



CEDAR

Centre for Educational Development
Appraisal and Research

Schools Enterprise Programme (Scotland) Evaluation

June 2004

Dr Daniel Muijs and Professor Geoff Lindsay

**Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research
University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL**

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WARWICK

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	6
2. IMPACT OF SEP	7
2.1 Training teachers to deliver enterprise education	7
2.2 Impact in schools	12
2.3 Impact on pupils	12
2.4 Teachers' views on the nature of enterprise education	22
2.5 Dissemination and sustainability	24
3. SUCCESS FACILITATORS	26
3.1 Building on existing strengths	26
3.2 Clear project goals	27
3.3 The role of the EESO	27
3.4 Quality of training	28
3.5 Quality of materials produced	28
3.6 Support from the Centre	29
P 3.7 Events/Conferences	30
3.8 The role of the head and LEA: Facilitator and barrier	31
3.9 Funding	32
4. BARRIERS TO SUCCESS	33
4.1 Time Management	33
4.2 Integration with the curriculum	35
4.3 Recalcitrant schools	37
4.4 Availability of enterprise packs	37
4.5 Organisational issues	38
5. SUMMARY	39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the Schools Enterprise Programme, conducted by Professor Geoff Lindsay and Dr Daniel Muijs at the Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research of the University of Warwick.

The effectiveness of SEP was evaluated through a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, allowing us to achieve both breadth and depth in evaluation, studying both overall effectiveness and those factors that had contributed to the results found.

The evaluation took place over the period 1 January 2002 to 31 July 2004.

The evaluation comprised:

- SEP training events: a questionnaire to all present Enterprise Education Support Officers (EESOs) at the end of the event, and qualitative observation of the various activities taking place during the three days
- Questionnaire to teachers and their pupils in 50 schools (October 2002): 37 schools (74%) returned the survey, which was completed by 542 pupils
- Case study visits: typically of one week each, were carried out throughout the course of the project to selected sites representing a range of contexts in terms of geographical area. EESOs, 21 teachers, 8 headteachers, and 12 groups of pupils (totalling 63 pupils) were interviewed. A number of training events were also observed.
- A large scale survey to all teachers trained in Enterprise Education as part of the Schools Enterprise Programme: 1498 questionnaires were returned (23% response rate).
- Interviews with 'core team members' (December 2003): managers, board members and programme developers.

Impact

In terms of impact, the following conclusions can be made:

Training of teachers:

- in the three years of the programme, over 6500 teachers were trained
- this training was considered to be highly effective by teachers, with ratings that are well above the norm for professional development activities in education

Impact in school:

- over 80% of trained teachers had carried out an enterprise activity in the year following their training
- over 90% of trained teachers surveyed described these activities as successful

- over ... enterprise projects were reported
- however, over 60% had not provided training or feedback on training to colleagues
- and fewer than 25% of other teachers in their schools were carrying out enterprise activities in those schools

Impact on pupils:

- Pupils and teachers were strongly of the opinion that enterprise education is motivating and enjoyable (over 90% of teachers said enterprise had motivated their pupils)
- Pupils felt they had learnt a lot from enterprise, and teachers and pupils felt their knowledge of the business world had increased strongly
- Increased pupil responsibility and confidence was reported to be a key outcome of doing enterprise activities
- Teachers and pupils feel their organisational, communication and collaborative skills have improved as a result of enterprise education
- Following training, teachers had developed a broad view of enterprise

Factors enhancing success

The factors that have enhanced the success of the programme were found to be:

- The programme built on existing initiatives and strengths and could be scaled up from there, rather than being built up from scratch
- The programme had a clear goal and focus
- The role of the EESOs, providing both training and hands-on support to teachers, was crucial to the success of the programme
- The high quality of the training provided
- The high quality of the materials provided
- The support of the centre to EESOs, in particular rapid and flexible reactions to problems
- The use of events that brought EESOs together and helped develop a community of EESOs
- Adequate funding
- The role of the private sector
- Supportive heads and LEA's in most cases

Barriers to success

The main barriers to success were:

- Time management issues for teachers and schools
- Integration of Enterprise with the 5-14 curriculum
- Recalcitrance in a minority of schools
- Organisational hiccups at the start of the programme
- The lack of activities focussing on the whole school and headteachers could be seen as a missed opportunity in terms of enhancing sustainability and dissemination.

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the Schools Enterprise Programme, conducted by Professor Geoff Lindsay and Dr Daniel Muijs at the Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research of the University of Warwick.

The effectiveness of SEP was evaluated through a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, seen as most able to allow us to achieve both breadth and depth in evaluation, studying both overall effectiveness and those factors that had contributed to the results found. Quantitative and qualitative elements were used both to achieve complementarity in the sense of answering different questions, and triangulation, in that it allowed us to collect data from different sources on particular evaluation questions, thus strengthening our ability to draw firm inferences from the data.

The evaluation took part between 1 January 2002 and 31 July 2004

The following elements form a part of the evaluation:

1. Evaluation of events. SEP events were observed using a semi-structured observation instrument. This evaluation of these 2 day training event had two main elements: a questionnaire given out to all present Enterprise Education Support Officers (EESOs) at the end of the event, and qualitative observation of the various activities taking place during the three days. This approach was chosen to enable us to triangulate the quantitatively analysed findings of the questionnaire with more in-depth analysis of the sessions, which should allow for actionable findings with a view to future training events.
2. Questionnaire to teachers and their pupils. A survey was sent out to 50 schools, in which one teacher and her/his pupils were asked to complete the questionnaire. In total, 37 schools (74%) returned the survey, which was completed by 542 pupils. Schools were selected from across the EESO areas, and were selected on the basis of recommendation by EESOs in order for us to obtain firstly, schools in which enterprise had taken place, so we could be sure that students surveyed would be able to respond to questions about enterprise and secondly, to obtain a high response rate. The survey was sent out in October 2002. This will be referred to as the 'pupil questionnaire' in the report
3. Case studies. Case study visits were carried out throughout the course of the project to selected sites representing a range of contexts in terms of geographical area (criteria used included whether or not the area was urban or rural and where it was geographically situated so we could cover the diversity present in Scotland). During case study visits, which lasted on average one week, qualitative data were collected through interviews with EESOs and school visits. During school visits, the headteacher, teachers involved in Enterprise and pupils were interviewed for between 40 and 60 minutes each. Pupils were interviewed in groups of between 5 and 10, teachers and heads were interviewed individually. In total, 21 teachers, 8 headteachers, and 12 groups of pupils (totalling 63 pupils) were interviewed. A number of training events were observed as well. These will be referred to as the 'case studies' in the report.
4. A large scale survey was sent out to all teachers trained in Enterprise Education as part of the Schools Enterprise Programme. 6500 questionnaires

were sent out in November 2003, 1498 questionnaires were returned to us (23% response rate). The questionnaire was designed to elicit views on the Enterprise training provided as part of SEP, the practical operation of Enterprise Education in their schools, and the impact of Enterprise Education on pupils and school. It was designed based on two teacher focus group studies carried out in September 2003. The distribution of responses by gender and age group are given in tables 1 and 2

Table 1: Gender

Gender	Male	Female
Percentage of respondents	8.3	91.7

Table 2: Age group

Age group	20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	60+
Percentage of respondents	15.9	20.4	35.5	27.6	0.5

5. Interviews with managers, board members and programme developers. Interviews were conducted with key leaders in SEP for the purpose of gaining further background information and their opinion on the project. Interviews were carried out in December 2003 and lasted between 65 and 75 minutes each. These will be referred to as 'core team members' in the report.

In this report, we will not discuss the different elements of the evaluation separately as described above, but rather report thematically, bringing to bear any source of data relevant to that particular theme, in order to exploit the possibilities for triangulation and complementarity offered by this mixed methods approach.

The structure of the report will instead focus first on the impact of the project, then on factors that have facilitated programme successes, and finally on barriers that have hindered programme development. The final section will present the main conclusions of the evaluation team.

2. IMPACT OF SEP

2.1 Training teachers to deliver Enterprise Education

2.1.1 Take up of training

Overall 10,393 teachers were trained in enterprise education as part of the project, this out of a total of around 23,000 primary (and 25,000 secondary) teachers. This is a high number, and reflects a major success for the Schools Enterprise Programme. It has also to be pointed out that up to 3,500 teachers were trained in Enterprise during previous projects. The fact that such a large group of teachers have been trained does mean that a critical mass may now be present within Scottish schools to take forward enterprise education.

2.1.2 Effectiveness of training

While the numbers of teachers trained is an important indicator, training will in itself not impact in schools if it is not perceived as effective by those trained. Effectiveness of training was therefore studied using data from feedback sheets presented to EESOs following training, case study interviews with teachers, items in the teacher survey, and EESO interviews.

2.1.2.1 *Trainee feedback*

Training questionnaires were handed out by EESOs following training. The format of the feedback sheets changed during the course of the programme as evaluators reacted to feedback from EESOs, so both formats will be presented here.

2.1.2.1.1 *Old format*

Table 3. Teacher training feedback: Overall effectiveness of the course (in %)

Highly effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat ineffective	Highly ineffective
78.2	15.8	0.8	5.2

From table 3 it can be seen that the training was perceived as highly effective by participants overall. The rating of 78.2% highly effective is above average for this type of evaluation.

Like the EESOs at their training events, teachers felt that the practical approach was the most effective element of the course. They particularly appreciated the fact that the training used real-life ideas they could use in their classrooms. The use of group work was also frequently mentioned as being a highly effective part of the training. The materials provided were praised, as was the quality of delivery. Ineffective elements were rarely mentioned, with the most common response being 'none'. The short length of the event, making it a bit rushed according to some teachers, was the main complaint. Not all teachers enjoyed the practical activities, some feeling that these took up too much time. This was a small minority, however.

Table 4. Teacher training feedback: Do you feel the training has fully prepared you to deliver Enterprise Education? (in %)

Fully prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not very prepared	Not prepared
39.6	56.2	1.2	0

While teachers see the training as having been highly effective, the majority of trained teachers felt that they were somewhat rather than fully prepared to deliver Enterprise Education in their classrooms and schools. Very few respondents felt that they were not prepared, however, which suggests that this result indicates a certain apprehension rather than a feeling that the training was insufficient.

Table 5. Teacher training feedback: How likely are you to deliver Enterprise Education in your school? (in %)

Highly likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not at all likely
76	20	4	0

The vast majority (76%) of respondents said they planned to carry out enterprise activities in their schools the same year, while the remainder claimed they would do so next school year. This suggests that participants were sufficiently enthused to feel that they wished to engage in enterprise quickly following training. When asked what further help they required, the majority of respondents said they would request support from the EESO when required, or that they would not know whether they needed further support until they were doing the enterprise.

2.1.2.1.2 *New format*

When looking at the new feedback format similar results are evident.

Table 6. Teacher training feedback (completed by later course members): New format (in %)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall rating of the course	56.1	43.4	0.5	0
Effectiveness in meeting the aims of the course	47.2	52.0	0.8	0
Effectiveness of course content	50.5	48.3	1.2	0
Organisation of the course	60.4	39.1	0.5	0
Presentation	58.9	39.3	1.8	0
Do you feel you have obtained the necessary skills and knowledge to deliver Enterprise in your school	31.4	67.9	0.7	0

The findings reported in table 6 confirm the positive views recorded in the old format feedback sheets. No trained teachers responded 'poor' to any of the items, and the category 'fair' was chosen by no more than 2% of respondents on any item. Overall, 56% of respondents rated the course as excellent. Courses were perceived as well organised (60% excellent), well presented (58% excellent) and effective (50% excellent). A slightly lower score was recorded on the item on whether the course was effective in meeting its aims (52% good). Again, teachers were more tentative with regards to whether or not they felt they had obtained the necessary skills to deliver Enterprise in their schools. Almost three quarters of trainees did intend to deliver Enterprise that school year, with just over a quarter making a vaguer commitment to delivering enterprise in future (see table 7).

Table 7. Teacher training feedback: Would you deliver Enterprise Education in your school

This term	Within this school year	In the future	Not at all
13.9	58.0	27.7	0.4

Asked what further support they might need, respondents commented that in future they might need help getting started with the project, and that they might need help once the project got started in their schools.

2.1.2.2. Case Study Data

The case study interviews confirmed this positive feedback. Teachers reported highly favourably on the training they had received. Training sessions were able to take away some of the anxieties of teachers about taking on this new approach, many coming away with a sense that they were already carrying out many enterprise-like activities that could easily be turned into enterprises. The hands-on activities were particularly valued, and respondents felt these gave them the opportunity to get a feel for what enterprise activities would look like. Interviews conducted as part of the case studies confirm this positive view. All teachers we spoke to were enthusiastic about the training. One teacher, for example, commented that

‘I thought it was great, it was really good. I mean they very much used what was available in the pack, turned us into the children basically and helped us to experience what the children would feel. It was very interesting. Helping us to work as a group. It was really entertaining but it was also a big learning experience because they just help you realise that there’s such a huge wealth of ideas that could be used’

From the point of view of headteachers, there were costs involved in the training, not least the difficulty of finding supply cover for teachers who were at training events. As one head, who was generally very enthusiastic about the project, commented:

‘Now I sent two teachers just recently on the new staff training but there are problems with that because you don’t get cover. It costs £140 a day to take a teacher away. There are problems with getting supply teachers to cover when they go. So immediately you can see the difficulties there are reasons for Head Teachers to say, no, no it’s another project in a heavy curriculum it’s going to cost me money. However, basically what they do is they hold a carrot of the upgraded box for enterprising infants. And the upgraded box for journey to enterprisethey get that. But what’s more importantly they get enthusiastic and they come back and say, “yeah this is really good stuff”.

Training events for teachers that we observed were highly effective, enjoyed by participants, and addressed the main issues teachers had, including those of time management and integration with the 5-14 curriculum. EESOs stressed the practical aspects of the programme and the practical feasibility of doing an enterprise activity in school, and participating teachers were clearly enthused by this. Overall, the approach taken in the training events observed was largely consistent across areas, with some variation in delivery, in some cases reflecting local realities. One problem

observed was that presentation of the website did not involve real-life access to the site.

2.1.2.3 Teacher survey data

The large scale trained teacher survey which was received by teachers some time after they had received the training as opposed to the feedback forms immediately following training events discussed earlier, also included questions about the effectiveness of the training.

**Table 8. What did you think of the training? (trained teacher questionnaire)
(in %)**

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
The training successfully used real examples of enterprise activities	0.8	2.1	4.2	37.6	55.3
Training <u>did not</u> sufficiently address the difficulties involved with doing an enterprise activity	23.7	24.2	16.4	28.7	7.1
The enterprise pack was clearly explained	0.5	3.2	4.7	39.5	52.1
The training made me feel more positive about doing an enterprise activity	1.5	2.8	6.7	36.5	52.5
Overall, the training was effective	1.1	3.2	6.2	39.1	50.4
Doing hands-on activities is a good way of giving enterprise training	1.8	3.1	8.4	34.0	52.6

The results in table 8 again show that training has been well received by respondents. All positive statements have over 50% of respondents agreeing strongly. The only item to which less than half of teachers responded positively is the statement 'Training did not sufficiently address the difficulties involved with doing an enterprise activity'. This could partly have resulted from respondents encountering problems when they put Enterprise Education in practice, but could also have resulted in part from a methodological factor, in that some studies show that negatively worded items form a separate factor in surveys, to which respondents react in ways that differ from positively worded items. On all other questions, less than 5% of respondents gave a 'disagree' or disagree strongly' response, that would indicate dissatisfaction with training. These satisfaction levels are above average for teacher professional development programmes.

Overall, then, these findings indicate a high level of teacher satisfaction with the training provided. Quality of training is particularly important in ensuring programme implementation in schools, as it is an important way of overcoming scepticism towards various initiatives that currently exists among teachers in the UK. As one EESO commented:

‘teachers have been sceptical about things... this sort of thing’s come around before and they know that it’s faded away’

However, while effective training is clearly an essential aspect of success, and is seen as a prerequisite to implementation, it does not in itself guarantee implementation.

2.2 Impact in schools

The first measurable impact in schools is the number of enterprise activities undertaken. Over 5349 projects, involving 218,822 pupils have been reported to EESOs. While not all schools submitted correct information, and this number is therefore a lower bound of the number of events, this does give a good indication of the impressive volume of activity that has been generated.

Another measure of implementation comes from the trained teacher questionnaire. According to this, the majority of teachers had done enterprise activities in their school.

Table 9: Have you done Enterprise activities? (in %)

	Never	Once	Twice	Three times	More than three times
I have done an Enterprise activity in my school	21.2	34.6	19.1	6.0	19.2

As can be seen in table 9, the largest group of respondents have done an Enterprise activity once, but substantial groups have never done one (possibly these are recent trainees), have done two or have done more than three activities. Almost 80% of respondents has done at least one Enterprise activity, however.

Also in this survey, the vast majority of those teachers said that the enterprise activities they organised had been a success. Over 54% agreed strongly that this was the case, with another 40% agreeing somewhat.

Overall, then, it appears that the level of activity generated in schools is high. As one core team member commented:

‘I believe we have now developed critical mass, there is still work to do, but I believe we have reached the stage where in Scotland schools see Enterprise as part of what schools do. I think we are now in a position to make the last push, which was not the case before SEP. I don’t think we would have ever got into that position without that huge investment, effort and time.’

Notwithstanding this, the view is that there is still a way to go. As another core team member said:

'We are still in the situation that I can go around Scotland and meet a random teacher who hasn't heard of us. In an ideal world that would not be the case. However, that dream is now attainable, and that is a tremendous step forward'

2.3 Impact on pupils

In the previous section we were able to establish that Enterprise activities were taking place in schools. A key measure of impact, however, is whether or not these activities are having an effect on the pupils taking part in them.

This impact on pupils can take place on a number of levels, such as enjoyment and motivation, learning, confidence and self-esteem, developing experience of the world of work, and social and behavioural skills, all of which have been put forward as desirable educational outcomes in the past (see, e.g. Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000).

2.3.1. Pupil Enjoyment and Motivation

Pupil enjoyment was measured by 3 items on the autumn 2002 pupil questionnaire and 2 items on the Autumn 2003 teacher questionnaire.

According to pupils themselves, the vast majority of pupils enjoyed being part of the mini enterprise (table 10), with fewer than 5% saying they had not enjoyed this, while 80% disagreed with the statement that the experience had been boring (table 11). 90% of respondents would like to be part of a mini enterprise again in future. These figures clearly point to high levels of pupil enjoyment.

Table 10. I enjoyed being part of the mini enterprise (pupil questionnaire) (in %)

	Very much	A bit	Not much	Not at all
I enjoyed being part of the mini enterprise	78.8	16.4	3.7	1.1

Table 11. I enjoyed being part of the mini enterprise (pupil questionnaire) (in %)

	Really true	Sort of true	Sort of untrue	Totally untrue
Taking part in the mini enterprise was boring	4.6	14.9	17.5	62.9
I'd like to be part of the mini enterprise again	70.8	20.6	5.0	3.7

Pupil motivation was also explored in the teacher questionnaire. Over 65% of teachers considered enterprise education had improved pupils' attitudes to school, with fewer than 5% disagreeing with this statement. Even more teachers agreed that enterprise had improved their pupils' self-esteem, with almost 90% agreeing, 36% agreeing strongly that this was the case. The fact that pupils can see the results of what they do when undertaking enterprise was mentioned specifically in this regard, hardly any teachers disagreeing with this statement and over 45% agreeing strongly (table 12).

Table 12. I enjoyed being part of the mini enterprise (teacher questionnaire) (in %)

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
Enterprise education has improved pupils attitudes to school	1.6	3.6	29.9	52.1	12.7
Doing enterprise activities motivates pupils because they can see the results of what they are doing	0.1	0.3	5.3	48.5	45.9

During case studies pupils were interviewed about their views on Enterprise Education, again pointing to high levels of enjoyment. Pupils interviewed said they enjoyed the enterprise activities, most enjoying them more than regular lessons. They appreciated the responsibility they were given and the trust they received from teachers: *'we are treated as grown-ups'* was a typical comment. The pupils said it was hard work, but they enjoyed it. One complaint that came up on occasion was unhappiness about not having got the job applied for.

In some of the case study schools it appears that pupils enjoyed the activities so much, a lot of the enterprise work was done after school and during weekends

'And in fact it got too big. The teacher was getting such fun that they were coming in on Saturday afternoons. That was the most, you know.' (teacher)

Another teacher commented:

'From day one when we started organising our lessons around it we were so enthusiastic, and the fact is it wasn't sitting down with jotters doing writing, using books it was kind of getting out there and doing it themselves and very much hands-on for them. So, they see it really as a bit of a treat more than work. They don't perceive it to be work, you know.'

A key element in fostering pupil enjoyment and motivation, according to teachers, was the connection that was made with real life and actual experience. The fact that enterprise allowed pupils to engage in particular activities within context was seen as useful both in terms of learning and in terms of motivation.

'Instead of just asking them to write a letter because you want to teach them letter writing style, if they're writing to a bank manager, or writing to a company, there's a purpose behind, a real purpose behind the writing. It's something different, something they haven't done in primary school before, and it is always difficult to find something to catch their attention.'

Several teachers interviewed made similar comments.

A related motivating factor was the fact that pupils were able to see the results of their work. According to both teachers and pupils themselves:

'at the end of it they were like "Wow, it looks so impressive" and this was sort of all our information for what we've done, so they were really pleased but when I had them bound they were like "Wow, it's a professional book". So they were, they were really pleased with that'.

The importance of this realistic element was echoed by a core team member who commented that

'at the heart of what is happening is that children are responsible to the outside world, to responding to the needs of customers. It's for a real purpose, so the learning becomes much more meaningful, because there is a reaction to that learning, there is a benefit to be gained from that learning. The fact that there is a risk of failure seems to me to be critical to this.'

However, making the experience realistic was sometimes seen as challenging due to teacher over protectiveness of pupils:

'One of the most difficult things has been to get teachers to give pupils that responsibility, because they have been brought up to protect youngsters from failure, and therefore for them to allow youngsters to fail is challenging. They need a little time to get through that', according to one core team member.

A final motivating factor mentioned frequently by teachers and also by some pupils was taking part in the regional and national showcases.

2.3.2 Pupil achievement and learning

A key impact measure is how taking part in Enterprise has affected pupil learning and achievement in school. This was explored in a number of ways in the evaluation, through questions in both surveys and case study interview. However, it has to be pointed out that all these are indirect measures relying on self-report, which do not allow us to take any definitive conclusions on pupil learning per se.

Table 13. **I learnt a lot from being part of the mini enterprise (pupil questionnaire) (in %)**

Really true	Sort of true	Sort of untrue	Totally untrue
56.0	32.6	6.6	4.8

Pupils themselves felt they had learnt a lot from taking part in the mini-enterprise, with over 55% responding 'really true' and just 11% stating that they had not learnt from the experience.

**Table 14: Effects of Enterprise on pupil achievement (teacher questionnaire)
(in %)**

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
Enterprise education has improved pupils' achievement in English	4.4	10.4	55.9	25.9	3.5
Enterprise education has improved pupils' achievement in maths	3.0	8.6	52.2	32.5	3.8
Enterprise education has made pupil behave in a more enterprising way in all subjects	3.1	8.2	49.8	31.7	7.3

In the trained teacher questionnaire a number of questions were asked about possible spill over effects of taking part in enterprise on performance in other subjects. The majority of teachers saw no spill over effects, though over a quarter felt English had improved, and over a third felt that enterprise had improved their pupils' achievement in maths. These are significant numbers. A positive finding is that 39% of teachers agreed that enterprise activities had made pupils more enterprising in other subjects, which suggests that in these schools enterprise is perceived as leading to more independent learning and initiative from pupils across the board.

Independent learning is encouraged by allowing pupils to take charge of the project and its development, while teachers, though clearly steering and making sure everything works, take on a facilitating role. Enterprise education was seen by many teachers interviewed as part of the case studies as much more student centred than traditional teaching used in the core subjects:

'I think the main difference is you know the way you want to go but you can't have the exact route because it's going to change depending on what the children see as an ideal..... And you have to have a general outline of what you want and where you're going but you can't stick rigidly to it because otherwise you're just delivering a lesson. And you're not delivering a lesson. It's a joint venture. Really that's what I felt about it.'

Teachers felt that they were able to act in a more facilitative role than usual and let the children get on with it.

‘Obviously you provide a lot of different resources and get a range of different resources and brainstorm initially and come up with ideas. I just provide things and then talk and get the inspiration going, get those ideas going, and get them open to the idea that they can actually do something. ... So, you know, I think just making them believe in themselves is my biggest role. Providing all the resources and letting them get on with it. And obviously if they’re going drastically wrong we can provide something else that’s going to give them the solution without me just telling them, because that’s important as well. Because if you find something out for yourself you do remember it, you know, better, it stays with you. Obviously, the amount of support the teacher needs to provide to pupils differs according to their age. ‘You must never forget that they’re only five and six years old and the support that they need is, is vast compared to, say, Primary 7 who could do quite a lot on their own. Even using the telephone you need to be there (deputy head)’.

Teachers, when asked this in the trained teacher survey, also felt that enterprise education allowed the less academic pupils in their classes to shine, over 80% of respondents agreeing with this statement.

2.3.3 Pupil Confidence and self-esteem

Pupil confidence and self-esteem were also investigated, as both can be hypothesised to increase as a result of the greater responsibility given to pupils as part of enterprise activities. This was explored in both teacher and pupils surveys, and in case study interviews.

Table 15. Taking part in the mini enterprise has made me more confident with adults (pupil questionnaire) (in %)

Really true	Sort of true	Sort of untrue	Totally untrue
40.1	40.1	10.7	9.2

As can be seen in table 15, pupils themselves felt that being part of an Enterprise had made them more confident in their dealings with adults. They also commented on this aspect in interviews:

‘We’re more confident now about going up to adults and asking for something, or doing something in front of a whole audience of people.’, in the words of one primary pupil.

Many teachers likewise commented on the aspect of pupil confidence in interviews:

‘I think it’s certainly made them more confident being able to do this and made them more aware of managing things and planning things. I’ve noticed a difference in that since when I first took primary seven and we only started working on this about January, and they have really come on, they’re so much more confident about answering questions and they like to sometimes use words that they would never have thought of before. They are treated almost like grown ups and their opinions are valued and people listen to them so it’s good for children.’

In the teacher survey teachers likewise commented positively on this as an important effect of the programme, with over half agreeing somewhat that Enterprise had improved pupils' self-esteem, while an additional 36% agreed strongly. Teachers therefore clearly feel that the programme has been beneficial in this regard.

Table 16: Does Enterprise education improve pupils' self-esteem? (teacher questionnaire (in%))

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
Enterprise education improves pupils' self-esteem	0.2	0.7	9.3	53.2	36.6

2.3.4 Knowledge of and attitudes towards the world of work and business

Has taking part in enterprise actually increased pupils' knowledge of the world of work and business?

The vast majority of pupils surveyed felt that being part of an Enterprise had helped them to know more about the business world, with fewer than 10% saying this was not the case. These findings are mirrored in the enthusiasm of pupils surveyed about starting their own business when they grow up, with over 38% responding really true and 28% somewhat true to this item (table 17). One pupil interviewed for example commented

'I didn't know enterprise would be so much fun... I'm good with computers, I would like to start my own computer business when I'm old.'

Obviously, these views may well change as the students mature, but some enthusiasm does seem to have been awakened in many pupils.

Table 17: Pupil knowledge of and attitudes towards business (pupil questionnaire) (in %)

	Really true	Sort of true	Sort of untrue	Totally untrue
Taking part in the mini enterprise has taught me about how businesses work	59.5	30.8	7.1	2.6
I would like to run my own business when I grow up	38.3	28.5	13.6	19.6

Teachers confirmed that enterprise education has made their pupils more aware of the world of work, with over 80% agreeing (table 18). They are less confident than pupils themselves as to whether doing enterprise activities has made pupils want to start their own businesses. The majority, however, neither agree nor disagree, reflecting the lack of certainty over behaviours such a long way in the future. 25% do feel that pupils are now more likely to want to start their own businesses.

Table 18: Pupil knowledge of and attitudes towards business (teacher questionnaire) (in %)

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
Enterprise education has made pupils more aware of the world of work	0.9	3.8	12.4	57.5	25.3
Enterprise education has made pupils want to start their own business	6.9	15.4	52.3	20.2	5.3

This experience of the way business works was seen to operate both specifically, in that pupils were able to develop skills they will need in their professional careers, and more generally, in terms of what one teacher called 'enterprisingness' and awareness raising.

Specifically, pupils gained knowledge of aspects like finance, profit and loss and ordering:

'I think on the business lines as well they learned a lot because they used the order forms and the clerical staff were good at showing them how to fill order forms in and how to go about the business lines of it. The finance, people with their own skills were able to pass their skills on, so they saw how things were ordered and such like, even going out to the shops' (teacher).

Interviewees said that one of the main advantages of enterprise education was that it could help them to develop a change in attitudes with regards to them feeling able to have a go, without being dogged by fear of failure. As one head commented:

'So if they had Enterprise in a primary school and it helped them to turn into enterprising people, the big thing also is to have a 'can do' philosophy. In Scotland, we often think, I won't do that, because if I do that I might fail, so I'm not going to try in case I fail. If you can get them past that, and I share things like in America people will have a business and they fail but they pick themselves up and they go again.. But in our country the philosophy is if you fail, ha, ha, ha. So primary enterprise can help, in the early stages to build them into the kind of people who have a go. '

In order to help children develop this enterprising view, it was seen by some EESOs as important that teachers themselves understood the background and reasons for doing enterprise education.

'It's not just a wee enterprise project that you do in the class. There's much more to it than that. The bigger picture. It's important teachers know the bigger picture, and see what it's all about and the reason behind it. Because when you go on courses you need to have a lot of emphasis on how you're going to implement it, but you also need to know what the bigger picture is and why, and what you're trying to achieve.'

One issue that concerned a number of EESOs and educators was the fact that when children applied for a particular job in their enterprise project (e.g. manager), they might not get it. This was seen as potentially harmful to pupils' self-esteem:

'And the next day after the interviews had finished she was told that she hadn't succeeded this time and she wouldn't be managing director but her best friend got the job. So the daughter was hysterical and sobbing all night at home and couldn't be consoled because she was going to be one of the odd job people and not one of the bosses which was what she wanted to be. ...So I think there is always the downside that a lot of kids are happy because they get the important jobs and many of them don't. They've all got to be seen to be important.'

However, others saw the fact that the children did not necessarily get the job they applied for as positive, as it was seen as preparing them for real life. As one school head said:

'they're not going to get everything that they want in life. They're not going to always get the first job that they come to. I think that prepares them for that. We do pamper to children an awful lot these days in school.'

According to most interviewees, the children themselves were able to accept this, though that was not always the case of the parents.

2.3.5 Pupil skills and behaviour

A major impact of enterprise according to teachers lies in its effect on pupils' skills in a number of areas. Pupils' collaborative skills (over 90% of respondents agreed), communication skills (just under 80%) and organisational skills (just under 80%) are all said to have been positively affected by enterprise. More than three quarters of respondents also feel that enterprise education has made pupils more aware of the world of work (table 19).

Table 19: Impact on pupils' skills and behaviour (teacher questionnaire) (in %)

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
Pupils' communication skills have improved as a result of doing enterprise activities	0.9	1.6	17.9	61.1	18.4
Pupils' organisational skills have improved as a result of doing enterprise activities	1.1	2.1	18.4	59.8	18.6
Doing enterprise improves pupils' collaborative skills	0.3	0.7	4.9	48.1	46.1
Enterprise activities improve pupils' behaviour in school	2.1	6.7	48.9	34.6	7.8
Doing enterprise activities can cause rows between pupils	10.3	19.9	27.4	36.8	5.6

Communication skills were an aspect frequently mentioned by teachers during interviews.

'I think it's just, it's like life skills, you know. Obviously the communication side of things in terms of setting up meetings, arranging things, written communication obviously they're dealing with all of that functional writing kind of aspect.'

Another teacher commented that:

'I think Enterprise promotes working together more readily within a group and helping them to learn to go with the majority decision and you can't always be the one to make that final decision.'

Social skills and teamwork were encouraged, and this led to some interesting changes in pupil attitudes in some schools.

'There was one or two kids that I found in class quite independent, work on their own and don't really get on well in group situations. It was very good for them. and, um, last year I remember one child saying "I wouldn't have normally chosen to work with A, B and C, but because A, B and C had chosen to work in this group as well, I had to work with them, and actually they're not as bad people as I'd thought".'

Pupils interviewed as part of the case studies also commented that doing Enterprise had taught them to work as part of a group.

As mentioned above, organisational skills were seen by a large proportion of teachers to have been positively affected by enterprise. This factor was also indirectly mentioned in some pupil interviews. In one school in the Central Belt, for example, pupils commented that:

‘So obviously you’ve got a strategy for selling more. Also, by getting them to order first, that means you can actually keep your production a wee bit under control as well.’

Pupil behaviour was also said to have improved by over 40% of teachers (see table 19), even though it can cause rows between them (see table 19). Again, this is probably related to the higher levels of motivation during enterprise activities.

Another advantage of enterprise was that it was seen to help all kinds of pupils.

‘it’s a great leveller, that every child can have a place in an Enterprise project. It’s not based solely on academic ability’

2.4. Teachers’ views on the nature of enterprise education

Before going on the training, many teachers were of the impression that enterprise was concerned strictly with business, according to EESOs:

‘A lot of the teachers that I’ve spoken to have said “Oh Enterprise, that’s, that’s about making money and profit, and that is the message that’s out there in a lot of people’s minds. I mean we surprise people on courses I think when we say to them, no, it’s not just about making money. It can be community-based, it can be environmentally-based. It doesn’t have to be that way. And I think that’s the main message that needs to go across.’

To SEP core team members and EESOs Enterprise was defined far more broadly as

‘Any activity in which young people take responsibility to meet the need of real customers.’ This wide definition means that enterprise is more than a set of activities youngsters have to work through. ‘It’s about developing a can-do attitude where the youngsters are responsible for their own actions.’ (core team member)

Schools can therefore do enterprise in different contexts, as what matters is the nature of the experience. A business enterprise is one part of that, but enterprise education is wider. It is the purpose of the activity rather than the context.

In order to see whether the SEP training had been able to get this message across, respondents were asked to rate their agreement with a number of statements about enterprise education in the trained teacher questionnaire. The results are given in table 20.

Table 20: What is enterprise education? (teacher questionnaire) (in %)

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
Enterprise is mainly about making money	45.7	34.0	9.5	10.0	0.8
Enterprise is mainly about creating a partnership with parents and pupils	9.9	23.7	25.5	32.0	9.0
All practical projects are enterprise activities	17.2	33.0	21.3	24.4	4.1
Enterprise is mainly about preparing pupils for the world of work	4.4	16.4	14.1	49.2	15.8
Enterprise is mainly about producing products at the end	24.8	36.8	17.0	18.3	3.0
Enterprise is mainly about people taking initiative	0.6	3.6	8.2	49.1	38.6
Enterprise is mainly about pupils working together	0.3	0.3	2.0	31.9	65.4
The difference between enterprise and other projects is the business element	3.6	11.1	14.6	48.8	21.9
The difference between enterprise and other projects is that enterprise is more structured	9.7	25.5	27.2	30.2	7.3

From table 20 it is clear that the majority of teachers no longer believe that Enterprise education is purely about business and money. Somewhat surprisingly, the most popular category among respondents was 'enterprise is mainly about pupils working together', with which 65% of respondents agreed strongly and another 31 agreed somewhat. Teachers also agreed that enterprise is mainly about pupils taking initiative, with just under 40% agreeing strongly and just under 50% agreeing somewhat that this is what enterprise education is mainly about. The next most popular category was preparing pupils for the world of work, with which over 65% of respondents agreed. Just under 60% agreed that the main difference between enterprise and other projects was the business element.

As one teacher commented: *'I just think enterprise is a positive experience and I just wish more people were less scared of it and gave it a go'*.

2.5. Dissemination and sustainability

A crucial issue to the future of Enterprise Education is that of its dissemination throughout the school and beyond individual teachers trained in the project, an aspect that becomes particularly important where high teacher mobility is present. This appeared to be somewhat problematic in many schools.

Table 21: What percentage of teachers in your school is involved in enterprise activities? (teacher questionnaire)

	0-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
What percentage of teachers in your school is involved in enterprise activities	33.1	23.1	16.6	9.2	18.0

Table 22: Are most teachers in your school doing enterprise activities?

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
In my school most teachers are doing enterprise activities	28.2	26.7	8.9	19.7	16.5

While trained teachers have enthusiastically taken up enterprise education (see above), this does not mean that enterprise has been embedded in their schools. A third of respondents claimed that less than 10% of teachers in their school was engaged in enterprise, while a further 23% claimed that between 11 and 25% of teachers was engaged in enterprise. 18% of respondents claimed that more than three quarters of teachers were engaged in enterprise. The latter school can accurately be described as 'enterprising schools'. Furthermore, more than half of teachers disagree with the statement 'In my school most teachers are doing enterprise activities' (table 22). This suggests that there is still a way to go to make schools as a whole more enterprising.

In the case studies, some interviewees commented that in many cases enterprise education within the school at present appears to rest with one or two enthusiastic teachers, rather than representing a schoolwide approach.

Some of the reasons for this lack of dissemination can be found in table 22, also from the trained teacher survey. While heads and LEA are overwhelmingly said to support enterprise, (over 80% agreement, over 50% agree strongly), and over 60% of respondents stated that their school had an enterprising ethos, only 25% of respondents had provided training on enterprise to colleagues. It would appear that notwithstanding respondents' views that their schools are enterprising, there is still

work to do to ensure that this is translated into action. Thus, while heads are supportive, there is clearly not a policy of in-school professional development and cascading in most schools. As one teacher commented:

'I went on a course and things and I've sort of been involved in helping to deliver parts of courses but my own school I haven't done any input in. I really feel that it would have been nice to, but we've just not had time there are so many other things that wasn't high in the development plan, priority. And I just feel that if somebody did get a chance to talk to the staff as a whole about what could be done I think more would be done, I really do.'

In view of the often fluid personnel situation in schools, the lack of in-school training and dissemination may be a problem. This may be a disadvantage of having focussed on the individual teacher rather than the school level in implementing the programme, which may have benefited from a stronger school-level component.

Table 23. Enterprising schools? (teacher questionnaire)

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
I <u>did not</u> provide any training to colleagues in my school	11.3	14.7	12.3	20.5	41.2
My headteacher actively supports enterprise education	1.5	3.2	9.3	28.5	57.5
My LEA actively supports enterprise education	0.2	1.1	12.2	30.0	56.5
Our school has an enterprising ethos	2.4	9.2	24.8	37.4	26.1
Our school has a clear policy on enterprise education	11.9	16.4	27.8	25.3	18.7

A number of teachers in the case studies expressed concerns about the sustainability of the project once EESOs were no longer there to provide support. Coming up with fresh ideas was seen as a particular problem:

'I think it is feasible with the support of these two girls actually who are out of class at the moment. It would be easier in a way if it could be because then the planning is there, everything is ready to be used. But to keep it fresh the ideas would have to change from year to year, which would involve more planning.'

Incorporating enterprise in planning was seen as important to ensuring sustained attention to it:

'I think it's something that has to be almost written in stone, saying that primary 3's will do it so that they know at the beginning of the year that it's

going to be incorporated. But we haven't done that for the past few years. We tried it when it was new, but because of everything else it just kind of got lost.'

However, in some schools dissemination was present. Where this was the case, our case studies showed that this was usually down to explicit interest and encouragement from the head, who would take care to ensure that enterprise was disseminated. In one primary school, for example, the head commented that:

'if I sent someone on a course they would bring back these resource materials and instead of it just being this month's thing and it goes on a shelf, we made sure it was on the front of everyone's attention, by organising meetings and training within the school'.

Overall, the role of the head was crucial in ensuring sustainability.

3 SUCCESS FACILITATORS

In this section we will explore what factors appear to have contributed to the success of SEP.

3.1 Building on existing strengths

Before SEP started, there was already widespread activity and training being undertaken by the team that would design the SEP materials and training. Over 3500 teachers had already been trained in Enterprise in Scotland through programmes run largely in partnership with Education Business Partnerships, and materials had been developed for these training activities. Therefore, the team that undertook the development and training activities of SEP was able to draw on strong expertise, making the initial start up faster and easier than it otherwise would have been. As one of the central team members said:

'had we had 5 million pounds five years ago (before the start of SEP), it would have been wasted. We had not laid the groundwork that had built up close to a critical mass. We had tried out models of implementation, that had shown that we didn't have the capacity to follow up. We needed the EESO model. We had done all the pilot work, seen it in operation, we knew it worked but we wanted to go big.'

Therefore, rather than being an experiment that was being newly tested, SEP was more akin to a scaling up approach, whereby a smaller scale school improvement initiative gets redeveloped in order to allow it to develop as a nationwide initiative.

This aspect of building on existing strengths was also evident where one or more members of the EESO team had been previously involved in Enterprise activities. Where this was the case, it was easier to get the project up and running quickly. As one EESO commented about a colleague who had been involved in promoting Enterprise in the area before joining SEP:

'he's been doing the job for ages and it means that he set up a fantastic network 'cos a lot of groundwork's had been done and we'd already sort of hit the targets in terms of teachers trained.'

In general, having established links to the area they worked in was seen as a great advantage for EESOs who could call on contacts in schools.

3.2 Clear project goals

Research on school effectiveness and school improvement (e.g. Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000) as well as research on successful business organisations (e.g. Collins, 2003) shows that effectiveness and success are enhanced by organisations or projects having a limited number of clear goals on which they are focussed. This was also the case for SEP, which had as its core starting purpose that every primary Scottish school child should have the opportunity to experiences enterprise. As one core team member commented

'this has remained a key goal, that has guided us through many, often quite difficult, discussions. Because if you have such a solid and agreed goal, you can always say: does that contribute to that goal? If it does, let's continue, otherwise we are not interested.'

This consistent focus has been key in the project not being allowed to drift.

3.3 The role of the EESO

Many school improvement projects falter owing to lack of hands-on support and guidance from the programme development team, leading to demotivation or drop-out in those schools where things don't immediately go according to plan. It is therefore not surprising that the role of the EESO was found to be a key factor in the success of the programme. The decision to concentrate funding on recruiting and training support officers based across the regions was vindicated by their key role in the success of the project.

Case study visits clearly showed that teachers received the role of EESOs highly positively, a feeling shared by all case study interviewees. The hands-on, practical support provided by them was seen as extremely helpful, and in some cases it was claimed teachers would have given up on enterprise activities if this support had not existed. Help with aspects such as planning was particularly valued. EESOs were perceived as helpful, approachable and competent. Teachers appreciate that EESOs had classroom experience themselves, and are therefore aware of the practical issues teachers face. The fact that the majority of EESOs were seconded teachers with relevant school experience has clearly been a major advantage with respect to their working with schools and teachers, not just in terms of school knowledge, but in enhancing their credibility among teachers, a key factor in educational interventions, making them effective change agents.

The fact that EESOs were able to support teachers during early implementation phases was helpful, as even effective training may result in low levels of implementation if problems arise in the classroom. One teacher described this role as follows:

'I just wouldn't have done it without the EESOs help, he's brilliant. Really dynamic, you've probably met him. You know what he's like. And I think people like that are what you need, and like he did to me what I did to the kids you can do it, no problem, you can do it. And he kind of held my hand.'

That this role was important is also borne out by the survey, in which 43% of respondents agreed that the help of EESOs was crucial to the success of the enterprise activities, with another 40% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

EESOs also reacted to specific issues within their areas by providing additional materials. In one LEA, for example, EESOs

'found we had to move the burden of planning for teachers because if we're doing this alongside the existing curriculum we cannot ask them to do that. We've got 5-14, and our LEA also has all the Environmental Studies topics typed up so that they're all doing the same topics around the LEA. So then there's no way they're gonna then write one for enterprises, that's not going to happen. So the reason we produce them is because you can then just photocopy the page and then just slip it in and then that's the planning'

Some teachers expressed some worries about what would happen once EESO support was no longer forthcoming:

'What worries me is when these girls are no longer doing that, they've only been seconded out for two years. So I imagine after that the planning will revert back to schools again. And it may be that because there isn't the same support there that it might not happen, it might dwindle away again.'

As well as the support from EESOs the use of business advisers was seen as very positive, both in allowing schools to make contact with businesses and in helping pupils see the relevance of what they were doing. The added credibility of business professionals was seen as a motivator for pupils. One issue for teachers in some cases was the lack of experience of some business contacts in interacting with pupils.

'Business people come into school and think basic, very basic how to approach kids in the classroom, just things like how loud your voice is and stuff like that, very important. Some of them are very informal, too informal, and sometimes not structured enough. If you get a good one the really good children hang on to what they say. So it's quite possible that you could run courses for business people going into schools.'

3.4 Quality of training

As mentioned above, the quality of Enterprise training delivered by EESOs was highly rated by participants. Previous research has shown that this is a key prerequisite for programme implementation and effectiveness, although it is insufficient in itself.

3.5 Quality of materials produced

According to data from the case studies, the enterprise packs were positively received by teachers where they were used. The activities are seen as very useful, particularly with regards to teaching pupils about business, personal and social education and problem solving skills. The attractive packaging impressed. Teachers usually take a 'pick-and-mix' approach to the materials, sometimes using cards outside the context of enterprise education. One criticism was that some of the cards are somewhat hard for the pupils, while the enterprise gamma also came in for some criticism from teachers. Nevertheless, overall, the packs were seen as a great resource by teachers. One teacher, for example, commented:

'the packs are wonderful, absolutely everything I think included, very well explained. The photocopied resources are superb. Again we found ourselves having to pick and choose too much'

Similarly, in another primary school, teachers commented that

'I really enjoy using that, I think it's an excellent pack. We are infant teacher and primary two. She does an infant enterprise and she uses the Enterprising Infant's books and I use the Go for Enterprise books, which, I think, are excellent.'

The pack was also seen as easy to use and accessible. In the trained teacher survey, 90% of respondents agreed that the enterprise pack uses accessible language, with less than 3% disagreeing.

3.6 Support from the Centre

Support from the centre was seen as strong by most EESOs interviewed.

'The various times that he's been up he's been very helpful and we know that we can just lift the phone, which I have done.'

A major positive was the quick reaction of the central team to perceived training needs. On several occasions (following the first event and following the Glasgow event for secondary EESOs, for example), additional training sessions were organised to meet the needs of EESOs. These training sessions were considered to be useful:

'Well there's been good and bad and overall extremely helpful I would say, bringing up a lot of interesting points and for me in particular I'm not into the business side and the last course we did a lot about business and I think that was very helpful for me.'

The freedom given to EESOs to adapt the programme to local needs was seen as another advantage. For example, some EESOs commented that in their area initially, in some cases, some of the language used by SEP was seen as off-putting by some heads. The freedom given to EESOs to go out and interpret this within their own area was seen by them as crucial in helping to enthuse people about enterprise.

'initially we've had to spend a lot of time going around and persuading the Head Teachers that they're already doing it in some ways. And again we've had to simplify it, the teachers are otherwise sometimes switching off to the language used. They're saying it's far too much work and switch off.'

In some cases, however, EESOs felt that the 'centre' was overprotective of the programme, and did not provide EESOs with sufficient autonomy, information and opportunities to participate in developing the programme. A number of EESOs commented on this:

'I feel that they're wanting to hang on to this project instead of letting us get on with it.'

Some EESOs felt that the national centre was too focussed on the 'central belt'.

However, from the point of view of programme success the role of the centre was crucial. In order for educational interventions to succeed, it is necessary both to ensure strong implementation (Stringfield et al, 2000) through strong central guidance, and co-construction with schools allowed to adapt programmes to their

needs (Datnow et al, 2003). It appears that through the mediating role of EESOs this balance was achieved in SEP to a large degree. The fact that all EESOs received the same training, and therefore were able to communicate a common and agreed message, was also a key advantage in this respect.

3.7 Events/conferences

One way in which both the needs of EESOs and the need of the programme to ensure coherence could be addressed was through the regular events at which EESOs were brought together.

For EESOs these events provided both training and a valuable opportunity to share practice and interact with other EESOs. They also allowed the central team to present new developments, train EESOs, receive feedback from them, and were crucial in developing a ‘community of EESOs’, a factor that as evaluators we saw emerge over the course of the training event. As one core team member commented.

‘Some people came to me and said: this is very expensive. I always said: get out of the way, this is one of the best ways we can spend our money. I would probably have done it more often. Part of the living success of this idea will be that there is a national sense, a movement, a community that have come together to be inspired, and that can inspire others. Any money spent on that is valuable. Some say to me: that’s just a jolly out for the day. Oh what a misunderstanding of human nature! EESOs need to come together as a community of EESOs’

Our evaluation of these 2 day training event had two main elements: a questionnaire given out to all present EESOs at the end of the event, and qualitative observation of the various activities taking place during the three days.

Generally, as can be seen in table 24, which presents aggregated ratings across all evaluated events, these events were seen as highly effective and important by EESOs.

Table 24: Events feedback sheets – aggregate percentages.

	Highly effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat ineffective	Highly ineffective
General effectiveness	44.8%	52.9%	2.3%	0.0%
Has this event been practically useful to you	56.8%	42.0%	1.2%	0.0%
Do you feel this event will help you in your role as EESO	60.2%	37.5%	2.3%	0.0%
How would you rate delivery of this event	20.6%	72.9%	4.5%	0.0%

As can be seen in the table above, the training events were well received. No EESOs felt any of the training event was highly ineffective, and only a very small minority felt

they were somewhat ineffective. Over 95% of respondents gave a positive response on all questions. The most positive responses came to the items on whether or not EESOs felt the events would help them in their role, and on whether the event had been practically useful to them. The least positive responses (72.9% somewhat effective) related to the delivery of the events. As we will see below, this is largely due to perceived differential effectiveness of delivery of different activities.

The opportunity to interact with other EESOs was always mentioned as one of the most useful aspects of the events. The opportunity to pose questions to the SEP team was also clearly useful to participants. In many cases this helped to clear up confusion about aspects of the programme. Where, like in Troon, there was a specific slot for this, this was seen as helpful, and appeared to act as a useful vent for EESOs to air any issues. These sessions were well managed, which was important as they could potentially (and at some events did) lead to negativity among some EESOs.

Practical sessions were also well received and training and presentation of new materials were seen as useful at all the events. The chance to practise approaches and engage in practical training was seen to be essential to EESOs own training role. However, at some events the practical activities were seen by a minority of EESOs to take too long, or be patronising. There was clearly a need to explain clearly the goal of the activities, especially to secondary EESOs who were used to a more didactic teaching style. Overall, however, practical activities tended to be among the most highly rated, whether they were delivered by the core team or externals.

A problem at some events occurred when invited speakers were perceived as not being effective communicators or as having ineffective presentational styles. This was the case with Media 4G and Quality Scotland at the Troon event, and Careers Scotland input in the 2002 Glasgow event. This was obviously not the case for all external speakers, however (e.g. the very well-received Art Matters and introductory sessions at the Airth event 2002). Web-based events regularly suffered from technical problems.

At some events there were complaints about the negative attitude of some EESOs (e.g. Glasgow, Stirling). This appeared to lessen by the later events as a stronger community was built up.

At the final event, EESOs were particularly keen on the discussions about the future of Enterprise education and creating enterprising schools, which suggests that their thinking has moved on considerably over time.

Overall, these events were invaluable to the programme, both in terms of communication between EESOs and the 'centre', and in terms of developing the EESO community.

3.8 The role of the head and LEA: Facilitator and barrier

This importance of the role of the head was mentioned by a number of interviewees during the case study phase of the evaluation. This, as mentioned above, was a key factor in ensuring dissemination of enterprise throughout the school. One teacher, for example, commented:

'it needs a committed and dedicated Head Teacher to take that interest and build it into the curriculum firmly and make sure it happens each year and doesn't just fall by the wayside'

The head could also hinder the adoption and spread of enterprise in the school:

'I didn't really take up the whole training. The head teacher can be quite difficult at times, I don't know if it was, maybe if you had resources to pay supply teachers to come in, that might have been an easier, if the head teacher knew that the finance wasn't coming from the school. But then at the same time I think, um, there's a lot of big businesses round about here which I wouldn't be backward in asking can we get some sponsorship, but again our head teacher feels that it's not something we should be doing, which is, is a shame because he's blocking really a link between the, er, school and the Enterprise in the area.'

In some cases teachers were only able to get information on enterprise by bypassing the head along with the EESOs, as, in the words of one primary teacher: '

if it had been up to the headmaster she wouldn't have probably handed me the information up'.

In some cases this reticence by headteachers was due to ideological reasons:

'our head doesn't want to get involved with anything to do with what she sees as capitalist, it's against her politics'.

In others more general resistance to change:

'I think it's just his general attitude to change and new things rather than Enterprise as such. It would be like with that with anything.'

What is clear is that while in these schools individual teachers took initiative and did enterprise, this would be hard to spread and even sustain over the long term in the face of this kind of resistance.

These negative examples should not disguise that in most cases headteachers were enthusiastic about enterprise, and were the main movers in developing this as a key strand of the education offered to their children. As one head commented:

'I think it's fantastic, just what is needed in education. Kids love it, teachers like it and I have done my best to make sure it happens in this school'.

Again, the possibility of a schoolwide approach alongside the teacher focus adopted suggests itself here.

The role of the LEA differed from area to area. In some areas LEA's had been proactive and had strongly supported the development of the programme, while in other areas the LEA role had been either passive or negative.

3.9 Funding

While funding has been found not to be the key factor in school improvement and programme success that it is sometimes made out to be, it is clear that without adequate funding school improvement initiatives fail (Muijs et al, 2004). Therefore, the generous £5 million devoted to the project, which allowed amongst other things the EESO network and the events to be funded, was a precondition to success.

The fact that the project was based on matched funding, with 2.5 million coming from the Scottish Executive and 2.5 million from private enterprise was seen as helpful. This combination of funding and support was seen to enhance the believability of the project *'it made people sit up and take notice'*. The involvement of the private sector was seen as inspirational by some teachers, and likewise helped to enhance the credibility of the programme.

4. BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

While the programme was very successful overall, there were a number of factors which appeared to be barriers to full and successful implementation of enterprise in all schools.

4.1 Time Management

As in most educational evaluations, the time factor was the most frequently mentioned barrier to implementation. Time management was a major issue, especially for teachers starting of doing enterprise projects. They often found that the project took longer than expected at the outset, and caused significant additional work for themselves. As one teacher commented:

'It's good stuff. But again, you're back to how much it's prioritised and I know it's in the national priorities now. But it's still this question of do we have time. The push with literacy, and numeracy, and target setting, and environmental studies is very heavy, it's very heavy.'

Some teachers appeared to underestimate the amount of work, and were initially somewhat overambitious in their projects.

'I think you end up, because there's so little time you end up just doing little bits of things and you can't do anything properly. And I think that's, either we do something very simple and do it properly or something vicious like that, you know. End up not doing it properly because of that'

Others, however, were pleasantly surprised following the training, as they realised projects did not need to be large-scale or complex, and could include a lot of what they had done before.

'That's something else I learnt on the course actually, was the fact that some of the things that we've done could have come under the banner of enterprise. Which I don't think people appreciated, that just suddenly came to mind.'

Teachers with longer experience of enterprise appeared to experience this problem far less. This would appear to be an issue that could benefit from additional training.

This issue also came up in the trained teacher survey. 7% of respondents agreed that time management was difficult when doing an enterprise activity, with only 15% disagreeing with this statement. Similarly, 66% of respondents felt that doing an enterprise activity was stressful for the teacher. 69% agreed that doing enterprise had taken more planning than they had realised, with only 15% disagreeing. This suggests that in their enthusiasm to promote enterprise, some EESOs may have neglected to stress the amount of work doing enterprise takes to teachers.

A smaller number of teachers felt that doing an enterprise activity took too much time and hard work. However, with 36% of respondents agreeing and a further 19.5% neither agreeing nor disagreeing this was an issue that clearly concerned teachers.

The new ways of teaching involved in enterprise were seen as challenging, as teachers had in many cases to move from teacher to pupil centred activity. As one teacher commented:

‘It’s been very challenging, I mean for the teachers as well, it’s lovely to hand things over to the children but you’ve obviously got to be behind the scenes and making sure everything’s running okay. ‘

As well as pointing to the difficulties in adding Enterprise to their work, many teachers also appeared to suggest a possible solution to this problem, with 75% stating that enterprise activities are easier to do if they are integrated with what is already being done. Similarly, starting with small scale projects appeared to be fruitful:

‘it’s been really difficult with the five to fourteen curriculum to fit everything in. Because I have taught at primary 6 and 7, and teaching at primary 7 there is such a lot to cover. To find the time to do a business project which takes a lot of time for planning and thinking about all the resources you would need and getting people in expertise in to help with things, it’s just not been very practical. So what we’ve had to do is to have small sort of research and development groups and move to larger projects later on’.

Pupils themselves also appear to struggle with the time issue. As a group of primary pupils said:

‘Yeah, I think we should do more I think we should get more time to work on it than what we’re getting at the moment because I don’t think we’re getting enough time to work on it so I think we need some more time to do it. ‘

Doing enterprise activities also appears to require quite a bit of support, not just from EESOs, but from parents and classroom assistants as well, as can be seen in table 25, depicting findings from the teacher questionnaire.

Table 25: Support for Enterprise Education. (teacher questionnaire) (in %)

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
The help of classroom assistants is crucial to making enterprise work	3.3	6.9	17.1	32.7	40.0
The help of parents is crucial to making enterprise work	5.7	11.3	32.6	33.1	17.4
The help of EESOs is crucial to making enterprise work	3.8	9.0	41.7	31.8	13.7

Classroom assistants appear essential, while most teachers think that parents also have an important support role in making enterprise work. 40% of respondents agreed strongly that the help of classroom assistants is crucial to the success of enterprise activities, with 32% agreeing somewhat.

The help of parents and EESOs was seen as slightly less important, the latter somewhat in contradiction to the stated importance of the EESO role in other parts of the evaluation.

Just over half of all respondents ‘agreed somewhat’ or ‘agreed strongly’ that the help of parents is important. As one teacher said:

‘And it was an awful lot of planning and because we undertook a technology task it involved sawing with wood and gluing and the children got an awful lot from it, but we had to organise extra helpers to be in. We had to bring in a parent helper and we got the help of our Classroom Assistant as well. So it took a lot of organising.’

This aspect of parental involvement has a strong positive side in that Enterprise Education may itself be a means of involving parents more with the school.

In some schools it appeared to be the case that engaging in enterprise had allowed the whole school to become involved in a way that strengthened school culture:

‘I think also as a school it was a good thing because we did rally round, you know, the dining staff did help all day. The janitor was in, you know, half seven in the morning filling paddling pools up. Every teacher seemed to rally round and I think, I think the children appreciated that.’

Likewise, parents appeared to get involved as well:

‘Parents come in and get involved in the production and with Sales and things as well so it really does provide an opportunity for parental involvement.’

Teachers would also have liked to have more opportunities to network with other schools to find out what kind of enterprise activities are being done there.

4.2 Integration with the curriculum

One issue that can cause problems whenever new initiatives are undertaken within the framework of existing mandatory curricula is integrating the initiative with the curriculum. This issue was addressed in both quantitative and qualitative parts of the evaluation, as it’s clearly comes into play with relation to SEP and the 5-14 curriculum.

Table 26: Doing enterprise means sacrificing other areas of the curriculum

Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly
12.3	22.6	14.5	36.7	14.0

75% of teachers surveyed in the trained teacher survey said that enterprise activities were more effective when integrated with the curriculum. Teachers were divided as to the extent to which enterprise activities were at a cost to other areas of the curriculum, though 50% agreed at least somewhat that this was the case (see table 25). Integrating enterprise with the curriculum was seen as possible, but difficult by teachers we interviewed. As one head said:

'we are very much more subject based now with a very tight curriculum, so really we're very time tabled now in primary schools so we're becoming more like academies. So, if it's nine o'clock in the morning we're doing Maths, or we're doing this textbook Maths, or we're doing practical Maths, or whatever. So it's actually quite difficult to feed things in to other areas of the curriculum now.'

Some teachers mentioned that they required support from EESOs to be able to do this effectively. The number of prescribed topics they had to do was seen as another problem in this respect.

'the environmental studies topics that will be covered in that year are fixed. Even for those ones, fitting them all in is difficult. And, you know, technology now is prescribed for us, er, and ... science and the, the social subjects which, I mean, they're all as important as each other, and it's difficult now to fit them all in.'

EESOs felt that this was not necessarily a problem, and tried to get that message across in training sessions .

'I don't see any difficulty in putting it into the 5-14 curriculum. I just think we need to be a little bit more flexible in the way that you approach things, a wee bit more creative.'

The extent to which that was possible was seen to depend on school factors:

'it depends very much on the teacher and the ethos of the school. I mean some schools you won't change. They stick rigidly to a timetable and you do your Maths between half past ten and half past eleven. It's very difficult to fit the Enterprise project into that. But you can borrow from parts of the curriculum. That's where we can support people.'

In some schools it was clear that this message had been taken on board, and that teachers were able to integrate enterprise with the curriculum. In one city school, for example, the head stated:

'we are looking for the skills that they're bringing in for ICT or for their talking and listening and all that. So there's lots of areas from the five to fourteen that Enterprise is going to be helped up on.'

Another teacher commented:

I don't find it a problem. It is time consuming, but I don't really find it a problem, because the writing skills, writing reports, writing letters to companies fits in with our language. A lot of it fits in with the personal social development programme, I do a lot of work in term 2 as an introduction to

enterprise.. And I fit that in with my Personal Social Development Programme for term two, the work we do in term 3 covers expressive arts as well'.

Another factor that appeared to impact on schools' ability to integrate Enterprise with the curriculum was support from the LEA. Where the LEA strongly supported Enterprise, and has written it into local schemes was strongly negatively correlated with the extent to which schools saw this issue as problematic.

4.3 Recalcitrant schools

In view of the workload of schools and teachers it is not surprising that some schools were reluctant to get involved. In most cases the main problem for EESOs seemed to be to get into the school and speak to the head and teachers in the first place.

'I think getting out to the school is the problem. Once we get in the Head Teachers door I can honestly say we usually get positive reactions. I've had only one negative experience where somebody just laughed in my face.'

Actually doing an enterprise activity was seen as the best way of removing any hostility:

'I think if you have a success with an Enterprise project there's not stopping you because you see the benefits of it. But it's trying to just get people to take it on. And teachers are very scared of doing it because they think it's going to be a heap of work, and, you know, they think it's going to be extra on top of all the things they're doing'.

In these schools, the main problem was not seen to be resistance to enterprise specifically:

'There's a lot of resistance because, it's not resistance to Enterprise Education it's a resistance to something else in the curriculum. And they must have the support from the Education Authority. '

It has to be pointed out that this was a problem in only a minority of schools, though according to some EESOs the problem was more acute in schools facing challenging circumstances.

'when we approach the city schools to either come on courses or to do Enterprise they say they don't have time because of, well, things like disciplinary problems that they have, you know, that kind of problem.'

The Mc Crone agreement, in particular its implications for teacher workload, was also seen as a factor that was, or could be used by less enthusiastic schools, as a barrier.

4.4 Availability of enterprise packs

A barrier to dissemination of Enterprise Education throughout the school was a lack of availability of the pack to teachers in some schools. One issue was that the pack in some schools was not known by teachers, as it was kept in the head's office. As one teacher commented:

'I asked the EESO, Where do I get the information about the Enterprise pack?' and she said "Oh, it comes into schools every year". Never seen it.

Never seen it. So the EESO said "I'll post it directly to yourself 'cos I know you're interested".

In many cases this was due merely to headteacher lack of interest, though in some there was active resistance to the concept of enterprise education.

4.5 Organisational issues

A number of organisational barriers were identified by EESOs during the course of the programme.

Problems existed initially with the role of Bank of Scotland, as mentioned by both teachers and EESOs. While the bank's support for the project was appreciated, the bank was slow to react to applications for the £40, which could lead to problems in schools, where in some cases heads have had to lend money to pupils.

'We had some problems at the beginning trying to set up the finance with the Bank, the Bank of Scotland. In previous years there was quite a straight forward system where the local bank manager was involved and we could go along and sort it all out. They for whatever reason changed that, and that's created quite a few problems. So it was quite frustrating for the children, and for us'

This also resulted in much additional work for EESOs who spent a lot of time on the phone to the bank. Teachers who had previously experienced the system whereby pupils applied for a loan from their local bank manager regretted the change to the more impersonal system now in place, claiming a valuable educational experience has been lost.

These problems were solved in 2004, however, when a new clear structure was put into place. While the lack of direct personal contact between pupils and bank was seen as a disadvantage by some EESOs, there was general satisfaction about this solution.

One problem perceived by EESOs was the change in management from Education Business Partnerships to Careers Scotland. This led to a number of problems for EESOs. One of the main problems initially was difficulties in financial management and changes in accommodation that in some areas followed the change are perceived to have led to a less conducive working environment. There also appears to be a lack of admin support for the programme under the Careers Scotland framework. Again, these issues appeared to get smoothed over over time, and were no longer mentioned in later visits.

Finally, the initial appointment process was seen as less than ideal. The initial appointment process was regionally organised, and led to EESOs coming in from a variety of backgrounds (teaching and non teaching) and with a range of experience and knowledge of enterprise, from virtually no knowledge to wide ranging experience. The central team was not necessarily involved in this process. This led to some problems both with regards to initial relationships between EESO's and to training required, and slowed down the initial start up of SEP. To illustrate this, the following comment of an EESO is instructive:

'I mean how are they going to tell a teacher I don't have any enterprise experience but they're a teacher and so that's supposed to make it okay. Maybe they'd been a college for a year, I think if I was a class teacher and

someone came in and didn't know what they were talking about and they'd only been teaching a year I think I'd say see you later. It wouldn't have swung it for me anyway.'

The lack of experience and knowledge of enterprise among many EESOs was a factor that surprised the central team, who put in place steps to rectify this through additional training events following the initial event. This was perceived as a successful response by EESOs.

This regional organisation, with concomitant contractual differences, lessened central control and therefore implementation fidelity in terms of what individual EESOs in different areas were doing.

5. SUMMARY

This evaluation has attempted to look at the impact of SEP, and the factors that have facilitated and hindered programme success.

In terms of impact, the following conclusions can be made:

Training of teachers:

- in the three years of the programme, over 6500 teachers were trained
- this training was considered to be highly effective by teachers, with ratings that are well above the norm for professional development activities in education

Impact in school:

- over 80% of trained teachers had done an enterprise activity in the year following their training
- over 90% of trained teachers surveyed described these activities as successful
- over 5349 enterprise projects were reported
- however, over 60% had not provided training or feedback on training to colleagues
- and less than 25% of teachers in their schools were doing enterprise activities in those schools

Impact on pupils:

- Pupil and teachers were strongly of the opinion that enterprise education is motivating and enjoyable (over 90% of teachers said enterpriser had motivated their pupils)
- Pupils felt they had learnt a lot from enterprise and teachers and pupils felt their knowledge of the business world had increased strongly
- Increased pupil responsibility and confidence was a key outcome of doing enterprise activities
- Teachers and pupils feel their organisational, communication and collaborative skills have improved as a result of enterprise education
- Following training, teachers had developed a broad view of what enterprise is

Overall, then, the programme has been highly successful in providing highly effective training to a large group of teachers, resulting in high levels of implementation of enterprise activities in schools. These activities are seen to have had a number of positive effects on pupils, improving their motivation, self-confidence, organisational,

communication and collaborative skills. They are seen to have learnt about the world of work and business, and some teachers believe there are spin-off effects on achievement in other subjects.

However, there is a lack of dissemination of Enterprise in schools beyond those teachers trained in the project, and some concerns regarding sustainability for this reason as well as because of the end of the programme leading to the loss of EESO support.

The factors that have enhanced the success of the programme were found to be:

- The programme built on existing initiatives and strengths and could be scaled up from there rather than being built up from scratch
- The programme had a clear goal and focus
- The role of the EESOs, providing both training and hands-on support to teachers, was crucial to the success of the programme
- The high quality of the training provided
- The high quality of the materials provided
- The support of the centre to EESOs, in particular rapid and flexible reactions to problems
- The use of events that brought EESOs together and helped develop a community of EESOs
- Adequate funding
- The role of the private sector
- Supportive heads and LEA's in most cases

The main barriers to success were:

- Time management issues for teachers and schools
- Integration of Enterprise with the 5-14 curriculum
- Recalcitrance in a minority of schools
- Organisational hiccups at the start of the programme

Overall, the focus of funding on direct training and support for schools through the recruitment of EESOs was found to be an effective use of resources, as was bringing together EESOs for regular events and conferences. The lack of activities focussing on the whole school and headteachers could be seen as a missed opportunity in terms of enhancing sustainability and dissemination.