From the *FORUM* archive

Schools within schools: the Countesthorpe experience

Michael Armstrong and Lesley King

Abstract: This article is republished from the spring 1976 number, *FORUM* 18 (2).[1] It contextualises, justifies and evaluates aspects of the 'Team' approach, a way of teaching at Countesthorpe Community College, the pioneering state 14-18 comprehensive in Leicestershire.[2] The 'Team' approach involved dividing the student body into smaller cohorts (hence 'schools within school') so that members of each cohort might be taught by a dedicated team of staff who took on pastoral as well as academic roles, with the academic role reimagined. The approach was designed to assist in reconciling student autonomy and the self-direction of studies – a cardinal element of the school's conception of education – with the equally important need to engage all students with a common curriculum. The authors note how unreformed academic and pastoral structures inhibit such a reconciliation. Their article looks at practical and theoretical issues, teacher expectations of students, and the demands placed on teachers by having to adopt a more generalist rather than a specialised approach. It also offers a first-hand reflective account of one teacher's work with a particular student.

Keywords: Countesthorpe Community College; schools-within-school; student autonomy; common curriculum; Team approach; progressive education

Introduction by Patrick Yarker

The spring 1976 *FORUM* was a special issue devoted to 'Flexibility and mixed ability'. It contributed to the continuing debate about how to create a pedagogy and curriculum best suited to a comprehensive intake. The editorial makes plain that criticism of what might now be called the 'ability' discourse was a feature of *FORUM* from its inception:

> This special number takes a new look at mixed ability grouping, or non-streaming, to use the original term … *FORUM* … from the first, united those who favoured modification of the rigid systems of streaming then practised in both primary and secondary schools … holding that the abolition of the divisive 11-plus examination and the establishment of comprehensive schools *necessarily implies* the abolition of divisive practices within the comprehensive school – that is, the development of the unified school.[3]

To establish 'the unified school' requires a fundamental rethinking of the nature of education, and a reconstruction of its methods and content. The article republished

DOI: 10.3898/FORUM.2026.68.3.05

here, written by Michael Armstrong (who was a member of *FORUM*'s editorial board) and Lesley King, considers one approach to that radical work of rethinking, as undertaken in what we would now call Key Stage 4 at Countesthorpe Community College, a pioneering comprehensive school in Leicestershire.

The 'miniature schools' or 'schools within schools', model in place at Countesthorpe aimed to circumvent or dissolve certain educational difficulties which inevitably arise in large schools. The Key Stage 4 student population at Countesthorpe was divided into smaller cohorts and taught by correspondingly fewer staff (hence the given name for the approach: 'Team'). Team members combined pastoral and academic roles, and reconceptualised these, the better to enable the relationships on which all teaching depends.

Armstrong and King explain how staff at Countesthorpe were committed to reconciling two apparently conflicting principles: student autonomy (which entailed the self-direction of studies) and the equally vital principle that all students engage with a common curriculum, or what the authors call 'the commitment to the major disciplines of human thought'. Such reconciliation is extremely difficult. The authors note how their early attempts at it failed, though not unproductively. They came to understand that:

> the context we needed in order to make a success of student autonomy was one in which teachers and students could take part in a kind of continual conversation with each other – not a dialogue, discussion or argument but something more free-ranging, intimate, expressive and egalitarian; that is to say a conversation. Only through conversation, so we felt, could a teacher learn to identify and value the intellectual demands and interests of his students and a student those of his teacher.

The first half of the article describes aspects of the 'Team' approach and offers a rationale and justification for it. The bulk of the second half is a reflective account by Lesley King of how she prepared for her new class of year 10 students and began to work with them, and in particular with one student, in line with the approach. The conditions of work, the scope afforded teachers and students, the assumptions about teaching and learning, the relationships with colleagues and even with the fabric of the classroom which Armstrong and King's writing vividly conveys are very far removed from the experience of most people in schools today. The working out in practice of the 'Team' approach, the principles which informed it, the reorganisation it required, the demands it made on teachers and students, and the conception it embodied of what education is and is for, cannot but ring like the music of another world, so far has the formal education system been retuned in recent decades.

Today's students struggle to secure meaningful voice and agency, and the pressure to conform and comply bears down hard on teachers too. But the essential question

which the Countesthorpe staff tried to answer through their committed professional work, rigorous reflection and principled dedication to the comprehensive ideal, abides. Education finds perhaps its greatest success when student autonomy and self-direction can be reconciled with engagement by and absorption in a common curriculum.

Schools within schools

The Countesthorpe experience

Michael Armstrong and Lesley King

> The process of education, at best, implies a dynamic relationship between teacher, pupil and task out of which knowledge is reconstructed, for both pupil and teacher, in the light of a shared experience.

In a previous article in *FORUM* (spring 1975)[4] one of us, Michael Armstrong, described one episode in his own recent teaching experience at Countesthorpe Upper School which seemed to illustrate this relationship. In the present article we want to describe the academic and pastoral structure by means of which our school has sought to foster the relationship. The article describes what has from the start been known at Countesthorpe as the 'team' system, although the term has always seemed to us somewhat unsatisfactory. To prevent misunderstanding we would point out in advance that the 'team' system has nothing to do with what is normally known as 'team teaching'. It has different origins and a different purpose, and it is to a description of these that we now turn.

Miniature schools

The idea of 'teams' – miniature schools within a school – grew out of a sense of dissatisfaction with the school's original curriculum strategy. That strategy sought to reconcile two apparently conflicting principles. One was the principle of autonomy – that every student should be responsible for determining the choice and direction of his own course of study with the help and support of his teachers. The task we set ourselves was to create the conditions in which autonomy could thrive. We did not intend meekly to submit to each student's passing whims and fancies, for unless teachers are ready to be positive, forceful and ambitious in their expectations of their students they cannot hope to create the conditions for a thriving autonomy. We did intend, as Stuart Maclure of the *Times Educational Supplement* once wrote, to try to 'match the education to the pupil rather than blame the pupil for failing to correspond to the kind of education which is on offer'. The second principle was that of a common curriculum

– our commitment to the major disciplines of human thought, the traditional forms of knowledge, mathematics, science, the humanities, the arts. We were convinced at the time, and remain convinced, that every student has the ability to pursue knowledge in all these forms, and that our task was to help each student to do so. At first we sought to reconcile the two principles by insisting that all students spend equal amounts of time studying each of the major areas of knowledge we identified (two to three seventy-minute lessons each of English, the social studies, maths and science) while insisting at the same time that within each area all teachers encourage each student to pursue knowledge in his own distinctive way.

The strategy failed, not so much because it is in principle impossible to reconcile autonomy with a common curriculum (though it is certainly exceptionally difficult) but rather because the context within which learning and teaching took place frustrated whatever attempts at reconciliation we made. We began to see that the context we needed in order to make a success of student autonomy was one in which teachers and students could take part in a kind of continual conversation with each other – not a dialogue, discussion or argument but something more free-ranging, intimate, expressive and egalitarian, that is to say a conversation. Only through conversation, so we felt, could a teacher learn to identify and value the intellectual demands and interests of his students and a student those of his teacher. Only such a context seemed to offer us a realistic hope of reconciling the students' and the teacher's experience and concern.

Yet the context in which we were working at the time did not encourage conversation to any great extent. How could it when our curriculum strategy entailed so clear a division between a teacher's academic and pastoral roles, between the teaching group and the tutor group? Our organisation, like that of many other comprehensive schools, kept tutorial guidance and teaching apart as distinct activities with separate structures. Guidance was organised through a pastoral system of year groups and tutors; teaching through an academic system of subject departments and subject specialists. Some tutors never taught their tutorial group. Those who did, taught them no more than one subject and no more than two or three lessons a week.

We needed a way of bringing the pastoral and the academic systems into one. Most students, if they are successfully to direct their own course of study, need sustained and systematic guidance from teachers who have come to know them well by working with them closely for a long time. The tutorial roles should therefore be at the centre of the academic system rather than on the periphery. The tutor's job is to work with his students, not just within the area of his own academic specialism but across the curriculum, teaching whatever he himself is most interested in and involving himself in whatever most absorbs his students. The more he participates in the work of his students across the curriculum the greater his chances of spotting and turning to advantage opportunities for extending and deepening the range of their intellectual and

personal concern. And thereby he helps them to direct their own studies successfully.

We did not want to deny the excitement, or even the necessity, of specialisation in secondary education. We knew and accepted that some of us would always be happiest teaching our own special subject to students who had chosen to study it. But we also knew that many of us had to become more than specialists if we were to achieve the academic goals we set ourselves, let alone the pastoral goals. In theory, perhaps, every teacher needs to be both tutor AND specialist. In practice some teachers combine the roles more easily than others. In any case the two roles are complementary. The tutor needs the specialist to take over where his own enthusiasm or expertise run out. The specialist needs the tutor to provide the supporting framework that enables a student to make sense of specialisation.

This, then, was the background against which we set about reconstructing our curriculum at the end of our first two years. We now divide each year group of students into units of 100 to 150 students each. Each unit becomes the direct pastoral and academic responsibility of a group of from five to eight teachers. Students and teachers together make up the 'team'. The group of teachers come from differing specialist backgrounds, usually, but not invariably, English, social studies and mathematics. The common factor is their readiness to assume a new kind of teaching role – new, that is, in secondary as opposed to primary schools. Their job is to get to know the students in their team (which is usually divided into tutor groups of some 20 to 25 students with one tutor), to work with them over a wide range of activities, and to guide and assist their entire course of study within the college. There is no longer a strictly compulsory core of studies which all students have to follow, but it is one part of the tutor's role to help his students to achieve a balanced curriculum involving all the major disciplines. Tutors spend at least half the week with the students in their team, working in one particular area or set of rooms which becomes the team's base, and is as far as possible exclusive to the team concerned. Thus teachers and students together make up a kind of mini-school within the overall framework of the college, semi-independent, close knit, distinctive in place and character.

Team time

For timetabling purposes the week is organised in two halves of ten periods each. One half – colloquially called 'team time' – is spent by the students in their team area working with their teacher tutors. The other half is devoted to specialist activities under the direction of specialist teachers from outside the team. Any student who has no specialist activity to take part in on one occasion or another during the specialist half of the week can remain in his team area working under the guidance or supervision of one or other of his team teachers. Conversely there have always been students who have

spent one or two lessons of team time engaged on outside specialist activities for which they could not otherwise find room on the timetable.

The difference between 'team time' and 'outside specialist activity' is a difference of emphasis. It would be wrong to think of the latter as the time when students study 'subjects' and the former as the time when they don't. It would also be wrong to imagine a sharp division between 'specialist' and 'generalist' teachers. The difference is rather in the kind of relationship between teacher and student and between both teacher and student together and the activities they engage them, that is to say between them and the curriculum.

Within the team the relationship between teacher and student is intended to be as many-sided as possible. The team's overriding objective is to help its students to make sense of autonomy and to put it to use in the expansion of intellect and personality. The teacher tries to get to know each one of his students as well as he can, both personally and intellectually, not simply for the sake of the pleasure of knowing them but in order to help them to develop their own powers of mind and feeling. This, so we feel, he can only do by talking with students, working alongside them, teaching them and learning from them over as many activities and subject matters as he can cope with. Sometimes he will be teaching his own individual specialism, sometimes following the particular interests and concerns of the student, sometimes teacher and student will be working together on activities neither is necessarily familiar with. The teacher has to be ready with his own ideas and responsive to those of his students, over a very broad area of knowledge. The boundaries between 'academic' and 'pastoral', between different 'subjects' or 'disciplines', between 'work' and 'play', between teacher and taught, become, of necessity, elusive and shifting within the team situation.

By contrast, when students work with specialists outside the team, they go primarily to engage in a particular definable set of activities or to study a particular body of knowledge with the help of an acknowledged expert. In this context, teachers and taught will probably concentrate more narrowly on the subject in hand. Within the team, such narrow forms of concentration, desirable and necessary though they certainly are in their place, can never form more than one part of the spectrum of teacher's and student's activity.

For all these reasons, team time is hard to pin down in a precise description. In order to suggest something of its character and content one of us, Lesley King, has looked back over the work of one of her present fourth year students during the first six weeks of this autumn term and over the period of pre-term preparation when she was getting ready to receive a new group of students entering the school for the first time. What follows is a brief account of just one teacher's experience of working in a Countesthorpe 'team'.

***

I first met Phil at his middle school at a time when I was really much more concerned with my present fifth year[5] group's examination work and future prospects. I was interested in my new group but had no time to give them my attention. I talked to Phil for about 15 minutes, giving him a booklet of basic information and a bus pass application form. The interview was quite a difficult one. He was obviously nervous. His voice was rather throaty and I found myself talking slightly more softly than usual. I remember that he asked no questions but in answer to my query said that he was looking forward to coming to Countesthorpe. I wasn't convinced and asked him if he minded having a woman for a tutor. Some boys resented being landed with the only woman in the team. He said no. I remember little else about the first meeting. My notes, taken at the time and added-to that evening, tell me more. Phil doesn't like maths but likes English very much. He reads adventure stories, thrillers and ghost stories. He wants to give up French but might like to begin learning German. He is also interested in what he has heard of control technology and art. He plays softball, table tennis and volleyball. He has an athletics star award. (He didn't tell me this; he was wearing it.) He also plays the piano accordion and would like to do some music.

I met him again shortly afterwards when he and the rest came from the middle school to look round our school. I remember being anxious that they should be impressed by the school. I'm always a bit afraid that fifth year students will show off in that tough way they sometimes do. Then I'll shout, and so on, and so on. I showed my group round the different teaching areas in the school. Afterwards we went back to the 'pod' – the small separate building that was to be our team area – and I explained about it being 'their' area. Then I left them for a bit as they seemed very tongue-tied, and asked one of my present fifth formers to talk to them. He said afterwards that they asked mainly about sport and music. They looked very small. We went for coffee and of course they hadn't any money. I offered money to lend but they daren't say yes. We were all rather shy. Fifth and sixth years looked at us as if we were from another galaxy. I was glad when the time came to get on the coach again. They waved as they left. I have no special memories of Phil except that he was not at all forthcoming. The notes from his middle school gave the following information: address, birth date, reading age (14), arithmetical age (11). They also mentioned that he was 'able' but 'under achieving', wanted to be a computer programmer, collects matchboxes and plays soccer for the school team. The headmaster did not mention him in particular as outstanding or specially worrying.

I later met his parents at the first parents' evening. This was to show the parents around the school and answer general questions, not specific ones about students. Over coffee his parents said that he was not happy at his middle school but felt that our system would suit him better. I was relieved. Until then I had half thought that Phil was not just shy but hostile, to the school or me or both. It was a good evening altogether. There were one or two arguments but they were productive, no useless chit chat, no 'do you push

them enough'. The school looked impressive. I got quite excited for the first time about the next year although my mind was still crowded with my present group and their work. I began to think that all the other teachers who felt rather dreary about going back into the fourth year (after spending two years with their previous groups) must be crazy. From this time my mind began to dwell more and more on the new group. I made an elaborate record book for next year: name, address, birth date, previous school/tutor, my own notes, annotated school notes, room for the timetable when it was worked out. It was important to do this to focus my mind on the group.

By this time our new team of seven teachers were meeting informally whenever possible. Most of us had worked together before in the same team, two of us were new to the team. We spent some time discussing the place of mathematics in team work. In our last team maths had been completely separate from the rest of team work and had been taught by only one of us, the team mathematician. This time round we all wanted to share in the maths teaching in one way or another. Then we could begin to explore the relationships between maths and other team work. This time, too, we'd asked to have a scientist working in our team so that we could begin to introduce more scientific activities into the team work. I was glad that science would no longer be a wholly specialised activity outside the team framework.

During the summer holidays I began to collect material and work out my ideas for the beginning of the year. By the end of term it had been clear that none of us felt the need to start the new year off with a grand, common theme – something like 'The Family' with which we had begun our last team's work. We each had our own ideas about how we would start the term off in our own groups. We swopped ideas informally but there was no master plan. Some of my new students had asked for particular things – material for a project they were thinking of doing, a nursery school where they could work, a certain book or type of book. I got together a book on UFOs, material for tapestry-making, ghost stories, *The Life of a Robin* by David Lack. I read through once more all the books in the Penguin English Project series. I arranged a link between the team and a home for children with learning disabilities at Glenfield. At the very end of the holidays I wrote out an 'emergency banda'[6] made up of suggestions for writing for students to try during the first few days, mostly autobiographical in theme.

I came into school three days before the start of term. I find this very important personally although I do little of worth. I wander around, polish the tables, arrange the tables, rearrange the tables, think in sociometric terms about the tables. I clutter the noticeboards and walls with things and wish that I had more aesthetic sense. I made a decision to risk all from the beginning this year and brought in plants and various objects, hoping nothing got broken or spoiled (nothing has).

It's important to start work as soon as the new students arrive but not simply to impose it – which is difficult when you don't really know the students. Various

departments had laid on demonstrations or talks about the kinds of activities they offered, but they didn't seem to be very successful. I felt a bit apologetic and thought things were flagging almost immediately. I got angry with several teachers for not planning their sessions well enough, or so I thought. But the students didn't seem to mind as much as I did. They quite like to chat and circle around each other. By the second day I relaxed more and concentrated on talking individually to students in my group. I didn't leave my area at all.

This is what Phil wrote at the end of his first day:

> I saw new faces as soon as I walked into the pod. Some look friendly and some don't look friendly. I'll have to make friends with them sooner or later. The school is very big and I'll be glad when I know my way around. Countesthorpe is a different school entirely from my last. The teachers seem more friendly and there is much more better things to do. The classes, or pods as they are called here, are a lot more open and don't seal you in like the old-fashioned classes at my last school did.

We talked about this and about his timetable. On the basis of chats with his teachers at the other school, chats with me, and what he had heard from specialists here he chose the following subjects to study (in addition to what he would be studying in team time, which would include maths, English, social studies and a variety of other things): art, visual communication, music, control technology, chemistry, PE and games. He had changed his mind about German after talking it over with his parents. He was especially excited by the idea of control technology because of the construction involved, music because of the possibility of using the organ and synthesiser, and visual communication because of a conversation with the person who was going to teach it who had talked about the possibilities of photography. Later he dropped PE and games and said he would play five-a-side during team time if he felt the urge. He also added typing at my suggestion. Here, then, is his present timetable:

Monday	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**
Art	Maths	Music	Team	Math
Chemistry	Team	Typing	Team	Team
Team	Vis. com.	Chemistry	Team	C. tech
Team	Typing	C. tech	Team	Team

Each week he uses one of his team lessons to do some extra maths, normally Friday 2. I work with him on Monday afternoon, Tuesday morning, all day Thursday, and Friday morning. He is alone on Friday 4. It is an atypical timetable because of the Thursday

when he works in the team area all day. But he says he enjoys planning that day most of all. I usually choose then to introduce something new, or at least to have something new handy. We also talk fairly formally then about the progress of all his work, in team and out. I still need to make quasi-formal arrangements to talk with him as he will not initiate a conversation. As soon as I speak though, he rattles on about his work, fishing, astronomy, the piano accordion.

At the start of term I'd suggested to Phil that he kept a journal. This is how he described his school life after two weeks:

> I have been at this school now for two weeks and now I have settled in and doing subjects I like to do and enjoy. Once you get to know the other students they are friendly towards you. When you get down to hard work, time seems to pass a lot quicker, but the first week we were just working out timetables and going to the different classes to see what the different subjects were like and so time seemed to drift slowly by! I like it at this school you learn things at your own pace and not like at my last school where for example in maths you go through different subjects in that category like an express train so you don't gather much knowledge.

Phil has been at the school for six weeks now. He does not work quickly, but he sometimes takes work home to finish if it interests him or ideas are fresh in his mind. Sometimes I encourage him to do this, but more often he decides himself and tells me. His journal is no more. His first story was called '*Life of Gold'*, about explorers being eaten by ants. This was in response to my reading two equally horrifying short stories to the whole class. We talked about his story and I suggested that the theme would make a good poem. He agreed and wrote one quickly. It was a splendid rhyming ballad. We talked about poetry in general. In the process he altered the rhythm of one of the verses in his poem. He insists that poetry must rhyme. I said it needn't and gave him some poems, written by students, that don't rhyme. The only one that impressed him at all was one that got in by accident almost, with an insistent rhythm and very regular rhymes. He copied it into his exercise book he thought it was so good. I questioned him about his reading. We chose *The Naked Sun* by Isaac Asimov. He has just finished it and is now going on to read an Evelyn Waugh novel he found in my box. From discussion about what makes a good book has emerged his own novel, *Invasion*, a science fiction story which promises to go on for several chapters. The subject is time travel and I have helped with technique while feverishly reading up about relativity. He tries to explain the scientific theories behind the plot to me. As yet the novel is in a rough state, but he shows me every page. He sometimes works in the library at this. He discovered the thesaurus one day by chance while writing his novel there and changed the word 'shouted' to 'bawled'. Now he uses it regularly with great excitement. His other written work, apart from the now defunct journal,

includes a piece about his friend's grandpa, written after I had read a small group some descriptive pieces, and the beginning of a short piece called '*The Book of the Dead',* written after reading the ballad *The Griesly Wife*.

During the second week of term Phil told me that he would do some work in astronomy after explaining about his telescope and how it worked. I was a bit worried that he felt he had to 'do a project'. This doesn't seem to be the case though as he is very interested to learn about nebulas and galaxies, partly in order to make his science fiction writing more convincing. Out of our conversations about astronomy we are now starting some historical work on the 'great figures' like Galileo and Copernicus. I soon found that we were both getting out of our depth in our struggle to understand relativity, despite a lot of reading and discussion. It was time to bring in outside help. I had already mentioned it to a sixth former studying physics and one morning we were given a lecture on the subject during team time. We felt that things were slightly clearer then but we still need more guidance. Luckily a student teacher working in the team at the time was the expert we were looking for and he plans to work quite closely with Phil and me on this topic.

Other work that Phil has got involved in so far this term includes a survey of the birds in Countesthorpe which a friend in his class has started. I hoped that he might be interested in working around the theme of old age after I had read the piece about his friend's grandpa. He thought about it for a week but decided that he wasn't really interested. I was quite sorry about that. Then there's maths. Although I work quite closely with a few of my students on their maths work, Phil is taught almost exclusively by the maths specialist. That's the way he prefers it at the moment and I am happy to leave it like this as long as both he and our maths specialist are satisfied with the way things are going.

Phil's work has begun well. My main regret, looking back over the past six weeks, is that I haven't managed to interest him yet in some of the things that excite me most – like local history, or child development, or the kind of work that involves students in experience outside school. There are other students in my group who are already involved in one or other of these things but so far Phil has not chosen to be. As I continue to work with him one of my aims will be to try and convince him that these things are worth studying too.

***

We have been working in teams now for three and a half years, long enough to recognise their value, short enough to know how far we are from making the most of the opportunities they present us. In order to define that opportunity we would return to a proposal put forward by David Hawkins in *FORUM* in autumn 1973. He wrote as follows:

> As many kinds of subject matter are now organised, it is not obviously nor easily possible to transform the teaching of them to a more self-directed and informal style of work in schools. Under these circumstances we are rather likely to fall back into the old polarities. By one party the tradition of the formal course will continue to be seen as for the most part a dreary, ineffective and superficial 'coverage' of subject matter on its way to ossification. By the other party the advocacy of resource-based learning will be seen as a denigration of both rigour and discipline in the mastery of subject matter. What I hope is that this old issue be buried and that we address, instead, the question as to HOW wider ranges of subject matter, of that stuff alluded to in curricula as syllabi, can be revived and reconstituted and extended so as to make it more diversely accessible and appealing to growing minds, more interwoven in the texture of a rich school environment.[7]

We are rash enough to think that in our teams we are beginning to create the kind of context in which the questions which David Hawkins asks can be fruitfully investigated and even, maybe, answered. That is how we would want to define our opportunity.

Notes

1. The article is presented without alteration to its language save for the updated rewording of one reference to children with learning disabilities.

2. For accounts of education at Countesthorpe, see John Watts (ed.), *Teaching: the Countesthorpe Experience*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1977; Lorna Chessum, *Revisiting Radial Education: learning from Countesthorpe College, 1970-1990*, London, Bloomsbury, 2011; and Jenifer Smith, 'An Exploration of Teaching in Action', unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Southampton, 1989, https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/461680/1/359849.pdf.

3. Editorial, 'Towards a Unified School', *FORUM*, 18 (2), 1976, p39, original emphasis: https://journals.lwbooks.co.uk/pdfs/forum/18/forum_18_2.pdf.

4. Misprinted as 'spring 1965' in the original. The quotation is from Michael Armstong's paper, 'Reconstructing Knowledge: an example', *FORUM*, 17 (2), 1975, pp50-53, p50: https://journals.lwbooks.co.uk/pdfs/forum/17/forum_17_2.pdf.

5. 'Fifth year' corresponds to year 11; 'fourth year' to year 10; 'sixth year' to year 12.

6. A 'banda' refers here to a worksheet which could be copied on the 'banda' machine or spirit duplicator in the days before widespread use of photocopiers in schools.

7. David Hawkins, 'Two sources of learning', *FORUM* 16 (1), 1973, pp8-11, p11: https://journals.lwbooks.co.uk/pdfs/forum/16/forum_16_1.pdf.