes of the interdepartmental meeting of the Ministry of Labour give the impression that the official view of the Ministry was that it agreed on the autonomous nature of the Authority, during the very first meeting of the committee, the issue was raised again. After a protracted discussion, it was recorded in the minutes that the representative of the Ministry of Education expressed the opinion that the Authority should be

autonomous, because, as he explained, if a Ministry was given jurisdiction over the Authority, that Ministry would gain control over all training in the island. The other members of the committee did not share this view. They supported the idea that the Authority should work within a Ministry. According to them, this would not necessarily mean that the Authority would lose its autonomy. The Ministry would just act as the medium through which the resolutions and programmes of the Authority would be presented to the Council of Ministers.(45)

There were also other points on which the two sides differed. For example, the representative of the Minister of Education suggested that no Minister should be appointed as member of the Board of the Authority. The others disagreed. There was also divergence of views on whether the personnel of the Authority should be civil servants or not and on the very important issue of the Authority's right to establish training centres.(46)

The final showdown between the two sides occurred at the meeting of the committee of 10th December, 1970. The meeting was convened to examine the Draft Law in the light of the decisions which had been taken during the previous meeting. Prior to the examination of the Bill, Mr. Hadjinicolas, on behalf of the Ministry of Education, stated that he objected to the proposed Bill, because, as he explained, his Ministry might establish its own

bodies to govern the training institutions functioning under that Ministry.

The rest of the members of the committee felt that, regardless of the views of the Ministry of Education, the need was apparent for a coordinated National Manpower Assessment and Development Policy and that, in the light of the objections of the Ministry of Education, there were left but two alternatives for them:

(a) To suggest, regardless of the disagreement of the Ministry of Education, that the proposed law cover not only industrial training, including management development and consultancy, but also technical education; or alternatively

(b) to advise the Council of Ministers, if the Law were to exclude technical education, to establish by administrative action a National Manpower Assessment Board to cooperate with all training agencies in order to achieve the aim of an integrated overall National Manpower Assessment Policy and Plan to cover both technical education and industrial training.

Before the two options were discussed, the Director of Technical Education departed. The rest of the committee continued with their deliberations and decided to adopt alternative (a) as stated above.(47)

It is pertinent to note that in a document, with the same date as the above meeting, 10/12/70, the Director of Technical Education proposed that the Ministry of Education should set up a consultative Board with representatives of the Employers, Trade Unions and the various Ministries, to advise the Minister of Education on matters pertaining to technical education. In the note it was stated that the U.N. expert on Technical Education, who at the time served with the Ministry of Education, fully subscribed to the idea. The document was addressed to the Director of Education who, in his turn, recommended to the Minister of Education the creation of a Consultative Board. However, the idea of the Board never really materialised. Instead, at a later date, a body with much broader terms of reference, under the name "National Educational Council" was set up to advise the Minister on all matters related to education.(48)

4.3 Discussion by the Ministerial Committee.

After a relatively long delay of over two years, the Ministry of Labour tabled with the Council of Ministers its proposal for the creation of a Training Authority.(49) The Council decided that it could not take a decision on the matter immediately and appointed a Ministerial Committee, consisting of the Ministers of Labour, Finance, Commerce and Industry, Education,

Justice and Health to study the proposal and submit a report to the Council. The committee held two meetings on the 24th July, 1973 and on the 19th October, 1973.

Meanwhile, the two Ministries produced a great multitude of documents, in which the Ministry of Labour exalted the idea of the Training Authority and stressed the need for its establishment(50), whilst the Ministry of Education tried to repudiate the claims in favour of the Training Authority.(51)

At the first ministerial meeting the Ministers of Labour and Education supported with fervour the declared views of their respective Ministries. The Minister of Labour, after pointing out that in most countries in the world, both industrialised and developing, there were in existence similar bodies, stressed the point that the Employment Consultative Body (52) unanimously supported the establishment of the Authority.

The Minister of Education retorted by saying that, though he was in full agreement with the view that planning in industrial training was needed, he would like to point out that there were many alternative ways of doing things. Most of the tasks that were to be undertaken by the Authority were already being carried out by various government departments. On the issue of industrial training, he underlined that it was not

possible to differentiate between education and training.

The other Ministers tried to be "neutral" by not taking sides directly. However, it was quite evident by what they said that they favoured the creation of the Authority. For example, it was mentioned that the Ministry of Labour should be commended on its decision to back the creation of the Authority instead of pursuing its plans to create its own consultative board. Also, the Director of Planning reminded those present that the Government, through its Five Year Plan, was already committed to the need for a better coordinated national plan for training, in which the employers and the trade unions would participate.(53) In spite of these comments, as there was no consensus of opinion, no decision was taken.

There followed further private consultations between the two Ministers directly concerned. These must have been fruitful, in that the Minister of Education must have been persuaded to withdraw his objections. Thus, when the second meeting of the ministerial committee was convened on 19th October, 1973, it unanimously recommended to the Council of Ministers that an independent Industrial Authority should be set up.(54) Following the endorsement of the Council of Ministers the Industrial Training Authority Law (no.21174) was

enacted on 25th June 1974.

4.4 Divergence of Views as to the Powers of the Authority.

At the very first meeting of the Board of Governors, there was difference of opinion as to the jurisdiction of the Authority on two significant areas, (a) on formal technical education, and (b) on the right of the Authority to specify levels of industrial training. (55) The matter was referred to the Attorney General whose interpretation of the Law was as follows:

(a) The term "industrial training" does not include regular school technical education. Consequently the Authority, in the exercise of its duties, has no right to get involved in the functioning of the technical schools. This means that the Authority has no jurisdiction to inspect schools, to approve school curricula, to set standards, to interfere in the examinations or to issue certificates or diplomas. (56)

(b) The Law gives the right to the Authority to specify levels of industrial training for any category or categories of employees. (57) As it was explained in the previous paragraph, the Authority has no right to set the standard of training inside the Technical Schools. This provision, however, does not exclude the Authority, after considering the standard attained at the schools, from accepting the attainment at school as satisfying the industrial standard demanded for any category or

categories of employees.(58)

It is obvious to the reader that the dissent rose from the concern of the Ministry of Education over the possibility of the Industrial Training Authority gaining control of the Technical Schools. It may be added that the suspicions of the Ministry were justified. However, the Attorney General's interpretation of the Law, which could be seen as one of compromise of the conflicting standpoints, alleviated the immediate fears of the Ministry of Education.

4.5 The Authority and Apprenticeship.

4.5.1 One of the original intentions for creating the Authority was that this body would take over the Apprenticeship Scheme. With this purpose in mind, the Industrial Training Authority Law provided that the Apprentices Law of 1966 would be abolished (59) with the enactment of the I.T.A. Law. The implication, of course, was that, with the creation of the Authority, the Apprenticeship Law would become superfluous, as apprenticeship would come under the jurisdiction of the Industrial Training Authority. However, in spite of the intentions, after it had been created, the Authority set its eyes on "higher things"(60), and seemed to be less than keen to take over the ailing apprenticeship scheme.(61) This reluctance of the Authority is borne out by the fact that the only article of the I.T.A. Law

that has not yet been implemented is the one on Apprenticeship. All the other articles have been in force since 1974. Consequently the 1966 Apprenticeship Law is still valid.

4.5.2 The Authority, however, has not been able to avoid involvement with Apprenticeship altogether. Thus, as a result of a resolution of the Board, the Authority instigated in 1979 a scheme to subsidise employers who have apprentices. The scheme provides for the wages of apprentices for the days that they are on day release, and which were previously paid by the employers, to be paid by the Authority.(62)

At the request of the Ministry of Education, the Authority also appointed three clerks, one for each of the three big schools, to carry out the administrative work of Apprenticeship inside the schools. These clerks, however, were withdrawn in 1985.(63)

4.5.3 In 1982 a study of Apprenticeship was carried out, by the Authority, with the view to paving the way for the Authority to undertake its responsibilities on Apprenticeship as stipulated on the Law. After examining various alternative ways of achieving this end, the study made the following recommendations:

(a) The Authority should continue the existing scheme of subsidies to the employers who send their apprentices to school.

(b) The Authority should undertake the planning and supervision of the Apprenticeship System.

(c) The Authority to reimburse the Ministry of Education with the expenses incurred in the training of apprentices (teacher salaries, materials and other workshop expenses).(64)

The above study, together with a definite proposal was presented to the Board on the 14th Dec.1982 (65)

The proposal included the following: (a) As from July 1983 the Authority to take over from the Ministry of Labour full responsibility for the administration of Apprenticeship.

(b) The application of Apprenticeship to be subcontracted to the Ministry of Education.

(c) The Authority to continue subsidising the employers who send apprentices to school.

(d) Gradually the Authority to bring about improvements in the Apprenticeship System.

Owing to the lack of time and because members of the Board expressed the wish to consider the proposal, the matter was adjourned for the following meeting of the Board. However, at the following meeting the subject was not on the agenda. In fact, the discussion on apprenticeship has been shelved ever since. Thus, in

spite of the recommendation in its own report, the Authority has shown unwillingness to take over the Apprenticeship scheme.

4.5.4 Surpluses in the Budget of the Industrial Training Authority.

The provision in the Law (66), that every employer is obliged to pay to the Authority a levy of the one per cent (maximum) (67) of the payable remuneration to each of his employees, has provided the Authority with an embarrassingly high income. In spite of the fact that the Authority tried to set up as many programmes as possible, its surpluses increased year by year, and by 1985 they rose to over five million Cyprus pounds.(68) Meanwhile, the Ministry of Finance was not happy with the accumulation of wealth by the Authority. An opportunity to show its dismay was presented in 1985 when the Authority announced to the government its intention to buy land with view to erecting its own premises.(69) In a very severe letter addressed to the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour, in his capacity as the chairman of the Authority, the D.G. of the Ministry of Finance pointed out that the reason for the accumulated surpluses of the Authority was that the Authority failed to shoulder its full responsibilities provided by the Law. For example, the letter stated, the Authority should undertake the financing of Apprenticeship and the upgrading courses offered through the Productivity

Council, the Higher Technical Institute, the Hotel Training Institute and the evening classes of the technical schools.(70)

Another source of contention between the Authority and the Ministry of Education was the decision of the Authority to finance the programme of industrial training of the hotel and catering students of the Hotel Institute, which is run by the Ministry of Labour, whilst refusing to finance similar courses run by the Ministry of Education. In a letter to the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour, the D.G. of the Ministry of Education registered a protest for the discrepancy shown. A copy of the letter was also sent to all the Ministries represented on the Board of the Authority. (71) In a similar vein, in another letter, the Ministry of Education complained that in spite of their surpluses the Authority showed marked indifference to the work carried out at the Technical Schools. The Ministry further pointed out that this policy was contrary to that followed by similar institutions abroad, e.g. the Manpower Services Commission in England, where every effort is made to support relevant courses offered in schools, through technical and financial assistance. To both the above letters the Authority answered that the matter was "under consideration". The Ministry of Education, however, continued to apply pressure and in the end the Authority gave way and consented to

subsidise, as from the summer of 1987, the technical school hotel students in the same way as the Hotel and Catering Institute students (72)

5.0 CONCLUSION

The object of the analysis of the issues and events in the Chapter was to show that the creation of the I.T.A. has had no real effect on the Apprenticeship Scheme. This was in spite of the fact that initially all attempts of the Ministry of Labour to improve training in the island through the setting up of some form of central policy_making body, stemmed from the declared intention of this Ministry to improve apprenticeship. It is therefore ironical, that when the I.T.A. was finally created, the original intention was forsaken.

A central aspect and perhaps the deciding factor in the developments described in this chapter, was the antagonism between the Ministries of Labour and Education. The biggest loser, as a result of this dispute, was apprenticeship. For the I.T.A.'s refusal to be involved with Apprenticeship can almost be entirely attributed to the reluctance of its officials to be entangled with the Ministry of Education. Consequently the 'autonomous' I.T.A. remained an outsider to the continuing strife between the Ministries of Labour and Education. Details of the nature of this strife will be given in the next chapter.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1.Many officials of the Ministry of Labour still hold the view, which they expressed to the researcher, that the Ministry of Education should confine its activities to formal, full time school based education and leave the training to the Ministry of Labour.

2.Ministry of Labour. Request to the United Nations Special Fund for Assistance in the Establishment of a National Training Programme. July 1967

3.Ibid p.45.

4.Ibid p.48.

5.Ibid p.53.

6.M.L. 74/67 24th April 1967.

7.It is obvious that to the meeting were invited all the Government Ministries and Departments that might be connected with the project. The exclusion, therefore, from the meeting of the Ministry of Education, whose jurisdiction over training made it more closely connected with the project than any of the other participants, was contrary to normal governmental procedure.

8. The fact that right from the outset further explanation was demanded, was a clear indication that matters were not plain sailing for the Ministry of Labour.

9. Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the Working Committee (Policy), held on the 3rd August 1967.

10. This remark by the Minister of Finance was probably meant to be a reprimand directed at the Ministry of Labour for not consulting the Ministry of Education.

11. It is of relevance to mention here that a similar body, that was again proposed by the Ministry of Labour two years later under the name "National Manpower Development Board" was outrightly rejected by the Ministry of Education. For further details of the proposal of 1970 please see para. 4.1 of this chapter.

12. Memorandum "Comments of the Request of the U.N. Special Fund for Assistance in the Establishment of a National Industrial Programme", Ministry of Education 25th August 1967.

13. Ministry of Labour 74/67, 15th Sept.1967.

14. This was a reference to the Cyprus Productivity Centre. This Centre was established in 1963 as a joint U.N. Special Fund Cyprus Government venture to assist in the training of management and supervisory personnel and in upgrading skills. At the time the Centre provided the following services:

(i) Courses in business organization within the programme of Management Development;
(ii) vocational instruction in the metal trades (welding) and in the automotive trades (diesel engines). The Centre was under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour (The Second Five Year Plan, 1967-1971, Planning Bureau Nicosia pp. 42-43).

15. This was in accordance with existing practice, under which initial training was regarded to be the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, whilst the Ministry of Labour was responsible for upgrading courses.

16. During interviews with the researcher, one Minister of Labour officer who was involved with the project at the time, conceded that dropping apprenticeship from the programme was a very bitter pill to swallow.

17. Minutes of the Working Committee (Policy) 9.10.67

18. Council of Ministers, Resolution Number 7119 -Cyprus Gazette 16th November, 1967.

19. Although the letter was not traced, a senior official of the Ministry of Labour informed the researcher that the letter was in fact sent. This information is also supported by other documents in the Ministry of Labour.

20. Document 117/67 of 15th May 1968.

21. U.N. Document DP/SF/310/CYP 4 of 24.10.68.

22. See Chapter 3.

23. Ministry of Labour: "National Manpower Assessment Board" M.L. 182/69 (undated)

24. Ibid. p.5

25. P.E.O. is the largest trade union in the island. Politically it is left-wing.

26. S.E.K. is the second largest trade union and politically right wing.

27. Though the Federation of Turkish Trade Unions was always included in such documents, in fact after the

secession of the Turkish minority in 1963, this union did not take part in any government activity.

28. Both Mr. Papadopoulos and Dr. Spyridakis, the Ministers of Labour and Education respectively, were replaced during a government reshuffle on 30th June 1970. It is interesting to note that, although the two arch-enemies and protagonists of the conflict between the two Ministries left, the friction between the two sides persisted.

29. Ministry of Labour 182/69 of 16th Nov.1970.

30. Note of the Minister of Education, Mr. Petrides, 9.12.70. M.E. 171/70.

31. M.L.130/70 of 4.12.70.

32. Ministry of Education 168/70 of 30th Jan. 1971.

33. Ibid.

34. At the time the Ministry of Labour worked very closely with both Employers and Trade Unions and achieved consensus on important issues relating to collective salary agreements and social insurance benefits, which led to the enactment of significant legislation on these matters.

35. Note: "Industrial Training and Draft Industrial Training Bill" M.L.130/70, 4th Dec.1970.

36. The Director of Technical and Vocational Education was the only member of the committee who was not an officer of the Ministry of Labour.

37. The Coordination Committee was the top government body which considered proposals, including draft Bills, to be tabled for consideration by the Council of Ministers.

38. Note: " Industrial Training and Draft Industrial Training Bill" M.L.130/70 4th Dec.1970.

39. This is included in Appendix 1 of Note: "Industrial Training and Draft Training Bill" M.L.130/70 4th Dec. 1970.

40. Note by the Minister of Education Mr. F. Petrides, dated 18.12.70. M.L.169/70.

41. Ministry of Labour (Document undated)

42. The researcher tried to find out the rationale behind the production of so many documents by the Ministry of Labour. However no satisfactory explanation

was given. Therefore, it seems that this behaviour could only be attributed to over-reaction of the various officials of the Ministry to the failure of the Apprenticeship Law and obvious lack of coordination between them.

43. Comments of the Senior Employment Officer on the Draft Training Law. M.L.130/70/111 (not dated).

44. Letter sent by the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour informing the members of the committee of their appointment to the committee. (M.L.130/70 of 13.8.70).

45. Minutes of the meeting:Y.E.130/70 of 8th Sept. 1970.

46. Minutes of the meeting:Y.E. 130/70 of 10th Nov.1970.

47. Minutes of the meeting 10.12.1979 YE 130/70

48. Ministry of Education document, undated.

49. Council of Ministers proposal No. 325/73 of 10th May 1973.

50. (a) Explanatory Note on the Industrial Training Authority Bill, Y.E. 130/70/111 (undated).

(b) Industrial Training as opposed to Education,M.L.143/73 (undated).

51. (a) Comments on the proposal of the Ministry of Labour for the Establishment of an Industrial Training Authority Ministry of Education 10th May 1973.

52. The Employment Consultative Body was established by the Ministry of Labour. In the Body participated representatives of Employers, Trade Unions and government officials.

53. Minutes of the meeting of 24th July 1973.

54. Minutes of the meeting of 19th October 1973.

55. Minutes of the meeting 4th April 1975.

56. Office of the Attorney General of the Republic, Doc. No.11(a) 1971 of 29th October 1976.

57. On this issue the Minister of Education, in a letter to his colleague the Minister of Labour, expressed the following point of view:

The subject to which the Law refers is that of defining the structure and grades of technical vocations and not of setting the standards in industrial training. Naturally we recognise that one of the factors, on which the grades in the various vocations will be based, is industrial competence. However, the most important

element in any structuring is education. For this reason, we view that the whole matter cannot be regarded as one which could come under the jurisdiction of the Industrial Training Authority. (File No. 203/68/9 of 21st April 1976).

58. Op.Cit. Office of the Attorney General, Doc. No. 11(a) 1971 of 29th Oct. 1976.

59. Article 38 of the Law.

60. The Industrial Training Authority launched an ambitious programme which included the following eight schemes:

- (a) Retraining of unemployed university graduates.
- (b) Upgrading of technical personnel.
- (c) Training of technical personnel overseas.
- (d) Participation in the Mediterranean Institute for Management.
- (e) Retraining of craftsmen.
- (f) Industrial training for the students of the Higher Technical Institute.
- (g) Industrial training for the students of the Hotel Institute.
- (h) Initial training.

61. For the problems in Apprenticeship see next Chapter.

62. By resolution of the Board.

63. By resolution of the Board, on its 69th meeting of 9.4.85 (Minutes of the meeting).

64. Industrial Training Authority "The Apprenticeship System," October 1982.

65. Minutes of the 52nd meeting of the Authority 14.12.82.

66. Article 20(1).

67. The current levy is 0.5%.

68. Industrial Training Authority 1985, Annual Report.

69. The Authority at the time was housed in rented premises.

70. Ministry of Finance. Y.O. 641/74/9 of 29th Nov. 1985. This was an obvious attempt by the Minister of Finance to pass on to the Authority part of the costs involved in the training offered in the government institutions.

71. M.E. 171/70/20 of 14th March 1986.

72. By resolution of the Industrial Training Authority

Board of 5th July 1986.

CHAPTER SIX

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SYSTEM

1. Introduction.

The main hypothesis that will be examined in this chapter is that the system of administration of apprenticeship constituted an inherent source of dysfunction. Furthermore, in addition to the weaknesses in the system, per se, an aggravating factor was that the main protagonists, in both the Ministries of Education and Labour, remained unchanged for the greatest part of the span of twenty five years under review.(1) Therefore, almost inevitably, as the positions of these officials on issues of dissent became increasingly hardened, the struggle for control over training between the two Ministries acquired the added complication of personal involvement.

The root of the problem lay in the fact that, whereas the Law gave sole jurisdiction over apprenticeship to the Ministry of Labour, its execution, owing to the lack of facilities in the Ministry of Labour, was entrusted to the Ministry of Education. This arrangement created considerable friction between the two ministries, as their concerns and interests did not always coincide.

The Ministry of Labour, on the one hand, was undoubtedly always strongly committed to apprenticeship and did its utmost to further its cause. Evidence of this commitment has already been provided in the previous chapters, and manifestations of the unreserved support of the Ministry of Labour towards apprenticeship will also be included in the present chapter.

The feelings of the Ministry of Education, on the other hand, have been much more ambivalent. For although there was considerable enthusiasm at the beginning, especially among the group which pioneered the scheme, as time went by, both the officials of the Ministry of Education and the great majority of the teachers increasingly regarded apprenticeship as a liability.(2)

More precisely, therefore, the aim of this chapter is to examine how the inherent administrative weaknesses in the system affected its efficiency. In order to achieve this aim, a brief overview of the system will first be given. This will be followed by an outline of the administrative arrangements for apprenticeship and their failings. Next there will be a report of some instances of serious friction between the Ministries, which were a direct consequence of the lack of delineation of responsibilities between the two Ministries. Finally, there will be a summary of the findings of a Technical Committee enquiry into apprenticeship, which highlights some of the issues raised in this chapter and lends support to the hypothesis under examination.

2. THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM IN CYPRUS.

Before proceeding with an analysis of the structure, administration and decision-making involved in apprenticeship, it would be helpful to present an overview of the main characteristics of the system as it is operating today:

1. The apprenticeship system is "jointly" run by the Ministries of Labour and Education. The former has the responsibility for the administration of the system, whilst the latter is responsible for the training of apprentices inside the school.(3)

2. Jurisdiction over matters of policy lies with the Minister of Labour. In order to assist him in this task, the Minister appoints the Apprenticeship Board which consists of representatives of employers, of trade unions and of a number of government departments. Apart from its role as Counsellor to the Minister, the Board is responsible for the overall supervision of apprenticeship.(4)

3. The Minister of Labour also appoints the Apprenticeship Committees, which again consist of representatives of the employers, the trade unions, the Ministry of Labour and the technical schools. There is

an apprenticeship committee for each apprenticeable trade in each district. Their function is to supervise the faithful implementation of the syllabus and submit their recommendations to the Apprenticeship Board.(5) It is also the responsibility of the Apprenticeship Committees to approve the syllabus for their respective trades, after the syllabus is prepared by a technical committee consisting of instructors from the productivity centre and the technical schools.

4. The duration of apprenticeship, which coincides with the period apprentices attend school, is three years for all specialisations, except dressmaking and goldsmithing which are of two years duration. Apprentices receive their training mainly in industry, whilst they are working. This training is supplemented by theoretical and practical instruction offered at the technical schools. The apprenticeship courses are fully integrated in the regular programmes of the schools.(7)

5. Apprentices are selected between the age of 14-18 and, in agreement with their employers, they attend the Technical Schools of their district once a week for the first two years, and twice a week for the third year. Apprentices attend school during their working hours, and additionally third year apprentices attend school on Saturdays when most industries do not work.(8)

Since 1979 the Industrial Training Authority has been subsidising the scheme by reimbursing employers with the

wages paid to apprentices whilst they attend school. The cost of this subsidy in 1985 was £156,000 (9).

6. The Ministry of Education appoints an officer - usually an inspector - who has overall responsibility for the smooth running of apprenticeship in the schools.(10)

Inside the school, responsibility for apprenticeship lies with the Headmaster of the School. In order to assist the Headmaster in this task, one of the senior staff, usually an assistant headmaster, is assigned duties of "coordinator" of the scheme within the school. For the performance of these duties the coordinator is given remission from his normal teaching load.(11)

7. Training of students within industry is supervised by part-time inspectors, all of whom are instructors at the technical schools. The inspectors report monthly, through the Ministry of Labour, to the Apprenticeship Board, on the progress of apprentices.(12)

8. The selection of trades for which apprentice training should be provided is based mainly on the following criteria:

(a) The present and future demand for skilled workers in industry, and

(b) the availability of training facilities in the form of equipment, qualified instructors etc.

The Apprenticeship Board appoints a permanent

subcommittee from amongst its members which, in consultation with the Ministry of Education and other interested parties, submits annually to the Board suggestions as to the trades for which apprentice training will be offered. The Board, in turn, makes recommendations to the Minister of Labour, who has the authority to decide.(13)

9. In 1985 there were 15 apprenticeable trades operating in the island. The total number of registered apprentices was 997.

3. THE APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM INSIDE THE TECHNICAL SCHOOLS.

3.1 Initial Arrangements.

The first classes of apprenticeship that were established used the technical schools on a rather loose and unstructured basis. The first official document, sent by the Minister of Labour to the Chairman of the Communal Chamber, (dated 16th November 1963), asking for permission for the use of the technical schools by the apprentices, included the following:

Since there are many areas of common interest and concern between the Greek Communal Chamber and the Ministry of Labour, especially in the field of vocational education, I feel it is necessary for our long established informal cooperation to be placed on a formal basis. For this purpose I suggest that the Director of Technical and Vocational Education, Mr.Stavros Syrimis, who happens to be the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board acts as the link between our respective

services.

I also wish to inform you formally that the apprenticeship scheme, which has been planned by a Joint Board, will soon be implemented and I am requesting you to grant permission for the facilities of the Technical Schools to be used for the training of apprentices. It is understood that the use of facilities will not take place before consultation with the Director of Technical Education, and in no case should it affect the regular programmes of the schools. (15)

The above request was discussed at a meeting of the Education Committee of the Greek Communal Chamber held on 18th November 1963. Some members of the Committee expressed the view that permission should not be granted because the committee had not been previously consulted on the planning and the setting up of the apprenticeship scheme. However, in spite of this opposition the permission was eventually granted. (16)

For the next three years, until the Greek Communal Chamber was dissolved and its duties were taken over by the Ministry of Education, the apprenticeship scheme continued to work inside the technical schools on an "unstructured" basis. This meant that the apprenticeship classes, at least in theory, could use

the classrooms and workshops that were free after the normal classes were time-tabled. If there was no room in the morning, the apprenticeship classes were time-tabled in the afternoons. However, in practice, the schools tried to accommodate the apprenticeship classes and time-tabled them in parallel with the normal classes.(17)

According to the above arrangement, though the education department provided the facilities, it was not responsible for providing the teaching staff. However, as it was practically impossible to bring staff from outside to teach exclusively to the apprentices, what in effect happened was that the existing staff were used and paid on an overtime basis. The apprenticeship periods were thus not regarded as part of the normal teaching load of the school and the teachers could not be obliged to take up apprenticeship classes. In practice most teachers were quite keen to use as many of their free periods as possible to teach the apprentices in order to make some more money. Thus the Director of Technical Education was forced to send a circular to the schools limiting the number of overtime periods to six per week.(18)

The above system was not difficult to operate during the first couple of years when the number of apprenticeship classes was small. However, as the numbers of apprentices grew, time-tabling became increasingly more

difficult. This crucial stage coincided with the abolition of the Greek Communal Chamber and the establishment of the Ministry of Education.

3.2 Integration of Apprenticeship in the Technical School Programmes.

The Ministry of Labour, which was not pleased with the existing arrangements, grasped the opportunity offered by the transfer of jurisdiction, to put apprenticeship training on a more sound basis. The Ministry was well placed to make new claims because the arrangements ^{for} apprenticeship ceased to be between a government ministry and an outside independent body, (i.e. the Greek Communal Chamber), and became an intra-governmental affair between two government ministries.

The objective of the Ministry of Labour was to enable the apprenticeship system to become fully integrated in the regular programme of the technical schools. In order to further this cause, the Senior Employment Officer, Dr. Protopapas, met the Minister of Education Dr. Spyridakis in the presence of the Director of Technical Education Mr. Hadjinicolas on 24th September 1965. During the meeting the possibility and the various aspects of integration were discussed. Dr. Spyridakis informed Dr. Protopapas that such integration would be impossible for the academic year 1965-1966 since plans for the year had already been completed. However, he

promised that the possibility of incorporating the system into the regular school programmes would be studied at depth and a decision would be taken before the beginning of the next academic year (1966-1967). Meanwhile the apprenticeship system would continue to operate as it did in previous years(19).

In spite of the above promise, there were no developments on the matter until the beginning of September 1966 when Dr.Protopapas, accompanied by Mr. Demetriou, the Apprenticeship Officer, met with Mr. Georgiades, the Director of Education, who deputised for the Minister of Education who was out of the country. Mr. Hadjinicolas was also absent from Cyprus at the time. Mr. Georgiades apologised to the two representatives of the Ministry of Labour that no decision had been taken on the subject, and promised to raise it with the Minister on his return(20).

When Dr.Spyridakis returned, he gave his assent to the integration. In a report to his superiors, the Apprenticeship Officer wrote the following on his success:

The fact that the Ministry of Education consented to incorporate the Apprenticeship System into the Technical School Programmes is a firm indication that the Ministry of Education wishes to cooperate harmoniously with the Ministry of Labour. The absence of Mr.Hadjinicolas helped in the successful solution of the problem. Mr.Georgiades showed understanding and cooperation."(21) and (22).

After the consent of the Minister of Education was

obtained, the incorporation of the apprenticeship programme into the regular Technical School programme was a mere formality. First the Planning Bureau and subsequently the Council of Ministers approved the new arrangement. The financial arrangements for the implementation of the scheme were as follows:

(a) Staff emoluments would be charged to the rates of the Ministry of Education.

(b) All other expenses, including inspector fees and travelling expenses would be charged to the Ministry of Labour.(23)

As a result of the above, additional funds were allocated to the Ministry of Education to pay for the extra staff. Since 1964 these arrangements remain unaltered.

3.3 Divisive Features in the System of Administration.

The logical implication of the integration of apprenticeship in the technical school programme would be that apprentices would be put on the same footing as full-time students, in the sense that matters relating to apprenticeship would be dealt with in the same manner as matters regarding the rest of the students. However, in spite of this obvious commitment, implicitly undertaken by the Ministry of Education on behalf of the schools, apprentices were never really accepted as belonging to, or being part of, the schools. At best

apprentices were treated merely as guests who were allowed to use the school facilities.

The administrative arrangements within the schools are indicative of the attitude of the schools towards apprentices. A striking feature of these arrangements is that they promote the division between apprentices and full-time students. Thus, although, as was indicated in the previous section, overall responsibility for the apprenticeship programme lies with the headmaster, with one of his assistant headmasters acting as the coordinator, in practice matters relating to apprenticeship tend to be kept distinctly separate from the mainstream of school business. Some examples of the division between the full-time school and apprenticeship are the following:

(a) There are different sets of regulations for full time students and apprentices which set different standards for school attendance, promotion and behaviour.(24) A very noticeable example is that full-time students are required to wear uniform at school and apprentices are not.

(b) Matters affecting full-time programmes are dealt with by the Teacher Body comprising all teachers, as provided by existing legislation.(25) Similar matters affecting apprenticeship are examined by the group of teachers who teach apprenticeship.

(c) Apprentices do not participate in school functions, such as school celebrations on national days, school sports, school excursions etc. If any of these functions coincides with a day when apprentices attend school, apprentices are usually advised to stay at work. Also two separate end-of-year (graduation) ceremonies are organised. The main speaker in the ceremony for the full-time students is the headmaster of the school, whilst the speaker for the apprentices is the school coordinator for apprenticeship.

(d) There are separate records for full-time students and apprentices, and usually there are different offices.

3.4 The Request for separate Clerical Staff.

Another indication that the officials of the Ministry of Education have not really accepted apprenticeship as being part of the normal work in the school, is their ambivalence over whether the staff in the technical schools should carry out any work generated by apprenticeship.

Thus, at the meeting of the Apprenticeship Board of the 22nd July 1971 the Chairman of the Board, who was the Director of Technical Education, requested that the clerical staff in the technical schools should be increased because of the extra load of work generated by the apprentices. He also expressed the view that the School Boards, which normally employ the school clerical

staff, would be unwilling to pay for extra staff to cover apprenticeship needs. Therefore, he suggested, the appointment of the extra staff should be funded by the Ministry of Labour Apprenticeship Budget. This suggestion however was rejected by the representative of the Planning Bureau who stated that, since apprenticeship was incorporated in the regular programmes of the Technical schools, the responsibility for budgeting for clerical staff lies with the Ministry of Education.

Consequently, the clerical staff performed duties related to apprenticeship under protest, and only if such duties were kept to the minimum and absolutely essential for the running of the system. The problem persisted for years until the Industrial Training Authority introduced a scheme to subsidise the apprentices. As a result, the Authority decided to appoint a clerk in each school to keep apprenticeship records.(26) The primary intention of the I.T.A. was for these clerks to keep the apprentices' record sheets and submit returns to the Authority so that employers might be reimbursed with the wages paid to apprentices. These clerks, however, were used by the schools to perform, in addition to the above duties, most of the school administrative work related to apprenticeship.

This arrangement continued until 1983 when the Authority decided to transfer the clerks to its own Head Office,

as it was deemed that the keeping of records could be done as effectively in the Head Office as in the schools. In this way the Authority itself, and not the schools, could benefit from any free time the clerks might have.(27) This decision sparked off another round of protests, and the problem is still unresolved.

3.5 Concluding Comments.

The divisive administrative arrangements exercised in the schools have been a serious source of dysfunction and have impaired the smooth running of the system. There is often duplication of work, and delays in time-tabling. Because of the obvious difference in the treatment of students by the school administrators, the prejudice of the teachers against apprentices is reinforced. So the apprentices tend to be regarded by the teachers as inferior, and certainly not worth much bother. Consequently the quality of teaching is affected.(28) Finally, the divisive policies inside the schools often cause resentment and feelings of bad will among the apprentices.(29)

4. Administration of Apprenticeship in the Ministry of Labour.

In spite of the failings in the schools, apprenticeship would have had a brighter future had the Ministry of Labour provided the support that was needed. However, because of understaffing and lack of expertise, the Ministry of Labour has been unable to provide the

leadership that was expected of it.

When apprenticeship first started in 1963, a junior officer (second grade labour officer) was assigned by the Ministry of Labour to act as secretary to the Apprenticeship Board. This officer performed, unofficially, the duties of the Apprenticeship Officer.(30) With the enactment of the Law in 1966,(31) and the increase in the numbers of apprentices, it became evident that a special department needed to be created at the Ministry of Labour, which would be responsible for the Apprenticeship scheme. This need was pointed out by the Apprenticeship Board on the 23rd January 1967. In responding, the representative of the Ministry of Labour gave the assurance that the Ministry had plans to proceed with the setting up of a special department.(32)

The matter was raised again at another meeting of the Board, on the 15th May 1968, when members protested strongly that the machinery available to the Ministry of Labour was quite inadequate to take action on the decisions and recommendations of the Board. At the meeting it was also suggested that the existing arrangements were quite unsatisfactory, as the officer seconded to act as the Apprenticeship Officer had neither the power, nor the means, to carry out adequately the duties expected of him.(33)

As a result of the mounting pressure, the 1969 budget

provided for the establishment of an Industrial Training Section to coordinate all the vocational training institutions and activities of the Ministry of Labour.(34) The section was established according to plan in 1969, and its work was supervised by the Senior Employment Officer until early in 1970, when the newly appointed Senior Industrial Training Officer took up his duties.(35)

Among the various industrial training institutions, programmes and schemes that came under the overall responsibility of the Industrial Training Section, was the Apprenticeship Scheme.

The creation of the Industrial Training Section constituted a departure from the provision of the Law. For, whereas in the Law it was assumed that the Apprenticeship Officer and his staff would devote their time entirely to apprenticeship, in the newly established Industrial Training Section, the scheme was only a small part of the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Section.

With the establishment of the new Section things improved slightly. However the more serious deep rooted weaknesses persisted. Soon after the creation of the Unit, Mr. Shalom Dimor, Industrial Training Advisor of the International Labour Office, wrote the following in his report:

The Apprenticeship Unit Staff is inadequate both in quality and in quantity. Neither of the two-men staff has any technical background. It is impossible at this stage to develop any activities connected with the improvement and development of the scheme. This Unit has no influence on the running of the scheme and is unable, due to objective circumstances, to assume the proper control and supervision of the Scheme in the name of the Ministry of Labour.(36)

Since the above comments were written in 1970, the situation as regards the Industrial Training Section has not changed. In fact, it may be said that the creation of the Section was an act of compromise on the part of the Ministry of Labour, after its efforts to implement the Law failed. The lowering of the significance attached to apprenticeship by the Ministry of Labour was only to be expected, since the provisions in the Law which would require the Apprenticeship Officer to carry out his role in full, were never implemented. As Mr. Dimor pointed out, however, the compromise solution the Ministry of Labour opted to adopt in practice curtailed the effective contribution of this Ministry in the running of apprenticeship.

Thus, although the Ministry of Labour prided itself that the apprenticeship scheme was under its own responsibility and jurisdiction, this was in name only, for increasingly the scheme came under the control of the Ministry of Education. As will be shown later, the programmes and syllabuses of training were drawn up by the instructors of the Ministry of Education, the apprentices received their training in the technical schools which belonged to the Ministry of Education, and finally, the training of apprentices in industry was

supervised by part-time inspectors who again were instructors in the Technical Schools. Compared to the above duties, the contribution of the Industrial Training Section of the Ministry of Labour, which supposedly was the nerve centre of the system, was reduced, mostly, to routine clerical and administrative work.

It is therefore ironical, that, although in the Apprenticeship Law the Ministry of Education is not mentioned once, in effect this Ministry deals with all matters of any significance to do with apprenticeship. As will be shown later, this state of affairs has been a source of frustration for the Ministry of Labour. Inevitably apprenticeship became a source of friction between the two Ministries.

5. INSTANCES OF FRICTION BETWEEN THE MINISTRIES.

5.1 Introduction.

This section will provide details of some instances of friction over apprenticeship generated between the Ministries of Labour and Education, as a result of the weaknesses in the system described earlier. The aim is to lend support to the stated hypothesis that the administration and decision-making mechanism of apprenticeship constituted an inherent source of

dysfunction.

As will be shown, the problem arose almost from the beginning, when it was made obvious that the delineation of duties, rights and responsibilities between the two Ministries was far from clear. Some of the hotly debated issues centred round the right of apprentices to use the technical schools and over financial arrangements. This section will also lend support to the earlier statement to the effect that the problems were aggravated by the clash of personality of the officials involved.

5.2 Conflict over the use of Facilities in the Technical Schools.

After the integration of apprenticeship into the programme of the technical schools, the Ministry of Labour considered that apprentices had as much right to the use of facilities at the technical schools as any other student. In fact some officers of the Ministry of Labour went as far as to suggest that apprentices had more right to these facilities than some of the full time students. For example, soon after the integration, in April 1969, the Apprenticeship Officer wrote the following in a report to the Apprenticeship Board:

Because of the lack of instructors and of workshops in the technical schools, the apprenticeship system cannot expand. Consequently it is imperative to make room in the schools. It is my suggestion that the first cycle of general studies, which now operates within the technical schools, is transferred to general education schools.(37)

Statements like the above infuriated teachers and administrators in the schools. The great majority of these educators wanted the apprentices removed from the schools altogether, because in their view apprentices had a detrimental effect on the prestige of the schools and the quality of schooling offered to the full time students. The following statement delivered publicly during an end-of-year speech by the Headmaster of the Nicosia Technical School, is typical of the feelings of most educators towards apprenticeship.

The arrangement by which regular students share classrooms with apprentices is creating many problems. There have been frequent reports of theft of books, exercise books, pens and turning of desks into blackboards....There remains the great problem of educating them (the apprentices) at the school. Their unwillingness to attend school and progress in the theoretical subjects has been repeatedly demonstrated. The indifference of the apprentices is so great that the teachers consider their being assigned to teach apprenticeship classes as a misfortune.(38)

The resentment of teachers, especially those of academic subjects, against the presence of apprentices in the technical schools, continued to be strong throughout the twenty-five years of the existence of apprenticeship in the technical schools.(39)

Another difficulty arose from the fact that the policy of the Ministry of Education on apprenticeship, was inconsistent. There were times when there were public and forthright declarations that apprentices should be removed from the schools. For example, in a policy statement delivered to the House of Representatives on

the 16th June 1969, the Minister of Education Dr.Spyridakis declared:

The existing arrangement for apprentices to attend technical schools has many drawbacks. There is a need for the establishment of separate vocational schools, according to the German model.(40)

At other times, however, there seemed to be greater awareness that the pursuance of a policy that committed the Ministry of Education to the removal of apprentices from the schools, would be quite unrealistic, as it would never be accepted by the government. Moreover, it was realised that even if such a drastic step were ever taken, it would create severe redundancy problems for the technical school staff. Therefore, the Ministry of Education usually concentrated its efforts on combatting what it regarded as the interference of the Ministry of Labour in the running of the schools. At times it even advocated the termination of the "dual" system of administering apprenticeship.(41)

A most enlightening document, in this respect, was a report of the Ministry of Education, which was prepared by a "technical committee" in November 1978. The committee was appointed by the Director of Technical Education and consisted of officials of the Ministry "with great experience in matters related to the apprenticeship system".(42)

The main conclusion of the committee was that the existing system of "dual responsibility" created many problems which could only be overcome if the Ministry of

Education took sole responsibility over apprenticeship. The problems facing the apprenticeship scheme, cited by the committee, were the following:

(a) As a result of "dual responsibility" the administration services are duplicated.

(b) Dual responsibility causes delays in the decision-making processes, as for example, in the creation of new classes and the appointment of teachers.

(c) Technical Schools regard apprenticeship as a temporary arrangement because its operation is planned on a year-by-year basis, and because administratively apprenticeship belongs to another Ministry.

(d) As apprenticeship is regarded as temporary, teachers in the technical schools are not keen to teach apprenticeship classes. This affects the quality of teaching and creates difficulties in the appointment of new staff.

(e) As the operation of apprenticeship is decided from year to year, it is necessary to set up every year a new administrative structure in every technical school.

(f) The standard of apprentices is very low and this is a direct result of the above weaknesses.

Finally the committee recommended that the apprenticeship scheme should be taken over by the Ministry of Education, which in essence already had responsibility for the scheme.

Mr. Hadjinicolas sent the report of the Technical Committee directly to the Director of Planning Bureau

for consideration and comments.(43) It is significant to note that Mr.Hadjinicolos did not send a copy of the report to the Ministry of Labour, as normal procedure demanded, since the Ministry of Labour was an interested party, and, directly involved in the matter.(44)

It seems, however, that the Planning Bureau forwarded the report to the Ministry of Labour, as Mr.Sparsis wrote a letter on the subject to the D.G. of the Ministry of Education. In his letter Mr.Sparsis rejected the suggestion that the Ministry of Education should take over jurisdiction over apprenticeship. He argued that as a matter of principle the Ministry of Education should be concerned with matters relating to education. The apprentices however, he claimed, receive training and this is the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour. Mr.Sparsis went on to suggest that eventually apprenticeship should be taken over by the newly established Industrial Training Authority.(45)

In its own reply, the Planning Bureau supported the view that apprenticeship should, in the near future, be given to the Industrial Training Authority. In the meantime, the Planning Bureau recommended, the apprentices should receive their training in the technical schools.(46)

The recommendations of the Technical Committee of the

Ministry of Education, could be seen as the culmination of years of mistrust of this Ministry as to the intentions of the Ministry of Labour. For though the latter was always at pains to stress that the apprenticeship scheme should not be seen as being in competition with the full time education programmes provided at the technical schools,(47) its intentions were viewed with suspicion by the Ministry of Education. These suspicions were reinforced by statements from officers of the Ministry of Labour, such as the following, made by the Apprenticeship Officer in one of his reports:

I suggest that the vocational streams of the Technical Schools should be turned into apprenticeship classes for the following reasons:

(a) The training offered in the apprenticeship classes is more relevant to the needs of the industry.

(b) Apprentices are trained in the spirit required by the industry.

(c) Apprentices contribute to the production, whilst students in the vocational streams are alienated from the industry for four years, during which they are taught more theory than practical work, which has a negative effect on their ability to adjust to work situations.

(d) Industry does not accept the graduates of vocational streams as skilled craftsmen- not even as semi-skilled craftsmen- but as apprentices (learners).

(e) Apprenticeship is the surest way to create craftsmen.(48)

In such an atmosphere of mistrust, which prevailed at various degrees of intensity during the twenty-five years of existence of apprenticeship at the technical schools, seemingly minor difficulties, which could easily have been ironed out in a spirit of good will, were often blown up beyond proportion and brought about

serious crises. Instances of such crises are described below.

5.3 Crises over the use of the Technical Schools by Apprentices.

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, perhaps the most serious cause of friction between the Ministries was over the right of apprentices to use technical school facilities. As there was a chronic shortage of room in the schools the matter was raised repeatedly. For example, at a Board meeting in 1971, the Director of Technical Education proposed that, in order to overcome the problem of overcrowding in the morning, whilst the schools were empty in the afternoon, apprentices should attend school in the afternoon.(49) The proposal was opposed by the representative of the Planning Bureau, who argued that it would not be easy for apprentices to attend school after working in the industry all morning. Practically all the other members of the Board shared this view and the proposal was rejected.(50) Mr.Hadjinicolas brought up again a year later the matter of afternoon attendance for the apprentices, but again the Board turned it down.(51)

The matter was raised again in the following year. At a meeting of the Apprenticeship Board, the representative of the Ministry of Labour pointed out that his Ministry believed that there was a need for the number of apprentices to be increased, and suggested ways and

means by which such an increase could be achieved. These suggestions brought about an immediate reaction from the Headmaster of the Technical School, Nicosia, who remarked that an increase in the number of apprentices would be incongruous with the shortage of room and instructors in the technical schools.

The arguments over the housing of apprentices continued in the same vein. Yet, although their differences were never really resolved, on the whole the two Ministries reached a "modus vivendi" on the subject. There were, however, times when the arguments erupted into intense conflicts. An example of such a crisis was the following: In July 1979, Mr. Hadjinicolas, the Director of Technical Education, wrote to Mr. Sparsis, the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour, that, owing to the lack of room in the Technical Schools, arrangements were being made for all apprenticeship classes to be held in the afternoon.(52)

On receiving the letter, Mr. Sparsis reacted very strongly. He ignored Mr. Hadjinicolas and wrote directly to the D.G. of the Ministry of Education with a copy to the D.G. of Planning. In the letter he stated that on no account could the decision of the Director of Education be accepted, because, if it were implemented, "it would in essence act as dynamite which would blow up the very foundations of the apprenticeship scheme". Mr. Sparsis, after referring to previous efforts of Mr. Hadjinicolas to exclude the apprentices from the technical schools,

gave the following reasons to support his case:

(a) As the apprentices worked in the morning they would be too tired to go the school in the afternoon.

(b) There would be an acute problem of transporting the apprentices from the place of work to the Technical Schools.

(c) The afternoon attendance would lead to a considerable number of dropouts.

(d) There would be a disrupting effect in the places of production because of the frequent absences of the apprentices so that they could go to school.

(e) There would be a departure from the agreed principles of apprenticeship, as the time available in the afternoon would not be sufficient for covering the syllabus.

In view of the above, Mr.Sparsis concluded, Mr.Hadjinicolas should be given directives to continue operating the system on the agreed lines, and future decisions on the subject should be taken only after consultation between the two ministries.(53)

As a result of the above letter, it seems that pressure was put on Mr.Hadjinicolas to toe the line, and consequently attendance of apprentices continued as before.

The problem, however, came up again a year later, in September 1980, causing once more another crisis. This time the Technical School in Larnaca, with the full

backing of Mr.Hadjinicolos, decided to cut down considerably on the number of the first year intake of apprentices. As a result the acting D.G. of the Ministry of Labour wrote to Mr.Hadjinicolos protesting against this decision and asking him to reverse it immediately.(54) Mr.Hadjinicolos replied that it was the policy of his department to accept as many of the apprentices as could be accommodated. In the case of the Larnaca Technical School there was no room to accept any more apprentices.(55)

The problem was again settled with the intervention of the D.G. of the Ministry of Education, and a compromise solution was found.

5.4 Problems over the Financial Arrangements.

A serious problem at the initial stages, was over finances. Although, after the integration of apprenticeship in the regular school programme, the matter should have been settled, Mr.Hadjinicolos sent a letter to Mr.Sparsis requesting the Ministry of Labour to pay the sum of £12,668 to cover the overtime fees for the teaching of the apprentices. These fees represented the overtime fees that had to be paid as a result of the inability of the Ministry of Labour to find enough additional technical instructors to appoint for the teaching of the apprenticeship classes.(56)

After discussing the matter with Mr.Hadjinicolos,

Dr.Protopapas of the Ministry of Labour, in a note to his D.G. Mr.Sparsis, reported that it was true that there was a shortage of technical teachers. The responsibility for the teacher needs, he added, which could be covered either by permanent appointments or by temporary arrangements through the payment of overtime fees, lay entirely with the Ministry of Education. In his note, Dr.Protopapas also included the following alleged statements by Mr.Hadjinicolos, which shed light on the relations between the two Ministries at the time:

Mr.Hadjinicolos referred to the friction between our Ministry and the Ministry of Education and added that if he referred the matter of payment of overtime fees to his superiors, they would not approve it. Moreover, he stressed that the relations between the Ministries are so bad that many senior officials of his Ministry would be pleased to see the apprenticeship system collapse.(57)

In a similar vein, another note by the Apprenticeship Officer, Mr.Demetriou, confirms the conflict between the two Ministries at the time. The author of the note writes that at his meeting with Mr.Hadjinicolos on the 12.8.68. he was told that the Ministry of Education had great difficulty in maintaining the apprenticeship system in the technical schools. Mr.Hadjinicolos also pointed out that in the previous year, because of the shortage of teachers, the Ministry of Education was compelled to pay over £22,000 as overtime fees. The Ministry of Labour had refused to reimburse the Ministry

of Education with this sum. It made no sense, Mr.Hadjinicolos added, for one Ministry to plan a system of training, whilst another Ministry had to act as the executive and also shoulder the financial burden. For these reasons, according to Mr.Demetriou, Mr.Hadjinicolos warned that neither the Minister nor the D.G. of the Ministry was prepared to support the continuation of the operation of the apprenticeship system within the technical schools.(58)

Eventually, Mr.Hadjinicolos wrote to Mr.Sparsis to put the case officially that, though the Ministry of Education would be prepared to pay the normal salaries of teachers, the payment of overtime fees should be the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour.(59) To this Mr.Sparsis, in a very strongly worded letter, reminded Mr.Hadjinicolos of the agreement that the Ministry of Education would be responsible for the teaching of the apprentices and suggested that this Ministry should apply to the government for the funds it needed to pay for both the regular salaries and the overtime fees of its own teachers.(60) The claim was eventually dropped by the Ministry of Education.

This suggestion of Mr.Sparsis brings to the fore the seemingly naive claim of the Ministry of Education for the Ministry of Labour to pay the overtime fees. Obviously, irrespective of which Ministry paid, the money would come out of the same pocket, i.e. the government budget. Moreover, as the payment of salaries

came under a separate heading from other funds allotted to the Ministry, any increase in the salaries would in no way affect the rest of the Ministry of Education budget. One would therefore conclude that, by bringing up the matter of payment of overtime fees, the Ministry of Education was really trying to show that there were difficulties in running the apprenticeship system and at the same time create problems for the Ministry of Labour. The Ministry of Labour, on the other hand, was often on the defensive. The following report shows how grave this Ministry considered its problems over Apprenticeship to be.

6. The Report of the Senior Employment Officer on the problems in apprenticeship.

The above document prepared for the Ministry of Labour gives an indication of the problems that the officials of this Ministry were facing over the future of the apprenticeship scheme. The main points of the report were the following:

1. The Ministry of Education was planning to extend and develop its regular activities in technical education by
 - (a) increasing the number of students in the technical schools,
 - (b) extending the vocational stream from five to six years,
 - (c) organising special short-term courses from one to two years for the dropouts of secondary education.

All the above measures would create additional work for the instructors and teachers whilst the classrooms and workshops of the Technical Schools would be utilised to their full capacity. If these plans went through, they would create such a situation that the accommodation of the apprentices at the Technical Schools would be impossible.

2. The teaching staff in the technical schools felt very strongly that apprentices had a negative influence on the regular students and school life in general. As a result, the principals had plans to separate the apprentices from the regular students by holding the apprenticeship classes in the afternoons or evenings.

3. The Director of Technical Education was thus under great pressure, both for technical reasons (lack of space), and pedagogical reasons (bad influence of apprentices), to remove the apprenticeship scheme from the Technical Schools. This pressure could seriously affect his help and collaboration in the running of the apprenticeship scheme.

4. The Labour Ministry's facilities in the Cyprus Productivity Centre and the Higher Technical Institute, even if extended, could only accommodate half the apprentices in Nicosia. In the other towns there were no training facilities under the auspices of the Ministry

of Labour.

5. All the above could seriously affect not only the development of the Apprenticeship scheme but could also lead to its liquidation "if radical measures are not taken in time".

6. The best solution to this awkward situation lay in the creation of a climate of mutual help and collaboration with Technical Education. Only if and when such a climate was established could the development of the Apprenticeship Scheme be safeguarded. (61)

The above document was written after the Ministry of Labour tried unsuccessfully to find funds to create training centres of its own. Thus the officials of this Ministry were resigned to the existing state of affairs. However they were far from happy with the situation. As the document clearly manifests, in the Ministry of Labour there were strong feelings of despondency and frustration over the whole affair. Indicative of the helplessness of the Ministry was the conclusion in the report that the only way out would be to try to improve relations with the Ministry of Education, in spite of what seemed to the Ministry of Labour the Machiavellian efforts of this Ministry of Education to liquidate apprenticeship.

7. THE REPORT OF THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

7.1 Introduction

The researcher feels that a very apt conclusion to this chapter is to deal with a report of an interdepartmental government committee of enquiry into apprenticeship. This is because firstly, the proceedings of the enquiry illustrate the atmosphere of acrimony and mistrust between the officials of the two Ministries, and secondly, the report itself shows the futility of such an exercise when an enquiry of this type is carried out under such conditions.

7.2 The Purpose and Constitution of the Committee.

In an effort to resolve the continuing and mounting acrimony between the Ministries of Education and Labour over apprenticeship, the two Ministers met in February 1980. The problems and issues however proved to be too complex for them to decide upon immediately. They decided therefore to set up an inter-departmental committee to study the problem, and make recommendations as to the short term and long term measures that need to be taken to improve the apprenticeship scheme in the island. Members of the committee were top officials of their respective departments, namely Mr.Hadjinicolos, Director of Technical Education of the Ministry of Education, Mr.Drakos, the Director of Programmes of the

Cyprus Industrial Authority, Dr. Protopapas of the Planning Bureau and Mr. Koutouroushis, Chief Industrial Training Officer of the Ministry of Labour.(62) It may be of some significance to say that although appointed on the committee, the Director of Technical Education never participated in the meetings of the committee and, instead, he sent Mr. Kontos, an inspector of technical education to represent him.

7.3 The Interim Report.

The committee held four meetings (16th, 23rd and 27th of June and 3rd September 1980) and drafted an "interim" report.(63) This was a short document of only three pages in which it was stated that the aim of the interim report was to make recommendations on pressing problems which required immediate solutions. This report, it was stated, would be followed by a second one which would examine the long term aspects of apprenticeship in the island. The report, in an obvious effort to paper over the crack in the system, took a very moderate and reconciliatory tone. For example, after recognising that there was a real problem in accommodating, especially in two technical schools, the great number of students, the report suggested that the problem would be alleviated if apprentices attended technical workshop subjects in the afternoons.(64) Another problem, that of the unwillingness of the technical school "professors"(65) to teach apprenticeship classes, could be faced by asking professors who were formerly primary school

teachers to take these classes.(66) As for the curriculum, the committee found that it did not have any suggestions to make, as the curriculum was taught satisfactorily. The report also dwelt on the lack of uniformity in the educational background of the apprentices and suggested that there should be streaming in the theoretical subjects. Finally, the report touched on the problem of the need for the adjustment of the apprentices to the school environment(67) and recommended that "this is a purely educational matter, and the technical schools are called upon to face it in an educational spirit, taking into consideration the particular problems that the apprentices often present". The Interim Report was approved by the Committee and was submitted to the Ministers of Education and Labour on the 18th September 1980.

The Interim Report constituted a tactical victory for the Technical Education Department, for, whereas the Ministry of Labour regarded the main purpose of the Technical Committee to be an evaluation of the apprenticeship scheme, the Ministry of Education was most unwilling to accept the evaluation of the work inside the schools, as it regarded such an exercise as blatant interference in its own affairs. Thus the interim report, which found no serious fault with the work carried out in the schools, was received with

satisfacion by the Department of Technical Education. Furthermore, the Department would have been quite content if there were no sequel to the matter. However this was not to be. On the 9th of June 1982, twenty one months after the completion of the first report, the Technical Committee was asked to convene again in order to resume work on the second, "long-term" part of the report.

7.4 Deliberations over the second part of the Report.

This section will serve to illustrate, once again, the climate of non-cooperation and mistrust between the two Ministries that prevailed at the time. The first meeting of the Technical Committee took place on the 16th June 1982. Mr.Hadjinicolas, although a member of the committee, did not attend the meeting, but as previously, he sent one of his inspectors instead. At this meeting, which was held under the chairmanship of the Senior Employment Officer of the Ministry of Labour, the chairman outlined the issues and problems that could be examined by the committee. These included matters pertaining to the efficiency of the apprenticeship scheme within the schools and matters on organisation and structure of apprenticeship.

After the meeting of the 16th of June, when the intention of the Ministry of Labour became known, the representative of the Ministry of Education refused to take part in any further meetings. Without the participation of the Ministry of Education, the

committee could not of course resume its work. Thus another six months of inaction elapsed. However, as time went by, and as the Ministry of Education came under pressure, it became evident that it could not evade the issue for ever. It was at this stage that Mr.Hadjinicolos, apparently, decided to create a diversion. On 28th December 1982, he wrote a letter to the Directors General of the Ministries of Labour, Commerce and Industry, Finance, Planning, and the Cyprus Industrial Training Authority informing them of the following: As there was the possibility that the presence of apprentices inside the technical schools created problems, and had a detrimental effect on the work of the schools, increasing thus the prejudice against technical education, the Ministry of Education had decided to set up a committee which would carry out a "research" on the matter. Members of this committee would be representatives of the Ministries mentioned above. The Directors General, therefore, were requested to nominate their representatives. In the letter it was further suggested that the terms of reference of the committee would be the following:

- (a) To re-examine the arrangement by which apprenticeship operated within the technical schools.
- (b) To investigate the effect that apprentices had on the regular students.
- (c) To investigate why the "professors" were unwilling to take apprenticeship classes.
- (d) To consider the financial aspect of apprenticeship.

Finally in the letter it was suggested that the committee should submit its report within three months of its appointment.(68)

It is obvious that the intention of Mr.Hadjinicolas was for the committee to enquire into the advisability of having apprentices inside the schools. It was, therefore, unfortunate for Mr.Hadnicolas that all the government Ministries, which he wanted to participate in the proposed committee, were already committed to the policy that the only possible place where the apprentices could receive their institutional training was the technical schools. Any other solution would entail the building of new training centres which, for financial reasons, was repeatedly turned down by the government in the past. Consequently all the Ministries concerned turned down the proposal, suggesting that, since there was already a technical committee examining the problems of apprenticeship, it would be inadvisable to set up a second committee.(69) At first, the Ministry of Education did not agree with the other Ministries and tried to point out that it would be preferable to have two committees instead of one, because each of the two committees would be looking into two different facets of the problem.(70) However, eventually the Ministry of Education was forced to suspend its proposal and the committee resumed work on 8th April 1983. As a result of the above deliberations, the Technical Committee was widened to include representatives of the Ministries of

Finance and Commerce and Industry.

The Technical Committee held many meetings, during which, according to the minutes, there were often differences in points of view expressed by the two Ministries. In addition to the meetings the committee held interviews with people involved with apprenticeship. The list included two headmasters of Technical Schools, three teachers who acted as coordinators of apprenticeship inside the schools, two industrial training officers of the Ministry of Labour, two apprenticeship inspectors, the Association of the Teachers serving in the Technical Schools (OLTEK), Labour Trade Unions, Employers and a number of apprentices and former apprentices. The report was compiled and submitted to the two Ministries in October 1984.

7.5 Findings and Recommendations of the Committee.

The main findings of the Technical Committee were the following:

1. The attendance of apprentices at school, for a full day, both in the morning and in the afternoon makes the apprentices programme very heavy. This arrangement may not constitute sound educational practice.
2. The training received by apprentices in industry is not satisfactory. It should be improved so that it becomes complementary to the theoretical training the

apprentices receive at school.

3. The fact that the commencement of lessons for apprentices coincides with that of the full time students makes it difficult to enrol apprentices.

4. Teachers are reluctant to take apprenticeship classes. In some cases instructors do not have enough industrial experience.

5. Apprenticeship inspection is not satisfactory. The teachers who are appointed as inspectors should teach more apprenticeship classes than they are teaching now.

6. Apprenticeship causes problems for the Technical Schools. Apprentices tend to take with them to school bad habits, and use inappropriate language which cannot be acceptable in a school environment. Furthermore, apprentices give a wrong impression of the work carried out in the technical schools, as the general public cannot differentiate between apprentices and regular students.

7. There is a serious shortage of textbooks.

8. Apprentices have no chance of proceeding with further studies and they have a limited chance for a successful career.

The main recommendations of the Committee were as follows:

1. The time apprentices spend in the schools should be increased.

2. The responsibility for apprenticeship in the island should be taken over by the Cyprus Training Authority.

3. Apprentices should be selected through entrance examinations.
4. The apprenticeship curriculum needs to be revised. The Ministry of Education, through systematic inspection, should ensure that the curriculum is taught faithfully.
5. A new system of inspection, to be jointly carried out by the Ministry of Labour and the Industrial Training Authority, should be introduced.
6. There should be teachers nominated who would primarily teach apprentices. Whenever possible these teachers should have previous experience in the elementary schools.
7. The teaching of apprentices should if possible be taken over by their inspectors.
8. The sum paid for the writing of text-books should be increased.
9. Ways should be found to allow for the educational advancement of apprentices. For example they may be allowed to register as regular students at the technical schools.
10. Apprenticeship training schemes should be linked with the Industrial Training Authority Trade Standards, when the latter are adopted.

CONCLUSION.

The main hypothesis examined in this chapter has been that the system of administration of apprenticeship constituted an inherent source of dysfunction. The

researcher feels that the evidence that has been presented leaves no room for doubt as to the validity of the hypothesis. For it is obvious that the system of administration, which in effect provided for joint responsibility by the two Ministries, became a source of conflict and inefficiency. The deliberation of the Technical Committee of enquiry, as well as its findings, in many ways reinforce this argument.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For example, two of the highest ranking officials, the Director General of the Ministry of Labour, Mr.Sparsis, and the Director of Technical Education of the Ministry of Education, Mr.Hadjinicolos, held their posts between 1960_1985 and 1963_1986 respectively.
- 2.Evidence of this attitude of the teachers will be presented later in the thesis.
3. Report of the Technical Committee for the examination of the problems of the Apprenticeship System. Ministry of Labour, Nicosia, October 1984, p 20.
4. Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance 1985, p24.
5. Idem. p.24.
6. Report of the Technical Committee op.cit. p 22.
7. Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance, 1985, p 23
8. Idem. p 25.
9. Industrial Training Authority, Apprenticeship System, October, 1982, p 4.
10. Minutes of the Apprenticeship Board of 20th Jan.1972.
11. Report of the Technical Committee op. cit. p 27.
12. 1984 Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance p.29.
13. Report of the Technical Committee op.cit p 23.
14. Ministry of Finance, Department of Statistics; Educational Statistics 1985.
15. Cyprus Government Archives Office- Greek Communal Chamber File "Apprenticeship System".
16. Idem. Note 25th Nov. 1963
17. Interviews with people who drew up the timetables.
18. Circular dated 4th Sept. 1964.
19. Memorandum written by Dr.Protopapas; Archives of the Ministry of Labour.
20. Memorandum written by Dr.Protopapas; Archives of the

Ministry of Labour.

21. Memorandum written by Mr.Demetriou dated 14:9:66;
Archives of the Ministry of Labour.(undated)

22. At the time Mr.Hadjinicolos was the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board. Therefore the Apprenticeship Officer's clear implication that Mr.Hadjinicolos would resist integration, in spite of the fact that such integration would obviously improve the training arrangements for the apprentices, is an indication that even at the early stages there was antagonism between the officers of the two Ministries. This reference also supports the thesis, that will be expounded later, that Mr.Hadjinicolos, although the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board, often antagonised the cause of apprenticeship.

23. Planning Bureau document dated 18:10:66.

24. All matters relating to regular school pupils are regulated by law 6/61 and Administrative Regulations of 1985. In this law there is no mention of apprenticeship or apprentices, so clearly, in the eyes of the law, apprentices are not regarded as 'pupils' of the technical schools. The regulations that are in force for apprentices are thus different from those stipulated in the education law, and they have been issued by the Ministry of Labour.

25. According to existing legislation (10/69) for purely educational matters, such as the implementation of the curriculum, including the promotion of students, school discipline and extra-curricular activities, the supreme authority in the school lies with the Teacher Body. In order to carry out these duties the Teacher Body meets ordinarily once a month, and extra-ordinarily whenever it is needed. The Teacher Body does not deal with Trade Union matters, only with educational ones. Chairman of the Teacher Body is the Headmaster of the school. Decisions are taken democratically, i.e. one man one vote.

26. Minutes of the Governing Board of the Cyprus Industrial Training Authority of 30.8.1979.

27. Minutes of the Board of the Cyprus Training Authority date 9th April 1985.

28. For evidence of the attitude of teachers and the effect on their teaching please see Chapter Eleven.

29. The views and feelings of apprentices are explored later in Chapter Eleven.

30. Report on Apprenticeship, April 1969.

31. The Law provided for the appointment of a chief administrator of the apprenticeship scheme who was

described as the "Apprenticeship Officer". In addition to being the Secretary to the Board, the main duties of the Apprenticeship Officer were to prepare progress scheme and prepare and compile lists of establishments where trainees could receive their training, keep the register of apprentices etc.

32. Minutes of the meeting of 23rd Jan.1967.

33. Minutes of the meeting of 15th May 1968.

34. Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance 1969 Annual Report.

35. The main functions of the Industrial Training Section were:

a) To advise the Minister generally on the industrial training needs of the Cyprus labour force.

b) To collect and collate statistical data concerning the industrial training needs of the Cyprus economy and plan all industrial training needs of the Ministry.

c) To coordinate the activities of all existing training schemes under the Ministry.

d) To implement policies and Laws concerning industrial training.

(Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance 1970 Annual Report).

36. Shalom Dimor: The Craft Apprenticeship in Cyprus (Report), Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance, 1970.

37. T.Demetriou.

Study on the Apprenticeship System, Ministry of Labour, April 1969.

38. Speech delivered by Mr. G.Lycourgos. Headmaster Technical School, Nicosia, June 1969.

39. The attitude of teachers towards apprentices is examined later on in Chapter Eleven.

40. Minutes of the House of Representatives of the meeting of 16th June,1969..

41. "Dual" in this case was the term used to denote the system of joint or shared responsibility over apprenticeship.

42. Report on Apprenticeship Ministry of Education, June 1979. It needs to be noted that the committee which prepared the report consisted of inspectors of Technical Education, therefore it could be said that it presented the Ministry of Education point of view.

43. Ministry of Education 309/68/66 of 14.3.79.

44. Mr. Hadjinicolas, by sending the report directly to the Planning Bureau and not through his D.G., in fact

ignored his superior as well.

45. Ministry of Labour File 68/79 of 4th May 1979. Here it needs to be noted that by 1985, after the departure of Mr. Hadjinicolas, the Ministry of Education came round to the view that apprenticeship should be taken over by the Industrial Training Authority.

46. Planning Bureau 68/79 of 11th July 1979. A memo written by the Planning Bureau on the Technical Committee Report is most revealing of the Bureau's position on the subject of apprenticeship. The memo, after giving a synopsis of the report, presents the views of the Ministry of Labour as follows:

"The ministry of Labour holds the view that the problems facing the Apprenticeship system have not been created by the "dual responsibility", but because of the fact that the Ministry of Education has never regarded apprenticeship "as its own", and has not really integrated it in the technical school programme. This has created the procedural difficulties, as well as the reluctance of the teaching staff to teach apprentices, and also the low standard of apprentices".

In a further analysis of the problem, the memo points out that the two Ministries, if they acted in unison, could offer supplementary services and benefits to the system. The memo goes on to say that even if the Industrial Training Authority were to take over apprenticeship, the technical schools would continue to be used for the training of apprentices because the erection of new training centres would be uneconomical.

47. The effort by the Ministry of labour to reassure all concerned, and most of all the Ministry of Education, that apprenticeship was not in competition with technical schools, started from the very first days of apprenticeship. In fact, the Minister of labour stressed this point at the press conference he gave on the introduction of apprenticeship in the island on 18th November, 1963.

48. T.Demetriou (Apprenticeship Officer). Report on Apprenticeship Ministry of Labour, April 1962, p.12.

49. Mr. Hadjinicolas also suggested that by having the apprentices attend school in the afternoon, the problem of the negative effect that the apprentices had on school life, would also be resolved.

50. Minutes of Appr. Board, 22nd July 1971

51. Minutes of Appr. Board 10th July 1972.

52. Ministry of Education 309/68/16 of 14th July 1979. Here it needs to be explained that as a result of the Turkish invasion and the ensuing occupation of the

Northern part of the island, some of the Greek Technical Schools were lost. As the population fled to the South, the existing schools could not cope with the increase in the numbers of pupils. As a temporary solution, a system of shifts was introduced so that in every school building there was a morning school and an afternoon school. In order to accommodate the shifts, however, the length of the teaching periods was shortened from 45 minutes to 35 minutes. The apprentices themselves were not affected by the shift system, as most of them attended school only one day a week, both in the morning and in the afternoon.

In June 1979, during a Board meeting of the Higher Technical Institute, the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour made the remark that, judging by the success rate of the technical school graduates in the entrance examinations of the Higher Technical Institute, the standard of work at these schools was dropping. Very soon after the above remark was made, the Director of Technical Education, in a letter to the D.G. of the Ministry of Labour, wrote the following:

The double shift at the Technical School Nicosia had as a result the reduction of the length of the teaching period from 45' to 35' and number of periods from 40 to 36. As a result of the above, a drop was observed in the success rate of our students in the entrance examinations for the H.T.I., a fact that in a very reproachful manner you pointed out during a meeting of the Board of the H.T.I. In order that we may bring back the previous conditions of work and improve thus our standards, we have decided to abolish the afternoon school. Thus, the length of the teaching period will become again 45' and the number of periods 40. In order to accommodate the classes, some workshop periods of the full-time students and the Apprenticeship will be taught in the afternoons.

(Ministry of Education 309/68/16 of 14th July 1969.

53. Ministry of Labour Y.E.63/72/11 of 14th August 1979.

54. Y.E.64/72 of 24th Sept. 1980.

55. Min. of Educ. 309/68/16 of Sept. 1980.

56. Letter dated 15th April 1968 (Min. of Educ. File No. 309/68/16)

57. Note dated 8.8.68 -Ministry of Labour Archives.

58. The note is dated 12.8.68 and is addressed to the Senior Employment Officer.

59. Ministry of Education 309/68 of 15th April 1968.

60. Ministry of Labour 4/67 of 13th July 1968.
61. Report sent by Mr. Koutouroushis to the Ministry of Education on 3.6.70.
62. Ministry of Labour 64/72 of 20th February 1980.
63. Ministry of Labour 64/72/A of 18.9.1980.
64. Afternoon attendance for apprentices, as stated earlier, was bitterly opposed by the Ministry of Labour.
65. Secondary school teachers in Cyprus, as in Greece and France etc., are described as 'professors'.
66. Here there was an obvious implication that former primary school 'professors', because of their previous experience with teaching at lower academic levels, would be able to cope better.
67. This was an obvious reference to the complaints of misconduct of apprentices in schools.
68. Ministry of Education 309/68/19 of 20th Dec.1982.
69. Min. of Labour 68/79/of 10th Jan. 1983, Planning Bureau 68/79 of 25th Jan. 1983, Industrial Training Authority 16.1.1.1 of 7th March 1983.
70. Min. of Education 309/68/19 of 15th Feb. 1983.
71. The Committee is referring here to the first and second year programme. This programme normally consists of seven periods in the morning (2 Mathematics, 1 Greek, 1 English, 1 Technology, 2 Technical Drawing) and 3 periods of workshop practice in the afternoon.

CHAPTER SEVEN

APPRENTICESHIP BOARD, APPRENTICESHIP COMMITTEES AND INSPECTORATE.

1.0 Introduction.

As was explained in Chapter 3, although the Apprenticeship Law was enacted in 1966, few of its significant provisions were ever put into effect. Of the provisions of the Law which were implemented, the most significant were the ones which provided for the establishment of the Apprenticeship Board, the Apprenticeship Committees and the Inspectorate. These provisions are still valid today.

The hypothesis that will be examined in this chapter is that although the idea behind the setting up of the Apprenticeship Board, the Apprenticeship Committees and the Inspectorate was a sound one, the effectiveness of these bodies was seriously impaired as a result of the antagonism between the Ministries of Education and Labour and other inefficiencies on the system.

In the analysis that follows the three bodies are dealt with separately because, although they were complementary, each one had a different role to play. In

the same way the responsibilities of the three bodies, although obviously overlapping, were actually quite distinctly delineated.

2.0 Apprenticeship Board.

2.1 Constitution and Functions of the Board.

The law provides that the Apprenticeship Board is a widely representative body that includes all parties, both government and non-government, which are either directly or indirectly involved in the training of apprentices. The government representatives are the following:

- (a) the Director of Technical, Agricultural and Vocational Education (Ministry of Education);
- (b) the Principal of the Technical School, Nicosia, or his representative;
- (c) one representative each of the Ministries of Labour and Social Insurance, Communications and Works, Commerce and Industry, and of the Planning Bureau, to be nominated by the respective Minister;
- (d) the Director of the Productivity Centre, or his representative.

The non-government representatives were the following:

- (a) three representatives of the most representative Trade Unions;

(b) three representatives of the Cyprus Employers Associations;

(c) one representative of the Cyprus Supervisors' Development Association.(1)

The functions of the Board may be grouped in two categories. Firstly there are the functions related to the implementation and the running of the apprenticeship system. In these areas the legislator intended the Board to have full jurisdiction over matters of planning and control. More specifically these functions are the following:

(a) to provide or secure provision of apprenticeship courses and other facilities for the persons employed or intended to be employed in the apprenticeable industries;

(b) to estimate the number of apprentices required to be trained in particular industries;

(c) to establish and recommend standards of training of apprentices;

(d) to apply or make arrangements for the application of selection tests or other methods of ascertaining the attainment of any standards recommended by the Board.

The second main role of the Board is to advise the Minister of Labour over matters of policy. The functions of the Board in this respect are the following:

(a) Recommend to the Minister the declaration of additional industries as "apprenticeable industries";

(b) recommend to the Minister the taking of such other steps in relation to apprenticeship of workmen as seem to the Board desirable;

(c) recommend to the appropriate authorities that such steps should be taken as seem desirable to ensure that young persons are guided into suitable vocations.

The above clearly indicate that the Board was intended to be a highly respected body with wide powers. That this was the intention of the initiators of the scheme, is supported by a recommendation made at a meeting of high-ranking officials of the Ministry of Labour, which was held soon after the enactment of the Law, that "the members of the Board should be top level people from the nominating bodies".(2)

In fact, when the first appointments to the Board were actually made, they were obviously in full accordance with the above recommendation, as the first Board consisted, without exception, of very highly placed representatives.(3) In the subsequent Boards, however, the level of representation gradually lowered.(4) This lowering of the status of the Board may be attributed to a possible gradual realization of the participating bodies of the ineffectiveness of the Board.

As for the functions of the Board, it is obvious from the above that the Law gave the Board wide powers over all significant matters pertaining to apprenticeship.

However, as will be shown in the following paragraphs, the Board was never really able to exercise these powers, mainly because of intra-governmental conflicts and the personal rivalries of the civil servants. Significantly, there was a marked absence of disputes between the government and the non-government members of the Board. Also there were no recorded differences between the representatives of the employers and the trade unions, although such differences would be more natural.(5)

2.2 The Chairman of the Board.

2.2.1 Introduction

The office of the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board was held for over twenty-five years by a single person, namely the Director of Technical Education of the Ministry of Education. As will be shown, the impact that the chairman had over the functioning of the Board was indeed profound, and in many ways determined the role the Board was able to play in matters of apprenticeship, and consequently affected the efficiency of the system itself. For this reason the effect that the chairman had on the development of apprenticeship merits examination at some length.

2.2.2 The Initial Election of the Chairman.

The appointment of a suitable chairman for the Board was, from the very beginning, regarded as crucial to the

success of the scheme. An indication of the seriousness with which the Ministry of Labour considered the matter, is found in the minutes of top officials, meeting under the chairmanship of the Director General of the Ministry (6). At this meeting which was held soon after the enactment of the Law, Mr.Theocharides, the Director of the Productivity Centre, suggested that the Law should be changed so that the chairman of the Apprenticeship Board would be appointed directly by the Minister of Labour, and not elected by the members of the Board. In this way, Mr.Theocharides explained, the Ministry would ensure that the chairman would be able to discharge his responsibilities efficiently.

The Director General agreed that it was important to have a strong chairman. However, it would not be easy to change the Law, so he suggested that the Ministry should try to point out to all interested parties, and the members of the Board, the need to elect a suitable chairman. There was also consensus on the need for an "independent" chairman.

The election of the chairman took place at the first meeting of the Apprenticeship Board which was held on the 23rd February 1967. At the meeting Dr. Protopapas, after welcoming the members of the Board on behalf of the Minister of Labour, read a letter sent by a trade union (P.E.O.) which proposed Mr. Hadjinicolas, the Director of Technical Education of the Ministry of

Education, as chairman. Dr. Protopapas proceeded to say that the Ministry of Labour favoured Mr. Hadjinicolas' candidacy and seconded the proposal. Subsequently Mr. Hadjinicolas was elected unanimously.(7)

In view of the rivalry between the two Ministries, the support of the candidacy of the Director of Technical Education by the Ministry of Labour raises certain questions. The researcher put these questions to Mr. Hadjinicolas himself, during an interview. He replied that the Ministry of Labour supported his candidacy for two reasons. The first reason was obvious. The Minister of Labour recognised that by having the Director of Technical Education as the chairman of the Board, he would make sure of the cooperation of the Technical Schools. However, according to Mr. Hadjinicolas even more important was the second reason, which was the following. He and Mr. Papadopoulos, the Minister of Labour, were very close friends. Mr. Hadjinicolas further revealed that Dr. Spyridakis, the Minister of Education, must have found out about this special relationship because on one occasion he challenged Mr. Hadjinicolas with the question " On whose side are you, with Mr. Papadopoulos or with me?" Mr. Hadjinicolas added that he, naturally, denied that he had any dealings with the Minister of Labour outside those

stemming from his official duties.

The above revelations are very significant in view of the open clash between the two Ministries which was at its worst at that very period. They also indicate that to a considerable degree the establishment and evolution of the apprenticeship scheme depended on the personal relationships between the protagonists.

2.2.3 Friction between the Chairman of the Board and the Minister of Labour.

When Mr. Papadopoulos was dropped from the Cabinet after a government reshuffle in 1971 (8), the relationship between the Ministry of Labour and Mr. Hadjinicolas changed dramatically. As the Chairman of the Board no longer enjoyed to the same degree the support of the new Minister of Labour, he felt it was time for him to resign. In taking this decision he was also influenced by the fact that the apprenticeship scheme was running into increasing difficulties. It was obviously not so successful as people expected it to be, and there was great pressure from the teachers to have the apprenticeship classes removed from the technical schools.(9)

Mr. Hadjinicolas asked the Board to relieve him of his duties as chairman at a meeting of the Board on the 8th October 1970. However the members of the Board did not

accept the resignation and decided to discuss the matter at the following meeting, obviously in order that deliberations could take place behind the scenes(10).

At the following meeting Mr.Hadjinicolos announced that, in view of the requests of all the members of the Board, he had decided to continue to offer his services as chairman. Subsequently Dr.Protopapas, speaking on behalf of the Ministry of Labour, thanked the chairman for deciding to stay on and added that he never doubted that the chairman always acted in a spirit of cooperation. His dual capacity as Director of Technical Education and chairman of the Board, Dr.Protopapas added, contributed greatly towards the smooth running of the Apprenticeship Scheme.The other members of the Board added their own comments of appreciation for his work. Thus, Mr.Hadjinicolos eventually consented to withdraw his resignation(11).

It is obvious that by offering his resignaion Mr.Hadjinicolos won a tactical victory. He drove home to the officials of the Ministry of Labour, and to the other members of the Board, that without the cooperation of the Ministry of Education there could be no future for apprenticeship . The surest way to obtain this cooperation was to have the Director of Technical Education as the chairman of the Board. Thus, Mr.Hadjinicolos' election as chairman of the Board became almost automatic and his personal standing

unassailable.

Mr.Hadjinicolos used the threat to resign on other occasions in order to drive this point home. Perhaps the most dramatic one was the following: On the 18th May 1978, in a letter to all members of the Board, he announced his intention to resign from his office as chairman "for purely personal reasons"(12).The letter of resignation was discussed at the following meeting of the Board, which Mr. Hadjinicolos refused to chair. In the same way as on the previous occasion, the representative of the Ministry of Labour appealed to Mr.Hadjinicolos to withdraw his resignation. The other members of the Board also praised his services and unanimously requested that the resignation should be withdrawn. Under the "pressure" Mr.Hadjinicolos withdrew the resignation at the following meeting of the Board(13).

It was therefore very unfortunate that often the role of Mr.Hadjinicolos as chairman of the Board came in conflict with his role as Director of Technical Education. Furthermore it was obvious that whenever such a conflict arose, the loyalty of Mr.Hadjinicolos lay with his own full time technical education(14). As a result, there were occasions when he tried to distance himself from the work of the Board by not attending the Board meetings, in spite of the fact that he was the chairman.

Some of the most striking examples of the failure of Mr.Hadjinicolos to attend the meetings were on two occasions, when the members of the Board were to elect a chairman(15). Thus at the meeting of the 16th June 1981, when the chairman was to be elected, Mr.Hadjinicolos was "unable" to attend. The representative of the Ministry of Labour explained that his Ministry intended to propose Mr.Hadjinicolos as chairman. Consequently, the election of the chairman was postponed for the following meeting when Mr.Hadjinicolos was duly elected as chairman(16). It is relevant to mention that at the meeting of the Board following his election, Mr.Hadjinicolos again did not turn up.(17)

The above was not the only time that Mr. Hadjinicolos was absent when the members of the Board were to elect a chairman. The meeting of 9th September 1983 was such an occasion. Mr.Hadjinicolos did not attend, in spite of the fact that the meeting was honoured by the presence of the Minister of Labour himself. Again the election of chairman was postponed and Mr.Hadjinicolos was elected at the following meeting.(18)

It is obvious from the above that the divided loyalties of the chairman were bound to hinder the functioning of the Board. It needs to be noted, however, that it would be simplistic to attribute all disputes that arose to personal factors alone. Thus on many issues the chairman

of the Board was at variance with the majority of the rest of the members, quite simply because the policies that the Board tried to implement were seen by the Ministry of Education as lying within its own jurisdiction. As explained below, the most hotly contested issues were those which were related to the exercise of control by the Board within the schools. This will be the subject of the section that follows.

2.3 The Board and the Exercise of Control Inside the Schools.

The matter was raised soon after the implementation of apprenticeship at a meeting of the Board on the 9th November 1967. As the discussion that followed was indicative of the views of the various parties on the subject, throughout the period under review, it is outlined below.

The issue was raised as a result of the Apprenticeship Secretary's inclusion in his annual report of a section on the work carried out inside the schools. The chairman objected strongly to this part of the report and requested that it should be struck off. The reason he gave for the request was that, since apprenticeship classes were incorporated in the regular programme of the technical schools, the matter was entirely under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education. The Board therefore, the chairman concluded, had no right

whatsoever to exercise control inside the schools.

During the discussion that followed, all members of the Board, government and non-government representatives alike -except of course those that represented the Ministry of Education- disagreed with the chairman's interpretation of the rights of the Board. The representative of the Planning Bureau, for example, pointed out that it was the duty of the Board to examine the facilities provided by the Technical Schools. The employers' representative added that the Board should be fully aware of the potential and ability of the schools to provide suitable apprenticeship training so that it could deal with the problems that arose. However, in spite of the fact that the other members of the Board spoke in a similar vein, the chairman refused to accept the wish of the majority, so the matter remained unresolved.

It needs to be explained at this point, that the issue of control inside the schools was indeed a complicated one, because in addition to other considerations there were legal difficulties; for according to the very detailed and precise provisions of the legislation on education, the exercise of control in the schools, including the curricula and the teaching and learning processes, was the responsibility of the Minister of Education. This responsibility was met through duly authorised officers such as inspectors of schools and

headmasters.(19)

On the other hand, the Board, according to its own terms of reference, as stated in the Apprenticeship Law, did not only have the right but also the duty to exercise control over the institutional training of apprentices. Clearly, however, from the moment the Board chose to hand over the institutional training of its apprentices to the technical schools, its terms of reference came in conflict with the relevant provisions of the Education Law, which the Ministry of Education was very zealous to uphold. The difference of view remained therefore unresolved. Specific instances of problems that were created because of this inherent weakness in the system will be given later.

Even more conspicuous than the clash between the functions of the Board and the Ministry of Education, was the clash between the functions of the Apprenticeship Committees and the Ministry. The nature of this clash will be explained in the following section.

3.0 Apprenticeship Committees.

3.1 Constitution and Functions.

The main function of the Apprenticeship committees is to assist the Apprenticeship Board, particularly on specific matters which concern individual trades. Thus,

according to the Law (CAP 7), apprenticeship committees are established by the Minister of Labour in respect of each apprenticeable industry. In practice, in order to decentralise the system, a different apprenticeship committee is appointed in every district for every trade. As a result there are, for example, four apprenticeship committees for furniture construction, one in every district.

The constitution of the committees is similar to that of the Board. There are representatives from the Employers' Associations, from the Trade Unions, from the Labour Office and from the Technical Schools.

As for the functions of the apprenticeship committees provided by the Law, some of them were not problematic in that they did not enter the territory of institutional training. These functions were the following:

- (a) Advise and make recommendations to the Board on all matters relating to the industry.
- (b) Satisfy itself that the employer is suitable to employ apprentices and has adequate facilities to give proper training.
- (c) Investigate complaints made by any apprentice, parent or employer.
- (d) Foster and spread the ideals of apprenticeship in the industry.
- (e) Review or test apprentices' progress in industry.

(f) Furnish the Board with such information as it may require relating to matters of apprenticeship in their industry.

Other functions however were directly related to the institutional training of apprentices, and became thus a source of dysfunction and caused disputes between the committees and the schools. These functions were the following:

(a) Visit, during normal working hours, classrooms and workshops where apprentices are being trained.

(b) Review or test apprentices' progress in related instruction.

(c) Conduct the final examination of apprentices.

Some instances of problems created, as a result of the conflict of responsibility and the policy to exclude apprenticeship committees from the schools, are given below.

3.2 The Policy of Exclusion of the Apprenticeship Committees from the Technical Schools.

As indicated above, throughout their twenty five years of existence, technical schools tried to discourage apprenticeship committees from becoming involved in the running of the schools. Even visits by the committees were frowned upon. The following statement by the chairman of the Board during a meeting, is indicative of the policy that was followed:

In Nicosia there have been some difficulties in relation to visits by apprenticeship committees. These visits were regarded by some as aiming at exercising some kind of control. It has therefore been decided that the committees may visit classes and workshops in the schools only if they are accompanied by the Headmaster of the School, and provided that such visits are not used by the committees to exercise control over (evaluate) the teaching processes.(20)

In another instance, which again was indicative of the climate which prevailed, the secretary (21) of an apprenticeship committee wrote a letter to the Headmaster of the Technical School, Nicosia, which included the following request:

I wish to inform you that the car mechanics apprenticeship committee, during its meeting of 15th Nov. 1979, expressed the wish to visit the classrooms and workshops of the school to observe the teaching of its apprentices. The purpose of the visit is to allow the members of the committee to obtain a better picture of the education that is offered to the apprentices.(22)

One would have thought that the letter was in line with the policy of the Director of Technical Education on visits to schools by apprenticeship committees, as stated in the quotation above. However the Headmaster did not grant the request. Instead he put the matter to his staff during a staff meeting. When he read the letter, the teachers expressed their shock and outrage at the "audacity" of the request. They also made it clear that they would not allow outsiders observe their

lessons. The Headmaster fully agreed with the reaction of his staff.(23) Subsequently, after consulting the Director of Technical Education, the Headmaster sent to the secretary of the committee the following reply:

I refer to your letter of the 7th December 1979, and I regret to inform you that I am not in a position to examine any matter when the proper procedure is not followed. In the present case your request should have been submitted through the Director of Technical Education. I shall gladly examine your request, in consultation with the Director, provided the proper procedures are followed.(24)

The letter had a damping effect on the enthusiasm of the committee (25). They did not seek to gain access to the school again and ceased to be interested in creating closer ties with the schools. Before the reference to the matter is concluded, the following needs to be noted, as it gives a fuller indication of the state of affairs that existed at the time. Apparently, when the employers originally made it known to the school that it was their wish to visit classrooms and workshops in the school, they also expressed their willingness to donate such equipment as the School might be short of. However the school administrators did not try to take up the offer, because they felt it was the responsibility of the government to provide such equipment as the school needed.(26)

3.3 Contribution of Apprenticeship Committees.

In spite of the above, it would be misleading if the

reader was left with the impression, that because of difficulties, the Apprenticeship Committees were unable to make an effective contribution to apprenticeship, for the opposite is true. The committees in general could justifiably claim much of the credit for any success that the apprenticeship system could show. The reason for the effectiveness of the committees is that they included employers and trade-unionists who, in their great majority, cared about apprenticeship because they dealt with matters which concerned them directly. Consequently, they worked very closely with the technical school representatives, who were themselves instructors on the specialised subjects. The employers were, of course, understandably very keen for their apprentices to be taught what the industry needed. The trade unions on the other hand were again often represented by people who worked in the trade and who could thus make constructive contributions which stemmed from their own personal experience.

The committees also helped considerably in forging closer links between industry and the schools, in spite of the difficulties explained earlier. The creation of such links were naturally unavoidable, since the committees afforded the opportunity to people of the same trade, and presumably sharing the same interests, to meet on a regular basis and discuss matters of common interest. Thus in many cases friendships were created between the instructors on the one hand and the

employers and the trade unionists on the other. So, although the committees might have been barred from visiting schools on an official basis, many members of the committees were invited by instructors to visit their classes on a personal basis and as friends. In the same way, many instructors were welcomed to visit the industry. What was even more positive and effective was the arrangement by which instructors of technical schools were appointed as apprenticeship inspectors. These inspectors were also members of the apprenticeship committees.

4.0 Apprenticeship Inspectors.

4.1 Functions.

The inspectors are appointed by the Minister of Labour. Their functions, according to the Law, are the following:

(a) To visit the firm and inspect the quantity, the quality and the method of instruction given to apprentices by the firm's instructor at the place of work, and to see that such instruction is in accordance with the relevant syllabuses.

(b) to cooperate with and advise the firm's instructor on the interpretation and application of the syllabuses.

(c) to hold interviews with the apprentice and the employer, to hear comments and investigate complaints about the behaviour and the progress of the apprentice, and to improve, where necessary, the relations between

the apprentice and the firm,

(d) to keep records and submit reports to the Apprenticeship Committee on the level of instruction offered and the progress made by the apprentices,

(e) to cooperate with the local Technical School, where the apprentices receive their related instruction and with the special Committee for the drafting of the examination papers.(27)

In the course of this chapter the writer will examine the degree to which the inspectors have been able to carry out their functions efficiently. However, before this is done, and in order to place the work on the inspectorate in its true perspective, it has been considered advisable to insert the following section on the appointment and terms of service of the inspectors.

4.2 Appointment of Inspectors.

As stated in Chapter 3, when apprenticeship was first introduced, it seemed convenient to appoint as inspectors, instructors of the technical schools. Thus the inspection of apprentices was carried out in the afternoons when the instructors were not required to teach at the school. Each trade in every town had its own inspector. The number of apprentices in the charge of each inspector was thus kept small, and rarely exceeded forty. This arrangement made possible the understanding that inspectors should visit every apprentice at his place of work at least once a month.

At one time (around 1968), as the number of apprentices and apprenticeable trades increased, the Ministry of Labour seriously considered the possibility of appointing full time inspectors to take over the duties of those who worked on a part-time basis. These thoughts eventually took the form of concrete proposals to the Board for the appointment of five full-time inspectors. The proposal was included in the proposed budget for the apprenticeship scheme for the year 1970 (28). The proposed posts were of a high status, in that the salaries that were suggested for the posts were relatively very high and, correspondingly, quite high qualifications were required (29).

The proposal was discussed at the Board meeting of 28th May 1969. It is relevant to mention that at this very meeting the Director General of the Ministry of Labour announced the intention of his Ministry to set up an Industrial Training Department (30). The appointment, therefore, of inspectors was part of the plan of the Ministry of Labour to upgrade the system of apprenticeship.

The proposal had a mixed reception. Some of the Board members, though they agreed with the appointment of full-time inspectors, suggested that the seventeen currently serving part-time inspectors should be kept on as well, so that they could act in an auxiliary

capacity. Another suggestion was that the financial burden to be created by the appointment of five inspectors would have been rather excessive. Finally, all the members of the Board, with the exception of the representative of the Planning Bureau, voted for the Board to recommend the appointment of three new full-time inspectors and maintain the services of the part-time inspectors.

The representatives of the Planning Bureau, however, voted against the appointment of new Inspectors and emphatically requested that his views were recorded in the minutes. The Planning Bureau was of the opinion that it was premature to make appointments of inspectors before the Industrial Training Department of the Ministry of Labour was established, as there was a possibility that after the establishment of the department, the policy and the needs for training might change.

Eventually when the matter was presented for consideration at government level, the views of the Planning Bureau prevailed. Thus, in spite of the recommendation of the Board, the proposal for the creation of the new posts did not materialise. The matter was in fact dead and buried forever, for it was not raised even after the establishment of the Industrial Training Department. Consequently the inspection of apprentices has continued ever since to be

carried out by technical school instructors, who serve as inspectors on a part-time basis.

4.3 Remuneration of Inspectors.

The matter of the remuneration of inspectors has been the subject of controversy, and many feel it has had a serious effect on the development and effectiveness of apprenticeship.

The first three inspectors offered their services free. In spite of their good will, however, it gradually became obvious to the Board that it was not right for the inspectors to pay travelling expenses out of their pockets. In February 1964 it was decided, therefore, that the inspectors should be paid 120 pounds a year. The amount must have seemed so meagre that the Board felt the need to justify its decision through the following record in the minutes.

It was agreed that, taking into account the limited amount of money allocated for this preliminary stage of the apprenticeship system, such inspectors should be asked to accept a yearly sum of 120 pounds, to be paid in 12 monthly instalments of 10 pounds per month.(31)

The level of remuneration of inspectors, low though it was, remained unchallenged for the surprisingly long period of five years, until the Nicosia district inspectors sent a letter to the Board demanding that their salary should be raised from 120 pounds a year to 200 pounds a year.(32) The matter was discussed at the Board meeting of the 31st January 1969. One of the

proposals put forward at the meeting was that since the number of apprentices in the charge of each inspector varied considerably, it was unfair for all inspectors to be paid at the same rate. The proposal was adopted in principle and was later incorporated in a formula which provided for a sliding scale of payment of 12 pounds per month for inspectors with up to 20 apprentices, and went up to 17 pounds per month for inspectors with over 60 apprentices.

In each case, half of the above sum was deemed to cover travelling expenses and the other half was the salary.(33)

At the same meeting, together with the revision of salaries, the Board decided that the inspectors were to be paid for only 10 months of the year and not for twelve, as they were paid previously. The intention was to stop the payment of inspectors during the two month school summer vacations, because, in the Board's opinion, during this time the inspectors had nothing to do.(34) Thus, the new remuneration scales in fact meant that no increase was given to inspectors with fewer than 20 apprentices, whilst inspectors with the maximum number of apprentices (61 and over), received an increase of about 40%. As the great majority of inspectors had 31-40 apprentices, the average increase for each inspector came to about two pounds per month. The new scales were put into effect as from the 1st February 1969 (35).

The decision disappointed the inspectors who complained bitterly to the Board and the officials about the virtual rejection of their claims for an increase in their payment. What the inspectors resented most, however, was the decision of the Board to stop payment during the summer months, for according to them, during this period they carried out some of their most constructive work in making contacts with the industry and finding new apprentices. It may also be added that during interviews that the researcher had with a number of instructors who were at that time serving as inspectors, they expressed their bitterness at the Board's apparent inability to appreciate the amount and significance of the work they were doing. These instructors also pointed out at that particular time, that the teacher trade union was not interested in their claim and they were therefore powerless to pursue their cause more vigorously.

4.4 The Teacher's Union Efforts for Salary Increase.

Four years later there came about an apparently complete reversal of the Teachers' Union (OLTEK) policy of indifference towards the inspectors' remuneration and conditions of service. Thus, in February 1973, OLTEK submitted to the Director General of the Ministry of Labour a claim for sharp increases in the region of 100% to the existing inspectors' remuneration. The principle of paying inspectors according to the number of apprentices was not challenged by OLTEK. It simply

demanded that the scales should be raised. Additionally, OLIEK demanded that the previous arrangement by which inspectors were paid during the summer as well, should be brought back.(36)

The claim was discussed by a committee of government officers during a number of meetings. After long deliberations the committee decided to recommend that inspectors should be given an increase. They were however unable to agree as to the level of this increase.

As for the Teachers' Union demand that inspectors should be paid during the summer months as well, the officials' unanimous view was the following: they considered that it was indeed essential for the apprentices to be inspected during the summer months, particularly as a great number dropped out of the scheme during this period.(37) However, they thought that even if inspectors were paid for the summer, the inspection of apprentices would not take place as most instructors would be away for the summer.(38)

The above recommendations and comments were discussed by the Board at its meeting of the 13th March 1973. During the discussion some prominent members of the Board linked any increase in salary with the efficiency of the system and they quite specifically questioned the conscientiousness of some inspectors.(39) After a lengthy debate on the matter, including adequate

supervision of inspectors, the Board decided to grant a general increase of 20%. It was also decided to limit the number of apprentices that any inspector could have in his charge to a maximum of fifty.

Surprisingly, the Trade Union accepted the Board proposals. Thus, once again, the attempt for a substantial increase in the remuneration of inspectors was unsuccessful.

There were another two revisions of salary, one in 1981 and the other, only two years later, in 1983. Both came about as a result of claims put forward by the Trade Union. In the first case there was an average increase of 45% and in the second case 20% (40).

It needs to be noted that though the increase of 45% gives the impression of being substantial, in fact it barely covered inflation since the previous revision of 1973. Also the 1983 revision followed a general increase of salaries of all civil servants. Therefore to all intents and purposes the increase did not bring about, in real terms, any betterment of the salaries of inspectors.

4.5 The Effects of the Low Remuneration on Inspectors.

It needs to be stressed at this point that the role of

the inspectors was vital for the continued existence of the system; for, quite simply, were it not for the inspectors, the apprenticeship system would have collapsed. Nevertheless, there were serious sources of dysfunction in the system of inspection, the most serious of which was perhaps the low remuneration of inspectors. Thus the repeated rejection of the inspectors' pay claims had the following effects.

(a) Some inspectors refused reappointment. These were mostly very able instructors who felt that the remuneration was so low, that, in their own words "it constituted an insult to their professional status".(41) The departure of such inspectors was not made en masse, or in an obvious manifestation of protest. They simply gradually dropped out of the system by refusing reappointment.(42) These instructors were replaced by less experienced instructors, usually of a hierarchically lower grade. In this way the quality of inspectors gradually dropped, and consequently the influence the inspectors had on employers was reduced.(43)

(b) A second group of inspectors chose to continue to offer their services but adopted the attitude that they would work only as much as they were paid for. Consequently, since in their opinion they were paid very little, the amount of time they spent on inspection was also little. Unfortunately this group of inspectors could get away with their failure to perform their

duties properly, because the system of supervision of inspectors was very inadequate. Nevertheless, there were often, as a result, accusations levelled against inspectors for lack of professionalism. One such accusation, veiled though it might have been, came from none other than the Headmaster of the Technical School, Nicosia, at a Board meeting during the discussion of pay increases to the inspectors. He stated the following:

An increase to the inspector salaries should be examined only if the Apprenticeship Board is satisfied that the inspectors perform their duties satisfactorily and an adequate system of supervising the inspectors is established.(44)

The above remarks were indeed surprising as headmasters had a tradition of defending the actions of their staff in any dealings they had with outside bodies. Therefore the headmaster must have felt very strongly on this matter in order to make the above-quoted insinuations against his own instructors.

It follows therefore that the level of remuneration of inspectors had a detrimental effect on the quality of inspection, and consequently on the whole system of apprenticeship itself. Before concluding this section, however, it needs to be stressed that naturally not all inspectors were apathetic towards their job, or neglected their duties. Indeed there were some inspectors who worked with great enthusiasm for the success of apprenticeship. Such conscientious instructors, however, were unfortunately the exception rather than the rule.

4.6 The Effect of Payment of Inspectors according to the Number of Apprentices.

Throughout the period under review, there was always a great effort, on the part of the Ministry of Labour, to enrol as many apprentices as possible. One of the reasons, perhaps, for paying inspectors according to the number of apprentices in their charge, was to induce them to recruit more apprentices. For even the Ministry of Labour officials often admitted that they relied heavily on inspectors to hunt around places of work and schools for potential apprentices. A typical remark by the Apprenticeship Secretary was the following:

We, at the Ministry of Labour, have the responsibility of organising and administering the apprenticeship scheme. On matters, however, relating to inspection, finding of apprentices, and selecting them, we rely on inspectors.(45)

The degree of reliance on inspectors for recruiting apprentices is also shown in the following statement made by the chairman of the Board:

The inspectors' role in finding apprentices is very important, as they visit work places and try to convince employers to register, as apprentices, young workers they employ. In the case of Larnaca no inspectors were appointed and probably this fact contributed to the low number of apprenticeship enrolments.(46)

This drive, however, to enrol as many apprentices as possible, had its bad effects as well, as inspectors were sometimes not very particular about the quality of apprentices they registered. There were even accusations that in order to increase the numbers, inspectors

registered apprentices who were not even working in a relevant trade. A very severe statement in this respect was the following, made by an inspector of technical education.

Inspectors are paid according to the number of their registered apprentices. Consequently they make every effort to increase the number of apprentices, irrespective of whether the apprentices work in the corresponding trade in industry.(47)

It seems, therefore, that there were abuses of the provision to pay inspectors on a graded scale. This need not imply that the provision itself was necessarily at fault. Rather the source of the problem, once again, lay with the inadequacy of the system of supervision of inspectors. This will be the subject of the following section.

4.7 Other Sources of Dysfunction.

4.7.1 Accountability of Inspectors.

The following extract is taken from the minutes of the Apprenticeship Board meeting of the 6th April, 1985.

It has been observed that there are deficiencies in the inspection of apprentices at the places of work. The Ministry of Labour, which has jurisdiction over inspection, should find some appropriate mechanism to evaluate the work of inspectors, and replace them if they do not perform their duties satisfactorily.

The above plainly implied that after twenty five of ^{the} operating the scheme, the Board was still searching for an adequate system of supervising the inspectors. The root of the problem lay in the absence of any form of hierarchical institutional structure, through which

inspectors would be accountable for their services.

As explained earlier, all apprenticeship inspectors are full time instructors at the Technical Schools. As such they are evaluated by their headmasters and the Ministry of Education inspectors. This evaluation is based on their general performance as teachers. What is pertinent in this case is that the work the instructors carried out in their capacity as apprenticeship inspectors, is not taken into consideration for evaluation purposes, either by the headmaster or by the inspectors.(48)

The Ministry of Labour, therefore, which is responsible for the inspection of apprentices, cannot, at least formally, affect in any way the conditions of service or the prospects of promotion of their part-time inspectors. The only course of action that the Ministry of Labour could take, if it was dissatisfied with the services of a particular inspector, is to refuse to ^{was} renew the yearly appointment. This measure, however, is an extreme one, and it is only exercised in cases of very serious defaulters.

Another source of difficulty for the Ministry of Labour in its efforts to exercise control over its inspectors, is the understaffing of the department that dealt with apprenticeship.(49) This situation made it impossible for officers of this department to supervise adequately

the work of inspectors. Consequently in order to check on inspectors the Ministry of Labour officials relied on random information or on telephone calls to employers. It is obvious that in this way it was only the very bad cases that were brought to their attention.

The only systematic means of exercising some form of control on inspectors, indirect though it may be, is through the inspectors' own monthly reports. In the first year of the operation of the system, when inspectors were not paid, they were requested to submit only one report at the end of the year. When inspectors started to be paid, they were required to submit a report every three months. The idea of introducing a monthly standardised report was discussed at the Board meeting of the 12th April, 1968.(50) The suggestion met with unanimous approval. Consequently a form was drafted which was approved by the Board at the meeting of 31st January 1969.(51)

In the standardised monthly report the following information was requested:

- (a) Number of apprentices per year,
- (b) Comments on the progress and behaviour of apprentices at the school,
- (c) Comments on the practical training of apprentices in the industry,
- (d) Employers' comments,
- (e) Relations of employers and apprentices,

- (f) Change of employers and reasons for such change,
- (g) Dropouts and reasons,
- (h) General comments from the inspector.

It is interesting to note that when Dr. Protopapas of the Ministry of Labour proposed the above standardised report, he almost apologetically explained that the prime reason for introducing the form was to collect essential data and not to check on inspectors.(52) In spite of the above remarks, the initial effects of the introduction of the standardised reports were very positive. However, as time went by, the filling of report forms became a matter of routine. According to the former Apprenticeship Secretary(53), usually the only useful aspect of the report was the part that provided information on the number of apprentices. In the other sections, inspectors mostly used cliché phrases, which said very little.(54) It seems, thus, that the monthly reports became gradually ineffective as a means of supervision and control of inspectors.

4.7.2 Jurisdiction of Inspectors in the Schools.

The other serious source of inefficiency was the ambiguity over the inspectors' jurisdiction. For inspectors faced the same problems as the apprenticeship committees in their role inside the schools. The inspectors' position was, if anything, even more difficult. For the committees were, in a sense,

voluntary bodies which in the face of difficulty might take their role in the school less seriously. The inspectors, on the other hand, were professionals who were paid to do a job, and part of that job was to keep records and submit reports on the level of instruction offered to the apprentices inside the schools. Furthermore, inspectors were required to cooperate with the committees and the schools for the drafting of the examination papers. Neither the school administrators, however, nor the teachers have been willing to allow apprenticeship inspectors to perform these functions in the way envisaged by the Law. The matter of jurisdiction of inspectors inside the schools was raised at the very first meeting of the Apprenticeship Board on the 23rd February 1967. Some members of the Board suggested that inspectors, according to the Apprenticeship Law, have the right to inspect apprenticeship classes inside the schools. The chairman of the Board (55) disagreed with the above interpretation of the Law and suggested that inspectors could obtain the information they needed on the progress of apprentices through the Headmasters of the schools. Though there followed a lengthy debate, no consensus was reached on the matter (56). The issue was raised many more times in the years to come. As in the case however of similar clashes over jurisdiction in matters related to apprenticeship, the difference remained unresolved. This in practice meant that apprenticeship inspectors were never allowed access to

the classrooms. Nor were they allowed, in their capacity as inspectors, to participate in the drafting of examination papers. Whatever work they carried out in this field was in their role as teachers in the same way as any other teacher.

It is evident from the above that once again the intentions of the legislator, this time on the powers of apprenticeship inspectors, were thwarted. The diminished role of inspectors was obviously a blow to the system.

5.0 Concluding Remarks.

What may be deduced from this chapter is that the effectiveness of the Board, the Apprenticeship Committees and the Inspectorate, was adversely affected by the following factors: (a) the antagonism between the Ministries of Labour and Education, (b) the clash over jurisdiction which arose from contradictions between the education law and the apprenticeship laws, and (c) the inadequate remuneration of inspectors.

The most striking feature of the system, however, which permeated and accentuated all the above factors, was the almost desperate struggle by the technical schools to stop outsiders, including industry, from becoming involved in the running of the schools. In this respect it would be very useful to examine the relation of the technical schools with society and more specifically

with industry, in the light of Bernstein's views on "open" and "closed" schools. In fact, since the object of this work is to examine this relation, even a short reference to Bernstein's views on the matter, would help place this dissertation in the right perspective.

In his paper "Open Schools and Open Society" Bernstein draws from Durkheim's "The Division of Labour in Society", the concepts of "mechanical" and "organic solidarity" and applies them to school organisation. After analysing the implications of the concept on various aspects of school life, he substituted the terms "mechanical" and "organic solidarity" as related to schools, with more easily understood "closed" and "open" schools. The main characteristics of the "closed" schools are fixed structural organisation, transmission of common values through ritual and control based on status, and clear cut definable units of curricular ^{work} where the subject matter is dominant and learning takes the form of standard operations. The "open" schools have features opposite to the above, that is flexible curricula, low insulation between the school and the environment and receptiveness to diverse ideas and values.(57)

It is obvious from what has already been said (58) that technical schools are "closed" schools. In fact this is one of the most dysfunctional consequences of the social environment on technical education. Thus, the cultural

traditions, the norms and values of society, have caused the technical schools to operate in the model of gymnasia, like a microcosm insulated from the environment and the outside world. However, by their very nature, the technical schools, more than any other kind of school, need to be flexible and receptive to the needs of industry and society. This is particularly important when technical schools run apprenticeship classes. Yet, in Cyprus, cooperation between the technical schools and industry has been minimal, so that in practical terms industry has very little say either in the running of schools or what is taught in them.(59)

The dysfunctions arising from the situation are obvious. Thompson and Ewen suggest that "the setting of goals is essentially a problem of defining desired relationships between an organisation and its environment" (60). Unfortunately, in the case of Technical Schools in Cyprus, there has been no effective communication between the education system as an organisation and the environment, and as a result goals suffered accordingly. One however could not speak in absolute terms on these matters. For in spite of the great resistance on the part of the schools, apprenticeship must have helped bring down some walls. In fact, the experience gained through apprenticeship helped pave the way towards the establishment of other forms of cooperative education in the island. These will be the subject of the next chapter.

REFERENCES

1. The Apprentices' Law 1966, CAP 3
2. Minutes of the Ministry of Labour 6th May 1966.
3. The minutes of the meetings of the first Board show that both the trade unions and the employer associations were represented by their general secretaries. Also the government representatives were all very high ranking officials.
4. This again may be deduced from the persons nominated for the Board as shown in the minutes of the Board.
5. This contention is substantiated by the minutes of the Board.
6. Ministry of Labour Minutes, 6th May 1966.
7. Minutes of the first meeting of the Apprenticeship Board 23.2.1967.
8. The new Minister of Labour was Mr. Mavromatis - Cyprus Gazette.
9. For instance at the end of year ceremonies at the Technical Schools of Nicosia and Limassol there was a call by the Headmasters for the Apprenticeship System to be removed from the schools.
10. Minutes of the meeting of the App. Board of 8.10.70.
11. Minutes of the meeting of the Apprenticeship Board of 2nd December, 1970.
12. At the time there was a strong dispute between Mr. Hadjinicolas and Mr. Sparsis, the Director General of the Ministry of Labour, over some comments the latter on the quality of education.
13. Minutes of the Board meetings of 21st June 1978 and 5th July 1978.
14. Some instances of conflict between Mr. Hadjinicolas and the Ministry of Labour have been given in the previous chapters.
15. The term of office of the Board, and its chairman, was two years.
16. Minutes of the Board meetings of 16th June 1981 and 22nd June 1981.
17. Minutes of the Board meeting of 7th May 1982.
18. Minutes of the Board meetings of 29th June 1983 and 9th September 1983.

19. Education Law, 10/69..

20. Minutes of the meeting of the Apprenticeship Board of 10th July 1972.

21. The secretaries of the committees were usually officers of the Ministry of Labour.

22. Ministry of Labour File No. Mc-1(A)/2 of 7th December 1979.

23. The researcher obtained eye-witness accounts of the reactions of the staff.

24. Technical School File 046/T.S.N. of 14th December 1979.

25. The reader is reminded that most of the members of the apprenticeship committees were volunteers.

26. The researcher was informed of this background information by the Apprenticeship Inspector for the car-mechanics, who at the time served as an instructor at the school.

27. Appr. Law 13 of 1966 Cap 28

28. Addendum A to Appendix 1 included in the agenda for Apprenticeship Board meeting of 28th May 1969.

29. The salary scale for the posts was £1014 x 36 = 1302 x 42 = 1344 (Scale 16) plus cost of living allowance. The qualification required were the following:

(a) Higher National Certificate of Higher National Diploma in Mechanical, Electrical or Automobile Engineering as the case may be, depending on the field of inspection. (Note: these qualification were obviously expected to be British.)

(b) Final Certificate of the City and Guilds London Institute in the above disciplines.

(c) Industrial experience of a minimum of five years as Instructor or Supervisor.

30. Details of the department and its work were given in the chapter 5.

31. Minutes of the Board meeting of 15th February 1964.

32. The letter dated 14th Jan. 1969 - Apprenticeship Board files.

33. This distinction was important in that inspectors would not be required to pay income tax on the sum paid for travelling, as being expenses incurred in the course of their duties. On the other hand, the part of the emoluments described as salary was taxable.

34. Minutes of the Apprenticeship Board of 31st Jan. 1969.

35. In parenthesis, it is illuminating to note that the revised salaries of the part-time inspectors were adopted at about the same period that the proposal for the creation of the new posts was tabled. As stated earlier, the new inspectors were to be placed on scale 16 which was £1014 - £1344 plus cost of living allowance, plus travelling expenses. Compared with these salaries the average yearly payment to the part-time inspectors was only £70 a year plus £70 for travelling. The emoluments of a part-time inspector amounted, therefore, to only one fifteenth of the initial salary and one twentieth of the top salary of a full-time inspector. It is obvious that no one full-time inspector could do the work of twenty part-time inspectors. The above simple exercise, therefore, indicates beyond doubt that, even after the revision of their salaries, the part-time inspectors were very poorly paid.

36. OLTEK archives.

37. The matter of the dropouts during the summer months was a very pertinent one. For in the summer of 1972, (the report was written in February 1973), there were 115 dropouts. This amounted to 13% of the total enrolment of first and second year apprentices, and a staggering 68% of the total number of dropouts for the academic year 1971-1972 of all apprentices. (Based on Education Statistics, Ministry of Finance.)

38. Appendix to the notice for Board meeting of 13th March 1973. (YE 9/67 of 7th March 1973).

39. There is further examination of this matter in the next section.

40. Ministry of Finance: 6043/69 of 23rd September 1983.

41. It is pertinent to note that a great number of the more competent instructors have no problem in finding part-time work, which is often quite lucrative.

42. Part-time inspectors were usually appointed on a yearly basis.

43. In fairness it needs to be mentioned that a number of the more able instructors ceased to be inspectors because they were promoted to administrative posts. On the other hand, however, when new inspectors are required there seems to be little enthusiasm for the posts.

44. Minutes, 13th March 1973.

45. Minutes of Apprenticeship Board 28th March 1969.

46. Minutes of Apprenticeship Board 18th November 1968.
47. Letter sent to the Minister of Education by inspector George Economides 3rd December 1973.
48. The criteria for evaluating teachers are specifically laid down by law. These include (a) teaching ability, (b) paper qualifications, (c) extra curricular activities, and (d) administrative abilities. The practice has been for the services that an instructor renders as an apprenticeship inspector not to be taken into consideration under any of the above four criteria, not even as an extra curricular activity, because he is paid for such services.
49. Details about the state of affairs in this department were given in chapter 6.
50. Minutes of the meeting.
51. Minutes of the meeting.
52. Minutes of the Board meeting of 31st January 1969.
53. He served as secretary for over twenty years.
54. The remark was made during an interview with the Appointment Secretary.
55. The reader is reminded that the Chairman was the Director of Technical Education.
56. Minutes of the Board meeting of 23rd February 1967.
57. Bernstein, Basil "Open Schools, Open Society", New Society 14th September 1967 pp 351-3.
58. For example see Chapter 3.
59. See Chapter 12.
60. Thompson D. and Ewen W. "Organisational Goals and Environment" in People and Organizations ed. Solomon G. and Thompson K., Longman, 1978 p 156.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR VOCATIONAL STUDENTS.

1. INTRODUCTION.

In addition to the Apprenticeship Scheme, another two cooperative programmes operate within the secondary technical education system in the island. The first is the Industrial Training Programme for the Hotel Trades (I.T.P.H.T.), an old-established programme which has been in operation since 1963. The second programme is the Industrial Training Programme for Vocational Students (I.T.P.V.S.), which was introduced in 1980. The latter, though more recent, is a much more ambitious programme that covers all pupils of the final year in all trades of the vocational section of the technical schools.

Before proceeding with a detailed examination of the two programmes, attention should be drawn to the following fundamental difference between the Apprenticeship Scheme and the other two programmes. Apprenticeship was never really accepted by the Ministry of Education as being part of the formal education system, but was rather looked upon as being a training scheme run by the Ministry of Labour. The I.T.P.H.T. and the I.T.P.V.S., on the other hand, have been organised and administered entirely by the Ministry of Education, and, as such,

have been considered universally as being within the formal system. The problems therefore that arose as a result of the conflict between the two Ministries, and which had a detrimental effect on the Apprenticeship Scheme, had practically no effect on the other two programmes.

This however does not imply that the two programmes were without problems. As will be shown in the course of this chapter, they too had their weaknesses which were due both to deficiencies in the system itself and to external environmental factors. In spite of their weaknesses however, unlike apprenticeship, with the passing of time, the effectiveness of the two programmes improved considerably. It may be therefore said that the two programmes, in spite of a shaky start, eventually constituted a positive step towards establishing a sound cooperative technical education system in the island.

The two programmes will be examined separately, as the issues related to their establishment and their evolutions are in many ways different. The Industrial Training Programme for the sixth grade of the Vocational Stream, being the most significant of the two, will be examined first, in this chapter, and the Industrial Training Programme for the Hotel Trades will be dealt with in the next chapter.

The treatment of the subject in both chapters will

Follow a similar pattern to that followed in previous chapters. There will thus be an analysis of the historical development of the programmes which is intended to highlight the major issues. In the analysis emphasis is given to matters of policy and administration, as a detailed examination of other issues related to curriculum will be included in subsequent chapters.

2. Developments that led to the Introduction of the I.T.P.U.S.

Strange though it may seem, it is interesting and illuminating to note that the I.T.P.U.S. was not introduced as a result of the desire of the officers in charge of technical education to incorporate industrial training into the school programme. It was rather the result of a well calculated ploy, of the Technical Education Department, to defeat government objections to extending the five year vocational stream to six years.(1) As the extension of the five year vocational course to six years was, therefore, directly linked with the introduction of the programme, the writer feels it would be useful to make a retrospective analysis of the relevant issues and events. This section may seem rather long. The researcher, however, feels that the historical analysis will help the reader obtain a wider perspective of some important issues and problems endemic to Technical Education in Cyprus, and thus help him

appreciate better the more specific issues that relate to cooperative education.

As was stated in an earlier chapter,(2), when technical schools were first established in 1960, they had two streams. One was the vocational stream at the craft level, and the other the technical, which was more academic, on the technician level. It may be added that, though there was provision for a student in the vocational stream to transfer to the technical stream, if he satisfied certain conditions, in reality the conditions were such that the provision was only of academic significance. This was in line with the official, though undeclared policy, that students should not be encouraged to transfer since the country badly needed craftsmen. In addition the transfers were generally regarded as uneconomical because the student who transferred invariably lost a year.(3) What made matters worse was that in some schools there were only vocational streams with no technical streams provided. Thus in these subjects no transfer was possible even if all other conditions were met.

As a result, there was an increasing unwillingness on the part of parents to allow their children to enrol in the craft streams, as they feared their children would be trapped in a system that offered no way "for betterment". Thus the general demand from parents was either to abolish the vocational stream altogether, or

at least make the vocational courses of a six-year, instead of a four-year, duration.(4) The authorities turned down this request because of financial considerations.(5)

Things improved in 1967, when, as a result of the introduction of a common three year cycle, the vocational stream became a five-year course. However parents soon realised that the five-year course was not enough, as the schemes of service for many jobs, both in the government and the private sector, explicitly required that the candidates should have a six-year school-leaving certificate. Thus the pressure from the parents' associations became stronger than ever.

There was yet another attempt to solve the problem in 1972. This time the Ministry of Education succumbed to the pressure from parents and introduced a unified system of technical education, by abolishing both the technical and vocational streams and replacing them by a single six year programme common to all students, irrespective of ability. A feature of the programme was that students would not be required, or even expected, to stay on at school for the full duration of the course. Rather, the programme was supposed to be designed in such a way that students would be able to leave at the end of the fourth year, or at the end of the fifth year, and still receive a certificate.

Furthermore it was stressed that the students who left at an early stage would still be employable. Thus, in the introductory report it was even predicted that the offer to students was so attractive that less than half of them would stay at school for the full six years of the programme.(6) The prediction apparently served its purpose, and it must have quietened the fears of the economists about the costs, for the scheme was approved.

The prediction however proved wrong, as very few students left before the end of the sixth year. For example, at the end of the academic year 72/73, before the unified system was introduced, only 40% of the total number of students of the fifth year stayed on for the sixth year, (these were all students of the technical streams). After the new system was introduced, by the year 77/78 the ratio of students who completed the sixth year rose to 88%.(7)

No wonder, therefore, that the Director of Technical Education acknowledged that his predictions were hopelessly wrong when he stated:

The unified type of the 1972 reformation provides that the pupils can leave school after completing the fourth or fifth year and find employment in industry. For various reasons the above arrangement did not function satisfactorily. The basic reasons are:

(a) the pupils want to continue their studies in spite of the fact that very often they are

incapable of coping with the level of the theoretical subjects;
(b) by completing the sixth year they are allowed to delay their enrolment in the National Guard.(8)

In the above statement the Director touched on another problem of the unified system. Apparently, partly as a result of having classes of mixed ability (9), there was a sharp drop in the success rate of students at external examinations.(10) Another factor that probably contributed to the drop of academic standards was that the "unified" programme was by necessity a compromise between the former technical and vocational curricula. As a result, it included fewer periods for academic subjects and more periods for shop subjects than were available to the former technical streams.

Conversely, the periods of workshop practice compared to the former vocational stream, were reduced. Industry as a result complained that the new programme was a failure because it did not prepare students adequately for work. There was thus increasing adverse criticism levelled against the unified programme. A typical criticism was the following made by a Trade Union Representative during a convention in 1977.

After a rough and badly prepared reorganisation in 1971-1972, the vocational and technical streams were amalgamated.....This was a big and serious mistake and must be corrected as soon as possible. The vocational schools could as a rule be two year courses and under exceptional circumstances three year courses.(11)

Eventually the outcry against the technical education system was such that the Department was forced to

reconsider its views on the unified system and to accept that it was necessary to revert to a two-stream structure. Thus, in a surprisingly frank statement the Director admitted the failure of the system, yet tried to justify the failure thus:

The unification of the vocational and technical cycles was made at the expense of vocational education. Owing to this arrangement the standards of the technical cycle were lowered in the theoretical field, and those in the vocational cycle in the practical field. It can be said that the lowering of the standard in the practical field was the demand of industry in the pre-war period.(12) Industry continually demanded that the vocational cycle should include more theoretical training, while at the same time it promised that it would provide opportunities for technical school leavers to complete their technical training in its workshops.(13)

The Director proceeded to explain the need for the introduction of the two stream system, in the following way:

Now that industrial conditions have changed the urgent demand of industry is that we supply it with well-trained craftsmen. Industry can no longer offer practical training as it is mainly concerned with its survival. It needs therefore well trained craftsmen so that it can improve production with respect to quality and quantity.(14)

Thus the two stream structure was reintroduced in 1978, in the same way as it was before, that is with six-year technical courses and five-year vocational courses. The new structure, however, inevitably revived the old pressure groups of teachers and parents who, though agreeing in principle with the division into two streams, demanded that the vocational streams should have a six-year cycle too. The Ministry of Finance, and the government in general, though, were extremely

reluctant to extend the vocational programme to six years.(15) It was then that the Department of Technical Education, caught in the middle of the tug-of-war between the two opposite points of view, hit on the idea of introducing an optional sixth year, which would be partly spent in industry and partly in school. The solution seemed a fair compromise. Students who wished to do so could have their sixth year and the programme would not be so costly. Finally in order to remove any lingering doubts among the economists, the Department of Technical Education decided that students would spend only two days a week at school and the remaining four in industry. In this way the programme received provisional approval and a pilot scheme was set up.(16)

3. The Initial Plan for the I.T.P.V.S.

The I.T.P.V.S. was first introduced on an experimental basis in September 1979. In the pilot scheme there were two classes totalling 37 students in Nicosia, and one class of 20 in Limassol. In these classes were registered students who had graduated from the fifth class of the vocational stream during the previous year. The pilot classes were described as "part-time sixth vocational" and their programme included two days attendance at school and four days training in industry. The scheme, as the name implied, was in fact supplementary to the five-year full-time vocational education provided at the technical schools. The other

main characteristics of the plan, as specified in a report of the Director of Technical Education, were the following:

(a) Choice of Industries.

The Department of Technical Education would choose industrial workshops suitable to offer training to students on the basis of the following criteria:

(i) The workshops needed to be equipped with modern machinery and use modern methods of production.

(ii) The students had to be given the opportunity to practice in all departments.

(iii) The employer would consent to cooperate with the inspector for the guidance and evaluation of students.

(b) Hours of Work and Remuneration of Students.

Students would be employed in industry as apprentices for four days a week. The conditions of service and their remuneration would be the object of a collective agreement between the employers, the trade unions and the government.

(c) Inspection of Students.

For the inspection of students there were three alternative options as follows:

(i) The evaluation and inspection of students in industry would be carried out by instructors nominated

by the Department of Technical Education. These instructors would be given remission from their teaching load as follows:

- (a) up to 10 students:----4 periods a week
- (b) 10-15 students-----6 periods a week
- (c) 15-20 students-----8 periods a week
- (d) 20-25 students-----10 periods a week

(ii) At the beginning of each year the Department of Technical Education would appoint part-time inspectors on the lines of the apprenticeship inspectors. These would be technical school instructors and there would be one inspector for each trade in each district.

(iii) The Department of Technical Education would nominate one or two instructors who would act as inspectors on a full-time basis and who would cover the whole of the island (17).

The pilot scheme implemented in Sept.1979 was on the lines on the plan outlined above. As for the inspection of students the last option was adopted. Thus two inspectors were appointed who, between them, had to carry out the inspection of all students all over the island. At the end of the academic year the pilot scheme was deemed to be a success. Thus in June 1980 the Department of Technical Education decided, after obtaining government approval, to implement the scheme in all schools. The scheme was to cover all trades with

the exception of hotel and catering and dress-making.(18)

4 Rules and Regulations for the Programme.

In a highly structured and centralised educational system, like that of Cyprus, it is regarded essential to have rules and regulations that are as precise as possible. Such rules and regulations therefore needed to be compiled for the I.T.P.U.S. Thus, when the pilot year was over, a draft was produced and, in November 1979, was circulated to the schools for their reaction. In the draft all the features of the plan outlined above were incorporated. Furthermore the following additional provisions and explanations were made:

(a) The new scheme was described as a voluntary one which gave the opportunity to interested graduates of the vocational streams to follow a further year of part-time study at the school, in association with a training programme in industry. For this reason it was described officially as a "scheme of part-time study".

(b) The necessary prerequisites for registration were:

(i) A leaving certificate from a state five year vocational school.

(ii) The candidates had to be under twenty one years of age.

(iii) A certificate that the applicant had found employment in the trade he intended to study.

(iv) A written consent from a parent.

(c) When students attended school they had to comply with the rules and regulations of the school in the same way as full time students.

(d) In order to complete his programme the student had to show evidence that he had received training in industry of at least 864 hours (the equivalent of 108 days).

(e) The maximum absence from school allowed annually would be 20 periods that were "not justified" and another 40 "fully justified".(19)

(f) If the condition for the period of industrial training was not met, students would not be granted a leaving certificate until they produced evidence that they had completed the hours stipulated in the programme.

(g) If the school attendance requirements were not met students would not be allowed to take their final examination and would be deferred to take the examination at a later date.(20)

5. The Reaction from Schools.

When the regulations were circulated the main comments from the schools (21) were the following:

(a) The scheme should be run on a block-release rather than on a day-release basis. Thus instead of the students going to school for two days a week throughout

the year, they should go to school continually for the first few months and then work in industry until the end of the year.(22)

(b) The system of inspection needed to be changed. Instead of having two inspectors who covered the whole island, the alternative arrangement, by which there was a part-time inspector for each trade in every district, should be adopted.(23)

(c) A syllabus, defining the training programme in the industry for each trade, needed to be drawn up.(24)

(d) Students over 19 years old should not be allowed to register.(25)

(e) The sixth year, instead of being optional, should become part of the regular cycle of studies. If some students opted to leave earlier, they should be able to do so.(26)

(f) It should be made clear that students would not work during Christmas and Easter holidays.(27)

(g) Students should be insured against accidents.(28)

(h) The condition by which students are required to find a job before they are allowed to register, should be dropped.

The reaction from the schools to the regulations is interesting in that it is an indication of the attitude of the schools towards the industrial training programme itself. From this point of view, perhaps the suggestion that the system should be run on a block-release basis is the most significant. The reason that the schools

preferred the block-release system was that they felt that if students worked in industry they would acquire "bad habits" which they would carry back to the school. Indicative of the attitude of the schools in this matter was the following explanation given by a school as to why students over 19 should not be accepted in the programme: "Students over 19 would create problems. Discipline problems are bad enough even with students of a younger age who work in industry."(29) By suggesting a block-release system, the schools were thus trying to delay the contact of students with industry until after they had finished, to all intents and purposes, their school programme.

Predictably the suggestion was not accepted by the Department of Technical Education because, as had been stated in the original Ministry proposal, one of the prime purposes of introducing the scheme was to cultivate closer links between the schools and industry. According to the Department, if the block system was accepted, the possibility of fostering such links would be minimised.

In fact, only two suggestions of any significance made by the schools were adopted by the Department. These were (a) not to allow candidates over 19 in the scheme, and (b) to drop the requirement that students should find a job before they were allowed to register. None of the other suggestions were accepted even though some of them

seemed reasonable. For example, even the suggestion that students should be insured against accidents was not included in the final regulations.(30) This was obviously an omission on the part of the Department. Some of the other suggestions, however, were not adopted, not because the Department necessarily disagreed with them, but because the Department felt that circumstances were such that did not allow it to do so. For example:

(a) It would have been impossible to draw up a specific training programme for industry, because workshops in industry varied considerably, both in the kind and range of work they carried out, as well as in the type of equipment and work methods they used. The Department further felt that as most industrial enterprises were small concerns, they would be quite unable to provide a comprehensive training programme for students. Finally the Department feared that, even in cases where industry could provide a full programme of training, the schools had no leverage on employers to persuade them to offer such training, particularly since most students were paid normal wages and as a result employers expected them to be productive. The Department, therefore, decided that it would be wiser, at least in the initial stages, to follow a policy of gentle persuasion with the employers, rather than prescribe a specific programme of training and demand that it should be adhered to.

(b) Again, the Department, though it might have wanted

to do so, thought that it could not possibly adopt the suggestion that the sixth year should become part of the regular cycle of studies. As explained earlier, the Department, in its previous negotiations with the Ministry of Finance, had argued that the establishment of the scheme would not become a serious additional drain on the government resources, because the extra year would be offered as an option and that very few students would take it up.(31) In fact the great majority of students opted to continue. This happened as a result of efforts by the schools to encourage the students to stay on, with the silent consent of the Department. In spite of its favourable attitude, however, the Department was not prepared to reveal its true intentions by modifying the regulations in order to make all vocational streams six-year courses. Such a change in the early stages might have backfired and might have even brought about the abolition of the scheme.

(c) The suggestion that students should not be required to work during Christmas and Easter holidays was another indication of the schools' efforts to emphasise that their students, even when they worked in industry, should retain their student status and should not be turned into mere workers. This was of course the policy of the Department as well as in its draft plan for the scheme. The Department incorporated into the plan most

of the provisions of the education law regulating the schooling of full-time students -e.g. provisions on attendance requirements, schooling, promotion etc. However in spite of the fact that the views of the Department and the schools coincided, in general terms, on this issue, the Department did not accept the recommendations of the schools on the specific matter of school holidays. The reason was that the Department felt that it was better for students to acquire more work experience in industry.

(d) On the other hand, the suggestion put forward, almost unanimously, by the schools to have a different inspector for each specialisation, who would be an instructor in the subject, was obviously so reasonable that it is difficult to understand why it was not adopted.(32) For even if such instructors worked on a part-time basis, they would be able to contribute more than the two full-time inspectors, because they were in a position to appreciate better the needs and realities of their own trade. Furthermore, if the arrangement for part-time inspectors were adopted, the extra requirements in staff, as a result of teaching hours remitted in the teaching load of part-time inspectors, would not have been too excessive for the authorities to accept. In spite of its reasonableness, however, the suggestion was turned down by the Department.

In concluding this section, therefore, it may be said that the Department of Technical and Vocational

Education followed a very "correct" procedure in drafting the I.T.P.U.S. regulations, in that it sought the views of the schools and received feedback on its pilot schemes, before proceeding with the drawing up of the "finalised" regulations.(33) It was obvious however that although in general terms there was no difference in philosophy between the Department and the schools, the Department was unable to adopt most of the schools' recommendations. In fact, as will be seen later, had the Department accepted the views of the teachers, the vocational streams would have been extended to six years of full-time education and the industrial experience would have thus been kept to the minimum. This was the demand of the Teachers' Union. In order to appreciate better, however, the arguments of the Union against the I.T.P.U.S., it would be wise, before examining the Unions' views, to dwell briefly on some of the most serious problems created by the introduction of the programme.

6. The Problem of Placing Students in Industry.

Perhaps the most difficult problem associated with the introduction of I.T.P.U.S. was finding places for the students in industry. The problem was quite serious in all districts, though in some cases the situation must have been quite desperate. The following letter for example sent by "a student" from Paphos to the Minister of Education is indicative of the problems facing the

Paphos Technical School. The letter is quoted practically in full because it portrays very vividly the feelings of many students and parents at the time.

I am, unfortunately, a student at the Technical School of Paphos. I say "unfortunately" because though all the other students have been attending school normally since the beginning of the year, we are wasting our time. As you may know, they have introduced as from this year a scheme by which we attend school only on Friday and Saturday, whilst on other days we are supposed to work in industry. However things are difficult because there are no jobs. Consequently we are wasting our time and we are not learning anything. For example, I follow the specialisation of electrical installations but I cannot find work because employers tell us they do not need any more apprentices. We went, therefore, to our Headmaster and asked him to help us, to find a solution to the problem. He said that one solution would be to attend school six days a week like all other students.

We also went to the Labour Exchange and asked them to find us a job. The man in charge told us that it would be impossible to find places for all students, and that the only solution would be for us to go back to school and have workshop practice in the school shops. In this way, he explained, the objective for which the scheme was introduced, i.e. to give the students more practical experience, will be met. At the same time, if we go back to school we shall be able to continue with our theoretical lessons, the ones we had last year. In this way we shall have a chance, if we wish to do so, to take the entrance examinations to technical colleges or universities.

The present situation, therefore, does not help us either to acquire industrial experience or obtain qualifications for higher studies. Even when we go to school, we do not have normal lessons because the school programme is completely disorganised.

In concluding, Mr. Minister, we appeal to you to help us in this difficult problem we face. We believe that the only correct solution is for us to have normal lessons for six days a week during our last year of school, like all the other students in this island.

Yours truly,
A student of Paphos Technical School.(34)

The above was not the only letter that was sent to the

Ministry of Education. There were other similar ones, all of them well-written and anonymous. One would suspect, judging from the quality of the letters that students must have received help, probably from the teachers, in writing them, or even that the letters were not the work of students at all. It is also interesting to note that the Director of Technical Education refused, at least officially, to investigate the validity of the complaints expressed in the letters, on the grounds that they were anonymous.

Despite the fact that the Director seemed to ignore the complaints, however, he was naturally aware of the problem and must have been deeply worried. An indication of this was that he sent a letter to the Planning Bureau asking for advice on the employment prospects of students in the various trades.(35)

The problem of placing students in industry was also discussed at a meeting of the Director, the inspectors of technical education (36) and headmasters of all technical schools, held on the 21:10:1980. At this meeting many views were expressed, some of them conflicting, and since no consensus of opinion was reached, it was decided to examine the matter further at another meeting.(37) The problem was thus discussed again at a similar meeting a month later. By that time there must have been concerted efforts by all concerned to place students, because the picture presented at this

second meeting was a much better one. Thus, as the two industrial training inspectors reported, out of a total of 680 students only 112 were without work.(38)

The problem continued to exist throughout the year. For example, a letter from the Technical School of Polis sent on 13th March 1981 stated the following:

The implementation of the "scheme" in the Polis area is meeting with great difficulties due mainly to the lack of industrial training facilities. As a result of a survey carried out by us among the industrial establishments in the area, it was ascertained that only a small proportion of students could be offered training.(39)

The implication of the above was that many students would be unable to satisfy the requirements of the course and thus they would not be eligible to receive a leaving diploma (apolyterion). This possibility, as will be explained in the following paragraphs, caused an upheaval among those directly concerned.

7. The Problem of the "Apolyterion" (Leaving Diploma).

As indicated above, the inability of schools to place students in industry created the problem as to whether these students should be given an apolyterion. According to the regulations quoted earlier in this chapter, students who had not satisfied the minimum required industrial practice were not eligible to receive an apolyterion. When faced with the problem, therefore, the first reaction of the Director was that as it was essential to safeguard the standards and credibility of

the scheme, students with no industrial training should not be awarded an apolyterion. He suggested that they could be offered, instead, a certificate from the school to the effect that they covered the requirements of the school programme. In taking this stand, the Director took into consideration that students had already received a leaving diploma at the end of their fifth year.(40)

When the views of the Department of Technical Education became known, there was a strong reaction by both students and teachers against the "unfairness" of the decision. Particularly strong was the reaction from the Parents' Association.(41)

As a result of the great pressure from all concerned, the Director eventually gave way and consented that, subject to certain conditions, an apolyterion would be awarded even to students who had not covered the requirements of industrial training. The new directive which was sent to schools in the form of a circular was the following:

The apolyterion will be awarded to all students of the part-time scheme who completed the requirements for school attendance and industrial training.

As for the students who were not able to secure a place in industry in order to receive their training, they will be awarded an apolyterion provided they show proof that they received training during the summer of 1980. This is an exceptional measure, and is granted as a favour to students because the scheme is implemented for the first time and because the economic crisis which has affected the industry had not been foreseen.(42)

It may be noted that the Director must have been under great pressure to issue the above directive, as the requirement that students should have had training during the previous summer was non-sensical. For since students were unable to find places when their programme officially started, it was very unlikely that they would find such places before the programme even started. As it happened, practically all students were able to produce some sort of a certificate, and since the training in the previous summer was not supervised and could thus not be verified the certificates were all accepted.

B. The Reaction from Parents.

The inefficiencies in the system and the general uncertainty about the I.T.P.U.S. angered the parents. At first they confined themselves to making representations to the schools. When however they realized that it was not in the Headmaster's power to deal with the problem effectively, they turned to the Ministry of Education. What triggered off, however, a more militant stand on the part of the parents was their suspicion that students who were unable to receive training would not be awarded a leaving diploma. The most vocal of the Parents' Associations (43) was the one in Limassol, which on the 14th April 1981, sent the following telegram to the Minister of Education:

Your Excellency: The Limassol Parents' Federation protests most strongly about the burning problem that students of part-time vocational classes are facing which may not allow them to receive a leaving diploma. We urgently request a meeting with you in order to discuss the matter, as there is great anxiety among students and parents.(44)

In addition to the above telegram the Parents' Associations of the two Limassol technical schools sent a combined lengthy memorandum to the Minister of Education. In this document, after threatening that there would be an uproar if unemployed students were not granted leaving diplomas, the Associations attacked the industrial training scheme itself. They said that the scheme was introduced without adequate prior research, planning, or consultation with interested parties. The memorandum went on to say that the scheme had not even been discussed by the National Education Council (45) so it should not have been implemented. As for the problem that vocational students were facing at the time, the Associations pointed out that these students, through no fault of their own, were indeed facing great difficulties. The responsibility for the unfortunate state of affairs, the document went on, lay squarely with the Department of Technical Education because students were cheated into believing;

(a) that their apolyterion would be recognized for the purposes of entering K.A.T.E.E.(46), the H.T.I. and for employment,

(b) that they would have no problem in obtaining an apolyterion, and

(c) that the Ministry of Education would find places for

them in industry.

In their document the Parents' Associations finally argued that although the regulations stipulate that it was necessary for students to have 864 hours of industrial practice before they were eligible for a leaving diploma, the government had not enacted legislation to provide for students' remuneration, conditions of work, and hours of work. As a result, the student was left at the mercy of the employer.(47)

The request for the meeting of the parents' association with the Minister was eventually granted. It is significant, however, that the meeting took place rather belatedly, that is four whole months after the request was made. More specifically the meeting took place on the 28th August. By that time, as was indicated earlier, the problem of the award of the leaving diplomas had been temporarily resolved. As this was the prime demand of the parents, much of the wind was taken out of their sails. Thus, at the meeting there was a general discussion of the problems facing the scheme and the parents were allowed to express their grievances. Consequently the Director of Technical Education, who was present at the meeting, explained to the parents the measures that the Department would take to improve the scheme. On the problem of placement of students, the Minister suggested that consultations should take place with the Employers' Association. With this vague promise

the meeting finished in an amicable atmosphere.(48)

9. The Views of the Teachers' Trade Union on the I.T.P.V.S.

OLTEK (the Teachers' Union) was always against the I.T.P.V.S. as a matter of principle, because it held the view that the vocational courses should be of a six year full-time duration. When the scheme was first introduced, however, OLTEK did not react against it, apparently because the Director persuaded the Union that such reaction would jeopardise the introduction even of a part-time sixth form.(49)

OLTEK held, thus, its peace until the scheme was firmly established. This lasted until December 1981 when the Union sent a letter to its district committees requesting their views on the I.T.P.V.S.(50) In their replies, the district committees were all extremely critical of the programme. The response from Larnaca, for example, where the committee claimed that it had carried out a survey among teachers and students on the I.T.P.V.S., was that the programme was unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

(a) It had brought about discipline problems among students as a result of their contact with workers in industry.

(b) Students got tired at work so they looked at school as their period of relaxation. This affected the

learning process.

(c) Students felt insecure because their leaving diploma was not recognized and they had no possibility for further studies.(51)

(d) Many students did not receive relevant training in industry. Some were even occupied in industries foreign to their own field.

(e) Part-time courses affected the interests of teachers as the number of periods was reduced and therefore fewer staff were required.

As a result of the above, the Committee decided that the I.T.P.U.S. should be either abandoned altogether and a full-time six-year course should be introduced, or it should be changed drastically. If the latter suggestion was adopted their recommendation was that there should be industrial training programmes in each one of the three years of specialisation. In order to run the programme the school year should be shortened, so that students would finish by the end of May. This would allow time for a training programme of two months, June and July.(52) Finally the committee recommended that there should be more strict selection of students (53). The other district committees replied on the same lines.(54)

The Central Committee adopted most of the recommendations made by the district committees and

declared its new policy during a meeting of the Director with the inspectors, the headmasters and officers of OLTEK, which was held on 30th June 1982. At the meeting the OLTEK representatives tabled a memorandum in which the following demands were made:

- (a) As from the beginning of the new school year, all vocational streams should have six-year courses with one month of industrial training in each of the three years.
- (b) All curricula of specialisation should be changed accordingly.
- (c) The inspection of the industrial training of students should be carried out by the instructors who teach students at school.(55)

The above was followed by a bitter attack against the I.T.P.V.S. published in the OLTEK bulletin of February 1983 (56). In this article OLTEK used the following arguments against the I.T.P.V.S.;

- (a) The I.T.P.V.S. increases the general prejudice that exists against technical education,
- (b) The programme has very negative repercussions on parents and students of the vocational stream because they alone, among all students in secondary education, have a five year course. The sixth form part-time schooling creates the impression that vocational students are the same as apprentices,
- (c) In addition to training for a trade, there is a need

for vocational education to equip the young with a sound all-round education which would allow them to have equal opportunities in their future lives as citizens. In order to achieve this objective a six-year full-time course is needed.

(d) The apolyterion of the five-year vocational course is not accepted for appointment in the public sector, and does not allow vocational students to proceed with higher studies,

(e) Industry in Cyprus is not in a position to train students. In reality most youths that are registered in the programme do not feel they are students, but cheap labour who "tour" the schools twice a week.

The article further argued that because of the above, a six year full-time vocational course should be established and the industrial training should be limited to one month per year, during the summer.(57)

10 The 1982 Revision of the I.T.P.U.S.

In August 1982 the Department of Technical Education, in an effort to pacify the critics, decided to make certain changes in the programme. The changes, which were put into effect as from September 1983, were the following:

(a) Students would spend equal time at school and in industry. Thus instead of two days at school and four in industry, the new arrangement provided for three days at school and three in industry.

(b) Instead of all vocational students being awarded a leaving diploma at the end of the fifth year, such diploma would only be given to students who leave school. Students who wish to continue in the sixth form, to follow the part-time course, would be regarded as normal students.(58)

The changes were well received (59), although officially OLTEK did not express their approval. The Union of course had reason to be satisfied. The extra day of schooling constituted a step towards their declared objective of full-time education. Equally important was the second change by which students would not obtain two diplomas, one after completing 5 years and another for completing a part-time course for another year. This in fact meant that students would be awarded a "proper" apolyterion of a six year school. Such an apolyterion would satisfy the requirements for appointment to a number of posts in the public sector, and at the same time it would open the gates to some colleges for the more able students. In September 1984 the recognition of the vocational course as a six year course, instead of a five year one with an optional supplementary year, was further consolidated with the Department's announcement that no leaving diploma would be awarded at the end of the fifth year. Vocational students, like technical students, would be awarded their "apolyterion" after they had successfully completed their six year course. It is interesting to note that this time the economists

did not react against the new provision because by that time the six year course, with part-time schooling in the final year, was already a "fait accompli".

11 The Role of the Industrial Training Inspectors.

The views of the industrial training inspectors on the I.T.P.V.C. differed considerably from those of OLTEK. The difference of opinion may be attributed either (a) to the fact that the inspectors, although they were teachers themselves, had a better chance to acquaint themselves with the programme, or (b) that being more closely associated with the programme, they felt they had a vested interest in it, or more likely (c) the inspectors might have been affected by a combination of both of the above factors.

The inspectors were, thus, the most ardent defenders of the programme and even accused their colleagues of trying their best to ruin the programme. In his annual report for the year 1981, for example, an inspector referring to the "negative attitude" of teachers towards the programme wrote the following:

Many teachers used to say that the I.T.P.V.S. would not survive and that the programme would break up in a few months. When however later they were proved wrong, as the programme worked smoothly, the same teachers started spreading rumours that the programme was a failure because there were unemployed students. These persons were the ones who campaigned for the termination of the programme and the introduction of the six year full-time vocational diploma. They also tell students that even if they receive a diploma, such a diploma would be worthless and not comparable to

that of the normal school. These stories they spread among the parents as well, telling them that their sons and daughters were used as guinea pigs. These actions caused an upheaval among the students and drove them into abstaining from their lessons and making demonstrations. Strangely enough these actions which have been instigated by teachers are used now by other teachers to describe vocational students as undisciplined and unfit to be in schools.(60)

With equal fervour the industrial training inspectors tried to stress the positive aspects of the programme. Thus, though they admitted there were some difficulties, in their reports the inspectors stressed that the programme was meeting with considerable success. In order to substantiate this claim they often quoted students and employers praising the programme. A typical eulogy for the programme from a student as quoted by an inspector is the following:

In the technical school we may have learnt many useful things, but we never had the chance to see how these are applied in real life. Our knowledge was mainly theoretical, as the work in the school shops did not give us a true picture of production. Now, during our industrial training, we are able to obtain valuable experience and complement the knowledge we obtained at school.(61)

Similarly in a reference to the way the employers viewed the programme, one report stated the following:

More and more employers are recognizing the usefulness of the programme. An indication of this is that I constantly receive telephone calls from employers who ask for students to be placed in their industry.(62)

In the eyes of the inspectors, therefore, the I.T.P.V.S., in spite of its weaknesses, provided the best solution for the training of young workers.

In one report, for example, the inspector, after listing

the great number of advantages that the programme offered, concluded thus:

After two years of experience working for the programme, I believe there is no room for further experimentation. It would be rash to abandon the programme which offers the only chance for successful cooperation between the school and industry.(63)

The above show clearly that the inspectors looked upon the I.T.P.V.S. as their own baby, which they nurtured with care. In fact the survival of the programme and its gradual acceptance by more teachers and parents is primarily due to the efforts of the inspectors. However the role of the inspectors as well as the general administration of the I.T.P.V.S. within the school system was to change in 1986. As will be explained in the next section, the inspectors did not like the change because they thought the changes affected their status.

12.0 The 1986 Revision of the Scheme.

12.1 The Nature of the Revision.

The 1986 revision of the regulations for the I.T.P.V.S. was characterized by a significant shift in the attitude of the various interested parties towards the concept of cooperative education.

The revision was initiated by the Department of Technical Education. Thus in May 1986 the proposed new version of the regulation was sent to schools for their consideration and comments.(64) The new regulations, like the older ones, dealt primarily with matters

pertaining to the administration of the system. Yet although the regulations did not include a policy statement as such, it was evident that they reflected a considerable departure from the existing policy on the programme. The most significant changes were the following:

(a) The title of the regulations was changed. Previously they were described as "Regulations for the Part-time Programme". The new ones were called "Regulations Governing the Operation of the Sixth Vocational Class of the Technical Schools"

Though not stated directly, it may be assumed that the change of title signified that the I.T.P.U.S. would cease to be considered as a part-time programme, and would become an integral part of the vocational school curriculum. The rest of the changes described below lend support to this assumption.

(b) The I.T.P.U.S. instead of being administered from the centre, came under the responsibility of the headmaster of each school. For example, the old regulations provided that the inspectors were directly accountable to the Director of Technical Education. Thus, although the inspectors were stationed in the schools, they were not answerable to the Headmasters. This implied, of course, that the I.T.P.U.S. was not a school activity but an independent complement to the institutional programme provided in the schools. The arrangement was

obviously modelled on the Apprenticeship System which again comprised two complementary but completely separate parts _ the industrial training administered by the Ministry of Labour and the school training administered by the Ministry of Education.

Presumably since the new regulations were based on the assumption that the I.T.P.V.S. was to become part of the school curriculum, the programme was administered according to strictly hierarchical procedures. As stated above, the responsibility for the running of the I.T.P.V.S. in each school, would now lie with the headmaster of the school. The headmaster was of course accountable to the Ministry of Education, through the Ministry of Education inspectors, in the same way as all other school programmes and activities. The headmasters, in their turn, nominated one of their assistant headmasters to act as the coordinator of the programme.(65) Finally the inspectors, who were again instructors who taught in the school, reported on the programme to the Headmaster through the Assistant Headmaster.

(c) The third significant change was in the appointment of inspectors. As explained earlier in this chapter, the previous practice was to appoint one inspector for each district, usually on a full-time basis. The new regulations put an end to this practice by actually specifying that inspectors should belong to the same

trade or specialisation as the students they inspect. This necessitated the appointment of a number of instructors to carry out the duties of inspection on a part-time basis. These instructors, instead of being paid extra, were given remission from their teaching loads on the basis of one day per week for every thirty students.(66)

(d) The new regulations specifically noted that, unless otherwise stated, all provisions of the education law (on matters related to examinations, attendance, discipline) would apply to the sixth vocational courses as well.

The above therefore clearly indicate that although the regulations did not explicitly state that the I.T.P.V.S. was an integral part of the school curriculum, there can be no doubt that it was so.

12.2 Reaction from Schools and Parents.

The responses from the schools on the proposed new regulations were surprisingly mild, and clearly showed that they accepted I.T.P.V.S. as a fact of life. One comment however that was included in all the replies was that the day-release system of industrial training should be substituted by the "block-release" system.(67) The same demand was also made by the parents.(68) Significantly, however, there were no other polemics against the scheme, as there were no previous occasions. Finally the industrial inspectors, who were requested to

send their views separately, on the other hand, were generally displeased with the new arrangements as they lost their independence.

12.3 Reaction from OLTEK.

OLTEK presented its views on the regulations during a meeting with the inspectors of Technical Education. At this meeting OLTEK stated that in principle it agrees with the programme. However it was not satisfied with some aspects of the regulations and had many misgivings as to the way the programme was applied and administered. More specifically, according to OLTEK, the I.T.P.U.S. suffered from the following weaknesses:

- (a) The programme was never evaluated "scientifically". Thus the changes in the regulations were not based on valid feedback.
- (b) It was necessary to draw up syllabuses for the training within industry.
- (c) Possible special requirements for the trades were not taken into consideration. Thus the uniformity of the programme was seen to be a weakness.
- (d) Industry was still not aware of the objectives of the programme and still regarded the students on training as cheap labour.
- (e) The placement of students in industry was in effect an easy way out for the Ministry of Education.
- (f) There was a need for some mechanism for constant evaluation of the programme.

In spite of its criticism OLTEK agreed on the implementation of the new regulations subject to the understanding that the regulations were of a provisional nature and a full evaluation of the programme would be carried out by the end of the school year.(69)

12.4 Implementation of the Revised Regulations.

After considering the above views, the Department of Technical Education decided:

(a) Not to accept the suggestion submitted by the schools that a block release instead of a day release system should be established.

(b) To study closely the criticisms levelled against the system and try to find ways to alleviate as many of the weaknesses in the system as was possible.

As a result it was decided to introduce a uniform system of administration and control to be used in all technical schools. To this effect, and as it was considered that in order to achieve greater efficiency in the running of the programme a certain number of bureaucratic procedures were essential, a number of forms and other material were produced. These were the following:

(a) A leaflet explaining the programme to employers.

(b) A statement to be signed by the employer notifying the school that a student was placed in his industry for training.

(c) A form for every student to show information about the student, the employer and the nature of the industry in which he was placed.

(d) A register of employers showing the names of students employed by each employer.

(e) A monthly statement showing a breakdown of the number of hours a student spent at work.

(f) An inspection and evaluation form to be completed jointly by the inspector and industry supervisor at every inspection.

(g) Weekly log book showing the type of work in which the student was occupied for every working day.

The above were presented to the Headmaster, the Assistant Headmaster and industrial inspectors in each school by the Ministry of Education inspector. During these meetings the schools were requested to keep a file for each student on training schemes in which all information relating to the training of the student would be kept.

13. Concluding Comments.

At the beginning of this chapter it was stated that the I.T.P.U.S. was, on the whole, more successful than apprenticeship but that this programme too suffered from many weaknesses. In the brief analysis that follows there will be an attempt to draw some conclusions from the material presented in the course of the chapter, in relation to the main sources of inefficiency.

The historical perspective of the developments that led to the introduction of the I.T.P.V.S. explains to some extent the attitude of the teachers towards industrial training. It also illustrates the conflict between educators and economists on the issue of industrial training. Obviously the teachers looked upon the role of technical education as being primarily one of cultivating the personality and promoting the all-round development of the students. The economists on the other hand were primarily concerned with training manpower at as low a cost as possible.

It follows from the above that even when the teachers were forced to accept the industrial training programme, they tried to keep it as near as possible to the full-time model of education. An indication of the educators' reluctance to deviate from traditional schooling, was the adoption of regulations practically identical to those provided for full-time students. It is also significant, in this respect, that educators tried to reduce as far as possible the influence that the part-time students would have on the rest of the school. The effort of the schools, for example, to introduce a block system may be attributed to the deep-seated conviction of teachers that the world of work and the world of school should be kept apart.

The issue of the apolyterion, or leaving diploma, is significant in that it clearly reveals that not only the teachers, but society in Cyprus as a whole, values paper qualifications far more than knowledge and skill relating to work. The paper qualification syndrome was demonstrated, for example, when parents were more concerned with the prospect that their children would not receive a diploma, rather than by the fact that their offspring were wasting their time by not receiving training in industry as stipulated in the regulations. Furthermore, the very fact that one of the main pre-occupations of parents and teachers was that the leaving diploma should open the doors to higher studies in the full knowledge that the vocational students were academically very weak, further supports the above thesis.

Another observation that may be made is that the vocational programme was inward-looking. This is demonstrated by the fact that the Department of Technical Education, contrary to the painstaking process of asking the educators' opinions on the programme, almost completely ignored industry. The result, as has been explained, was that the programme faced great difficulties, especially in the early stages.

An interesting issue was that of the remuneration of students. Obviously such payment must have affected the training programme, as some employers tried to cover

their costs by using students on production work of a repetitive nature. This was further aggravated by the fact that in some cases students, though productive, were paid less than they should have been. Such cases gave rise to accusations from the Teacher's Union that students were used as cheap labour. These and accusations from OLTEK relating to the kind and quality of training offered to students in industry, as well as other issues raised in this chapter, have been investigated by the researcher through interviews and surveys, and the findings will be presented in a later chapter.

Finally, in the course of looking at this subject, some evidence is present that the programme gradually improved as experience was gained. In spite of these improvements however, it needs to be emphasised that, at best, the I.T.P.U.S. could be described merely as a good work-experience programme but not as a genuine training programme, as the programme never reached the stage that students would follow a prescribed syllabus in industry. Learning was rather incidental as it was determined, almost entirely, by the needs of production. As a result some students received very narrow and completely inadequate training. In fact the only industrial training programme in Technical Education that has overcome this serious weakness, very recently, is the Hotel Training Programme. The programme will be subject of the following chapter.

REFERENCES AND NOTES.

1. There is no written evidence to support this claim. The information was given to the researcher by the Director of Technical Education. The claim is further supported by the material presented in this chapter.
2. See Chapter Three.
3. These remarks are based on the writer's personal knowledge of the matters, reinforced by extensive interviews with officers serving in technical education.
4. Particularly strong protests came from the schools of Larnaca, Xeros and Polis where the parents associations made a number of petitions to the authorities.
5. It needs to be clarified that at the time public education was free for all pupils up to 15 years of age. Pupils from 15-18 paid fees if they attended general education schools. In the case of technical schools, however, education was completely free.
6. "Introductory Report on the Industrial Training Programme" by the Director of Technical Education 28.2.80 (Min. of Educ. 537/70)
7. Source: Educational Statistics, Ministry of Finance, (1972-1973).
8. N.Hadjinicolos: Technical Education in Cyprus: Policy and Priorities, Ministry of Education Nicosia 1977.
9. The problem of classes of mixed ability was probably aggravated by the fact that teachers were not given any training on how to cope with the demands of the new situation.
10. For example the technical school graduates' passes at the H.T.I. entrance examinations, which were traditionally regarded as a yardstick of the performance of technical schools, fell practically to nil. As a result, under pressure from the Department of Technical Education, different criteria were used for the admittance of technical school students in order to help them.
11. G.L.Savvides: The Problems and Prospects of Technical Education in Cyprus, OLTEK Convention, January 1977.
12. This was a reference to 1974 invasion of Cyprus by Turkey, as a result of which Cyprus was partitioned.
13. Op.Cit: N.Hadjinicolos: Technical Education in Cyprus: Problems and Priorities, p.6

14. Ibid. p.10

15. It was generally believed at the time that even the Director General of the Ministry of Education was against the extension of the programme. This stand of the government, it would be fair to point out, could be justified on the grounds that the economy of the country, following the Turkish invasion, was on the verge of collapse.

16. The decision was taken during a meeting held on 22.4.80 under the chairmanship of the Minister of Education (Minutes-537/70/2)

17. N.Hadjinicolos, Director of Technical Education: Industrial Training of Students, Ministry of Education 28.2.80.

18. The Department felt that two years of specialisation were ample to cover the needs of the two trades.

19. "Justified" are the absences for which a medical certificate of some other form of certificate was produced.

20. "Draft Regulations for the Part-time Scheme" Ministry of Education 129/80, November 1980.

21. It is worth mentioning that the regulations were discussed by the teacher body in every school. Therefore the comments represented the views of the teachers as a whole and they were not simply the headmasters'.

22. This suggestion was made by practically all schools.

23. This suggestion was made by practically all schools.

24. This suggestion was made by two schools, the First Technical School, Nicosia, and the First Technical School, Limassol (Dated 2.12.80 and 10.12.80 respectively.)

25. This suggestion was made by the same schools as above.

26. This suggestion was made by two schools, the First and Second Technical Schools, Limassol (Dated 10.12.80.and 15.12.80 respectively)

27. Suggestion made by the Second Technical School, Limassol (Dated 15.12.80.)

28. Suggestion made by Second Technical School, Limassol.

29. Technical School Limassol. Letter of 12th March, 1981.

30. The problem of insurance was settled at a later stage.

31. N. Hadjinicolas: Introductory Report on the Industrial Training of Students. Ministry of Education, February 1980.

32. The appointment of a different inspector for each trade was in fact adopted in 1986.

33. The Department asked for the views of the Trade Unions and the Employers as well. The deliberations with these bodies will be dealt with at a later stage.

34. Ministry of Education File 129/80 Date 24.10.80.

35. Ministry of Education: 528/80 of 17th October 1980.

36. The inspectors of technical education should not be confused with the inspectors of industrial training. The former are the equivalent of the H.M.I.s in England.

37. Minutes of the meeting of 21st October 1980.

38. Minutes of the meeting of 11th December 1980.

39. Technical School, Polis 32/65.

40. This pronouncement of the Director was made orally to the Headmasters. No written directive was required because the Director simply asked the Headmasters to apply the regulations.

41. At this point it is useful to explain that the school leaving diploma in Cyprus Education, officially known as the "apolyterion" has traditionally been a feature of vital significance. This is because in the Cypriot, and Greek, systems of education, until very recently, there have not been official external examinations. The yardstick of educational achievement has been, therefore, the apolyterion, which corresponds, for example, to the German "Arbitur". The apolyterion has of course been traditionally awarded by the Gymnasia, the Lycea (general education schools). When the technical schools were created, however, they modelled themselves on the Lycea and offered apolyterion too.

It is obvious from the above that the apolyterion serves as proof or indication that its holder successfully completed his schooling. In the schemes of service for many jobs, therefore, the apolyterion features as a basic requirement. In this respect it is significant to note that for many jobs, even the holder of a university degree is not exempted from the requirement to produce an apolyterion.

Seen in the light of the above, the concern of students of the vocational stream for an apolyterion, is quite understandable.

42. Ministry of Education 129/80 of 17th April 1981.

43. The Parents' Associations in Cyprus are very well organized and quite influential. Every school in the island, both elementary and secondary has its own parents' association. The associations in each district elect the "District Federation" and the district committees elect a committee for the Pancyprian Federation of Parents' Associations. All parents' associations are governed by similar constitutions. The system of parents' associations is therefore very structured and represents a strong pressure group on all matters concerning education.

44. Ministry of Education 129/80 Date 14.4.81.

45. The National Education Council is the highest body that advises the Minister of Education on matters relating to educational policy. This consultative body has representatives of all political parties, trade unions, employers, voluntary organisations and other interested parties.

46. Technological Colleges in Greece.

47. Ministry of Education 129/80 of 14th April 1981.

48. Minutes of the meeting. Ministry of Education 129/80, 29th December 1981.

49. There is no written evidence of such a "deal". The researcher obtained the information from two instructors who served on the central committee of OLTEK at the time.

50. OLTEK Bulletin of January 1982.

51. This was apparently a reference to the vocational graduates' not being allowed to sit for the H.T.I. examination.

52. It may be pointed out that if students left the school early, teachers would naturally have no teaching to do from the beginning of June to the 15th of September.

53. The conclusions of the survey and the recommendations of the committee were sent on the form of minutes on a meeting held on 10th March 1982.

54. In fact the positions taken by the district committees were so similar that one cannot but suspect that the responses were actually orchestrated from the centre.

55. Minutes of the meeting of 10th March 1982.

56. The reader may wonder why there was such a big time

gap between the pronouncement of the official policy of OLTEK against I.T.P.U.S. made on 10th March 1982, and the publication of the article which appeared in the bulletin 10 months later, in February 1983. The reason was that the bulletin is not published regularly. In fact the issue of February 1983 was the first that appeared after the new OLTEK policy was decided.

57. OLTEK bulletin, February 1983.

58. Ministry of Education document 129/80 of 10th August 1982.

59. The OLTEK bulletin article which come after the changes were made, could be attributed to their desire to publicise the work they had carried out to change the system.

60. Report on the I.T.P.U.S. for the Districts of Limassol and Paphos April 1981.

The researcher tried to find out whether the allegation of the industrial inspector could be substantiated by other evidence. The result of the investigation showed that there was certainly unrest among students at the time. It is also true that many teachers spoke openly against the programme, so probably the students must have been aware of these views. However it was difficult to assess whether the unrest among the students was caused primarily by the weaknesses in the programme itself, or whether it was the teachers who stirred up the students.

61. Report on I.T.P.U.S. Limassol district- April 1982.

62. Report on I.T.P.U.S. Nicosia district- June 1982.

63. Report on I.T..P.U.S. Limassol district- April 1982.

64. Ministry of Education 537/70/2 A.

65. For these extra duties the Assistant Headmasters were given up to six periods off per week.

66. It was estimated that students should be inspected on the average once a month, therefore inspectors were expected to see seven students per day of inspection.

67. The replies from schools were sent to the Ministry around the end of June. Ministry of Education 108/69/3.

68. This position was included in a memorandum sent by the Pancyprian Federation of Parents' Associations to the Minister of Education, dated 15th July 1986.

69. Minutes of the meeting of the inspectors of technical education with the OLTEK committee 2/10/86.

