

Bulletin of the COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY CLASSICAL DEPARTMENTS



Bulletin 32 (2003)

Contents

Vocation, Vocation, Vocation

Gillian Clark

Chair's Report 2003

Margaret Atkins

Should He who Pays the Piper Call the Tune?

Lorna Hardwick

Classics and Ancient History at University: Shaping Future Directions in Learning and Teaching

Graham Shipley

Classics at British Universities 2002-3: Statistics

VOCATION, VOCATION, VOCATION

I hear on the radio that it has been an excellent year for strawberries and dormice, rather a bad one for the Church of England and about average for education. The summer's crop of A level, GCSE and university admissions scandals had an almost formulaic feel; it soon blew over and I was too much exercised by the row over 'gay bishops' to fret about it. Whatever your view of the latter, the debate struck me as depressing from an educational point of view. Here were two groups, all of whose spokespeople had a higher education in humanities subjects and in many cases more than one, apparently unable between them to read a text critically or in its historical context, wilfully ignorant of variations in historical practice and doctrine, refusing even to take an intelligent interest in anyone else's point of view. If this sort of thing is the result, why do we bother?

The Conservative Party seems to be wondering the same, and after a generation of overall expansion, is beginning to suggest that higher education may not, after all, be the right thing for many people. When I hear that, I remember why I do bother. In a world where the ideas of a few affect the lives of millions, it is vital that those few have the habit of careful, critical thought, of looking at a question from all sides, of distinguishing prejudice and wishful thinking from a defensible argument. In such a world, the more people have the same skills, the more accountable the few will be. And, I believe, a society where people think thinking is important will be better than one where they do not. We have to try.

Which makes me a utilitarian, at least as a teacher. As a researcher, I share with Margaret Atkins in her article a sense of vocation: I do it because it is good--beautiful--delightful. Many of us share this double rationale (for many both research and teaching are both vocational and useful) and because of this I also have some sympathy with the authorities whom Margaret criticizes. In so far as what we do is meant to be socially useful, is it not right that society, represented by the QAA and RAE, the givers of grants and payers of salaries, should call the tune? Is it not fair that if they pay us to do research, we should be able to show that it has a point?

Margaret says no, because things about which people are vocational are a kind of art, and you cannot treat an artist like a factory hand and get good work out of him or her. But not all academics see their work this way. And the government might say that it isn't interested in artists, and if artists have been hired, it was a mistake: what they want is technicians.

Can we reply that vocational scholars make the best teachers? ... not always. Or that societies need intellectual artists? Maybe. Governments rely on sophisticated thinking, from civil servants, think tanks, consultants, the judiciary, the houses of parliament, and academics might dub themselves the full-time guardians of such ways of thinking. This almost gives us a utilitarian argument for vocation, which I suspect is the best compromise artists ever make with society. Our real, private reasons for what we do will never justify our getting public support, any more than Bach's or Holbein's did. If we are artists, then our problems are the old problems of patronage in contemporary form: persuading society that it will be somehow better for what we have to offer it.

Education is also an area of specialized knowledge. Like doctors, we are paid to know better than the people we look after, what they ought to learn. Unlike patients, though, almost everyone who has had any education feels that they know as much about it as the teacher.

We'll never get around that, because education is too bound up with people's identity, and at the same time, what most people learn in school and college is too loosely related to what they do as adults. Nevertheless, I think it is true that educators do tend to know better than their students, both present and past, what is worth learning. But that is not a reason for rejecting assessment or the questions of funding bodies.

I see the government as a sort of recalcitrant pupil or disaffected student. 'Why do we have to do this, Miss? It's *boring*. I'm no good at it. It's not going to get me a job.' Every engagement with anyone in this frame of mind is an educational exercise in itself. The very fact that such views exist, is a reason to roll up our sleeves and deal with them. If we refuse to engage with them, not only are we not improving the situation, we are betraying our vocation. There are times, of course, when convincing yet another politician, or civil servant, or man on the Clapham omnibus, that what you do is worthwhile, is a howling bore. But the point about a vocation is that you can't leave it behind in the office. If we say that we have a vocation to think and teach, every display of ignorance or narrow-mindedness is a challenge we can't refuse.

Chair's report, 2002-2003

GILLIAN CLARK

When the journalist asked me what I felt about classics, I kind of shrugged my shoulders and said that it wasn't so clear [as the case of philosophy]. So I am happy to make my position clear since it has been widely represented. I am in favour of the study of classics.

This is a welcome reply by the Secretary of State for Education (*Hansard*, 6 February 2003) to reports that he had said he would not care if nobody ever studied classics again. Classicists sprang up in the House, in the press, on the *Today* programme (the redoubtable Peter Jones), and in his office (*JACT Bulletin* 123, pp. 6-7) to ensure that he now knows exactly why the study of classics continues. On 10 May 2003 Mr Clarke wrote to the *Daily Telegraph*, this time to counter reports that he was opposed to medieval studies:

I am not in any way opposed to medieval studies (or for that matter Latin). I support the spread and development of both classical and medieval studies.

Classicists, and their medievalist colleagues, will look forward to his continued support. Mr Clarke may have missed the impassioned reaction, in the autumn of 2002, to reports of the closure of Classics at Queen's University Belfast. This was especially to be regretted because schools in Northern Ireland have such a strong record in classical languages. The good news is that ancient history, Byzantine studies and classical tradition continue at Queen's. These days, university classicists are often located in departments, schools or institutes that do not carry the title 'classics': indeed, this has prompted a concern that HESA statistics may hide the true size of the subject community. Fortunately, we have accurate CUCD statistics: renewed thanks to Graham Shipley (Statistics Officer) and to all those who provide the information.

Three topics have been of special concern this year. First, RAE and the Roberts Review. CUCD consulted member departments in summer 2002 (as reported in *Bulletin* 31, p. 7) in the expectation that we would be asked to comment. The Roberts Review was eventually published at the end of May 2003, and the CUCD response to interested parties is as follows:

Council of University Classical Departments: response to Roberts Review of RAE This response rests on CUCD's consultation of member departments about RAE 2001 and on discussion of their views in CUCD Standing Committee and at Council (AGM) November 2002. It is a discursive response that includes comments on alternative forms of assessment and on the cross-cutting themes of the Roberts Review.

CUCD regards academic peer review, expensive though it is in academic time, as the only credible method of assessing the quality of research. Most research in our subject-area is returned to Panel 57, which in all RAEs to date has actually read the work submitted. This is not practicable for subjects (such as English or History) with many more submissions, but we regard it as the best method. We think that RAE guidelines should continue to be formulated in consultation with subject communities. We strongly oppose the suggestion that there should be fewer panels and larger groupings of subjects. This would mean loss of subject expertise, and we do not think it would improve the assessment of interdisciplinary work. Classics is itself an interdisciplinary subject, embracing language, literature, history, philosophy, material culture and visual arts, classical tradition and reception. Current RAE guidelines also allow for interdisciplinary work to be cross-referred at the request of universities or of panels.

RAE 5/6 already provides an opportunity for self-assessment: departments are asked to comment on their achievements, resources and aims. But self-assessment is not credible unless it is submitted to peer review. A rolling review programme, responsive to different subject-cultures, might be less disruptive than the national RAE, and could also allow a longer time-scale in appropriate subjects. We considered the possibility of combining teaching assessment with research assessment, but we do not see who could do it. Reviewers external to the subject would not be credible, and colleagues would not be willing, because of the potential damage to morale and to collegiality (as in Subject Review). Staff-student ratios, and average contact hours, could be included in the information on research management that is supplied to RAE panels.

Our respondents agreed that research culture should be taken into account in RAE ratings, but were divided on whether publications should be given more weight than research culture. Some respondents expressed concern that the assessment of research culture must be a mix of quantitative measures and impressionistic judgements including the rhetoric of RAE 5/6. All opposed quantitative assessment. Citation indices and bibliometrics are not widely available because they are not thought to indicate excellence. Quantitative measures often reflect levels of resource, or different funding needs. Thus the 'Golden Triangle' can attract and retain more graduate students because of library resources, numbers of academic staff, and graduate peer-groups. Larger groupings generate more conferences and seminars, and may find it easier to bid for and maintain funded research projects. Some areas of our subject, such as classical archaeology, need high levels of funding; others, such as philosophy and literary criticism, chiefly need time. But departments with relatively few 'indicators of esteem' may still produce research that is excellent in terms of scholarship, imaginative range, enhanced understanding, or new approaches.

Our subject is intensely research-active. No classical department is ranked below 3A; almost all colleagues are returned and a high proportion are in departments ranked 5 or 5*. But we do not think that ratings should be historical, because that would remove the incentive for departments to improve or maintain their rating. There is very strong feeling about the failure to fund the further improvement shown by the results of RAE 2001.

Sir Gareth Roberts, to the general relief of academics in the humanities, recommended expert review of research. Initial reports suggested that he would also recommend far fewer 'units of assessment', but that applies to the overview panels: the number of sub-panels with specific subject expertise is slightly increased. At the time of writing this report, it remains unclear whether all or any of the Roberts recommendations will be accepted, and if they are, how universities will interpret them. The precise funding consequences of RAE 2001 also remain unclear, although it is very clear that current funding policies do not acknowledge the quality that was affirmed by the peer reviewers. As the CUCD response (like many others) points out, research in the arts and humanities does not require a 'critical mass' concentrated in a few expensively equipped universities. Humanities research depends on conversation and interchange: collaborative projects are sometimes appropriate, but the individual scholar is not a lone scholar. But the question remains: is that research to be funded through the block grant to universities, or through competitive funding bids?

This year's second main topic is the AHRB invitation to bid for ring-fenced doctoral studentships in endangered or emergent subject areas. Postgraduate funding has until now been awarded in response to applications from potential research students; competition, as we all know, is intense. This will continue to be the main mode of funding, but there is widespread concern, documented in recent AHRB and British Academy reviews, that some subject-areas may be seriously endangered by a shortage of graduate students and therefore of future colleagues. Standing Committee was not convinced that ring-fenced awards are the best way forward. I have passed on to AHRB our concern (shared with many other subjects) that doctoral students chiefly need more time to acquire and to consolidate the languages and core skills (such as epigraphy, numismatics, papyrology, palaeography) that they may not encounter before their MA. Three full proposals, each for a maximum of six studentships over three years, have been submitted in our field. All three asked for support from CUCD. Those involved know just how much work these proposals entailed, at a time of year when many colleagues are not available for consultation: we hope to hear of their success.

The third main topic is very closely related to the second: it is the vexed question of language levels. Many of our students have no opportunity to learn Latin or Greek before they come to university. Language teaching in schools has been undermined by the pressures of the national curriculum and the examination system. So that even students with good grades are wary of language options at university, until they realise that they want to continue their studies and that they will need the languages. So there are Master's students, and undergraduate students in the later years of their degree, who want to learn a language *ab initio*. It makes sense for such students to join an *ab initio* language class, with provision as needed for different forms of assessment, or for scaling down very high marks that might distort a degree result. But some of our member departments have reported that their universities are interpreting QAA/SCQF guidelines to mean that *ab initio* language classes are by definition at level 1 and cannot be taken by students at levels 2 or above. CUCD will pursue enquiries in the hope that this is not an intended consequence of the qualifications framework.

The Chair's report is a personal document, even when it reports the results of discussion on Standing Committee and among member departments, and I end on a personal note. Each academic year is busier than the last, but CUCD could not continue its work of supporting our subject without the time and effort put in by the elected and coopted members of Standing Committee and by the colleagues who raise questions and respond to consultations. Thanks to you all, and may CUCD continue to flourish.

Gillian Clark
University of Bristol
September 2003

Should He Who Pays the Piper Call the Tune?

Margaret Atkins

The piper and the paymaster

Some fifteen years ago I received from the administrator in charge of graduate grants at the British Academy a response to my criticism of the introduction of forms for graduate students to complete after their first year. (At the time, this struck me as a slight on the competence and integrity of graduates' supervisors.) Unfortunately, the gentleman to whom I had complained turned out to have designed the forms, and his letter was somewhat acerbic. It concluded with the words, 'He who pays the piper calls the tune.'

I thought at the time that this was an oddly inappropriate proverb: would he who paid the doctor prescribe the medicine? After a further decade and a half the consequences of acting in the spirit of a certain interpretation of that proverb are becoming all too apparent in the wider field of education, and indeed throughout the public services. 'Micromanagement' is everywhere: the paymaster is calling all the tunes, providing detailed instructions to the pipers as to how to play each note, and then checking that he has obeyed the instructions (or at least that he can make a show of providing evidence that he has obeyed instructions). It would be surprising under these circumstances if the pipers were to play musically, let alone to enjoy their playing. It seems to be time to ask: how ought I to have replied to that letter? In particular, how ought I to have challenged the assumption that the paymaster is the right person to decide the way in which the piper should account for how and what he plays?

'He who pays the piper calls the tune.' It is interesting to discover how the usage of this proverb has changed.[1] The simple phrase 'pay the piper' predates the longer version by some centuries. It was used simply to mean 'bear the cost', with no reference at all to controlling the piper's playing. Thus the Earl of Chesterfield, writing to his son about his hopes for peace in Europe, said, 'The other powers cannot well dance, when neither France nor the maritime powers can, as they used to do, pay the piper'.[2] In other words, war is unlikely, because no one will foot the bill. This usage remains alongside others right into the late twentieth century. Even when the phrase 'call the tune' or 'choose the tune' is added, the resulting proverb is not, at first, used to control the piper, but rather to emphasise the rights of the payer as against others who might be enjoying the piper's playing. Mr Evan Spicer, for example, argued, in a debate on the constitution of a public water authority for London, that as London ratepayers were paying for the water supply their council should have full control

of it, rather than share control with the chairmen of outside councils: 'Londoners had paid the piper and should choose the tune'.[3]

Despite the proverb's nuanced history, I had known immediately what my friend from the British Academy meant by it: 'I am paying for your graduate work;[4] therefore you will do it in the way that I say.' How revealing it is that we so easily now assume his interpretation! The influence of the despotic model of relations between employer and employee is all-pervasive; its conceptual basis is the understanding of action and responsibility assumed by my correspondent; and this conceptual basis underlies the arguments (and the demands) of his countless heirs. For shorthand, I shall use 'the paymaster' to stand for anyone who thinks in this way.

What the paymaster thinks about piping

Let me begin, then, by summarising the paymaster's beliefs. He treats the piper - let us call him Peter - who is presumably a good musician, like a factory hand. He assumes that Peter pipes only in order to earn a wage and that he will pipe to instructions. The purpose of piping is 'the tune', which is seen as a product rather oddly separable from the playing of it. Indeed, the paymaster thinks of the piper as a producer of tunes; his actions are characterised simply by their 'products'. The piper, in his view, should discover what he must do by receiving his orders; he should obey the paymaster rather than any other person, or any musical impulse or understanding of his own. His obedience is secured by the promise of money that he needs: his motivation to act is external to his action. He is free (assuming he is not destitute) to accept or reject the contract, but he is not free to contribute his own views of what the project should be. The paymaster will consider him a responsible person to the extent that he fulfils his instructions.

The piper is accountable to the paymaster and not to anyone or anything else (he cannot protest, 'But everyone else loved the tune that I chose'.) He is accountable not in the sense that he must give an account of himself (his understanding of what he is doing is of no interest to the paymaster); instead, the paymaster will require him to prove that he has fulfilled the required instructions; the paymaster will be the judge of this. The reason that the piper is considered 'accountable' is simply that he is being paid. If he were not, he would be free to play whatever tunes he liked, however well or badly he wished. A worker who is 'accountable' in this sense is simply one who, because he is being paid, is required to show that he has obeyed his instructions.

The model of the piper and the paymaster is extremely simple. Modern micro-management is highly complex: in the universities, the 'paymasters' include benefactors long dead, modern corporations and the tax-payer. Their 'instructions' are mediated through tangled and winding underground channels by politicians and civil servants, by academic administrators and by administering academics. These 'instructions' are complicated still further by requirements to 'consult' a further variety of groups: students, parents, potential employers. Moreover, even if there were only one paymaster, with a single coherent set of desires to satisfy, he would be ill equipped to select the tunes the scholars might 'produce'. Instead, therefore, his collective persona relies on procedures: whatever is produced in accordance with the agreed procedures will be deemed the correct product. The procedures themselves grow ever more elaborate and time-consuming.

My model cannot of course do justice to all the details of this system. On the other hand, it has the advantage of clarity; the system itself is just too large and too complex for most of us to think about it clearly. Moreover, it is my suspicion that people accept the system to the extent that they assume the paymaster's view of action, which in fact underlies it. I should like, therefore, to outline an alternative model of action, which, although a little more complicated, seems to me to have the merit of being correct. In other words, I want to explore why we really do the things that we say we do, and how we ought to explain why we have done them. Most people, it seems to me, do not behave as the paymaster wishes the piper to behave; and in so far as they do, we ought to help them to grow out of it.

What the piper thinks about piping

The piper pipes because he is a musician. He pipes as well as he can because he loves music, has a vision of how to play musically, and wants to incarnate this vision. The music, and the communication of the music, are his motive. His piping conforms to Thomas Aquinas's analysis of a properly human action: it aims at what is good.

The piper, being a wise and honest man, knows that real life is complicated. Our motives are always interconnected, and rarely unmixed. He pipes in order to make music; but he also pipes in order to earn some money, to please his musical pals, to impress his girlfriend. He knows that these further goals may or may not affect his piping.

If he has a fair employer, a patroness let us call her rather than a paymaster, then piping for wages need have no effect on the way in which he pipes. The patroness has chosen him because she knows that he is a good piper; she agrees with Peter when and where he will pipe; then she leaves him to pipe as he thinks best.

Suppose next that Peter is piping partly to please his musical friend Paul. In this case, he will play as well as he can. Of course, he normally tries to play as well as he can, but Paul's presence may inspire him to make an extra effort, to take an extra risk, to give his musical imagination just a little more rein.

Thirdly, suppose that one of Peter's motives is to impress his girlfriend, Patricia. Patricia thinks she is musical, but is sadly mistaken. She thinks that Peter is brilliant because he can play fast. And Peter is in love. In Patricia's presence, then, against all his musical instincts, he catches himself sacrificing fluency for flashiness, subtlety for sheer speed. Even true love can corrupt.

The ways in which Peter's different secondary goals may affect his piping become clearer when he is asked to explain why he piped in the way that he did. If the secondary goal has not affected his playing (if, say, he knew that he would get the same wages whatever), then his explanation will pick out something about the music itself: 'It was important not to rush here in order to preserve the shape of the melody', for example. If his secondary goal was an inspiring one, like pleasing the knowledgeable Paul, then he will also explain his playing by talking about the music, and in this case, his explanation may be still more sophisticated and richer. On the other hand, if he was piping to please Patricia, his honest explanation of why he piped in the way that he did will refer not to the intrinsic goodness of playing that way, and therefore not to the music itself, but rather to Patricia's wishes. (It may be instructive to

note that if he is giving this explanation to Paul, he may well be tempted to be economical with the truth.)

If Peter were philosophically minded, he might categorise possible secondary goals as follows:

- i. those that do not affect the playing;
- ii. those that inspire the playing;
- iii. those that distort the playing.

In the case of (iii), but not in the other two cases, an honest explanation of how the piper plays will refer not to the music, but to some extrinsic factor such as the wishes of a third person. It seems unlikely, one might note in passing, that this sort of account of an artist's work would provide much in the way of illumination.

What the piper thinks of the paymaster

The paymaster made it quite clear what he thinks of the piper. But what, on this analysis, would the piper think of the paymaster? Where would he locate the paymaster's view of action within his own, rather richer, understanding of it? The paymaster, we recall, believes that the piper pipes for the sake of money and will pipe as he is instructed. In other words, the paymaster treats all piping as if it is for the sake of a secondary goal. He further assumes that the piper's secondary goal is pay; and that he will achieve this goal by satisfying (i.e. obeying) the paymaster. You will recall that my correspondent from the British Academy introduced the proverb in question precisely to characterise a situation where paymasters wanted to compel pipers to conform with their wishes. On his understanding of the proverb, then, the piper and the paymaster disagree about the best way of piping.

It follows from this that if the piper pipes as he is required, for pay, this secondary goal will, from the piper's point of view, be a distorting one. The piper categorises motivation in several different ways; in the paymaster's eyes, however, all professional activity conforms to a single model. This model, according to my analysis, would be characterised by the piper as action for the sake of a distorting goal. The paymaster appears to have asked himself neither whether there are any other possible models of action that he has neglected; nor whether there are any dangers in encouraging the model that he has assumed. The piper might, if he were in a charitable mood, put this down to lack of imagination rather than to positive malevolence.

Accounting for the Academy

The systems of assessment introduced in recent decades into universities have clearly transformed the way that we account for what we do; they were intended to do so. They have done this by introducing into our activities the secondary goals of satisfying the various assessors. These secondary goals may, in a few cases, have proved inspiring. It seems uncontroversial that they have often been distracting, in the sense of demanding time and energy and resources. Goals that merely distract us, however, although they may hamper our fulfilment of our activity, need not distort our aims or the way that we attempt to do what we do.

It is distorting goals that threaten our own best understandings of our academic lives. Most academics can easily think of instances where the goals of success in assessment threaten to distort: the timing of publications, the criteria for appointments, the choice of methods of teaching, and so on. One example of my own might stand for them all, that is, a favoured saying of the head of a prestigious laboratory in which a friend of mine works: 'It is better to be first than to be right'.

Fortunately, it is easy to frame the questions that might protect us against the dangers of such distortion: 'Would this have been the way to do it even without the inspection?' 'Can I give a full explanation of why I am doing it this way, of a kind that refers to the goodness of this activity, but does not mention the inspection?' It is easy to frame the questions, but it may be difficult to answer them honestly. If we find that our secondary goals are distorting our actions, and we stick with those secondary goals, then we will have a choice between a cynical (or despairing) account on the one hand - 'I know this isn't the best way to do it, but that's the way the world is' - and an incoherent one on the other.

My deepest fear, however, is that many of us can now give accounts that are all too coherent, precisely because our own understanding of what is good about what we do has been so dramatically altered under the pressure of the new systems. It is as if Peter had come to believe Patricia's view of how to pipe. Here the question that might protect us against ourselves is, 'What would I have said about my reasons for doing this fifteen years ago?' (Of course, the longer the regimes of inspection last, the fewer people will be able to answer that question.) I find it helpful to remember the shock I felt early on in the era of Research Assessment when I overheard two eminent and respected members of my Cambridge college discussing seriously and at length whether or not it was *fair* that Psychology had received four points and Physiology five (or was it vice versa?).

I had already realised, of course, that university departments were being graded on a crude scale of one to five. What I had not yet grasped was that some scholars were now taking such grading so seriously as to be able to describe it as either fair or unfair.[5] Even five years previously, it seemed clear to me, they would both have mocked such an idea. Yet they had now appropriated quite a new view of the worth of their own scholarly activity. Their accounts of why they thought a department worthy would now be couched in the terms set by the RAE; they would disagree with the inspectors not about what was good, but only about how far one department or another had achieved that good.

Ten years later it is difficult to recapture the shock of that moment, so much do I move in a world where so many seem to take it for granted that their department merited their good grades (or alternatively did not merit their bad grades). Indeed, when our own department was undergoing QAA, I was struck by quite how difficult it was *not* to believe that the score we were given was closely related to the quality of our work, although the actual evidence pointed overwhelmingly to the opposite conclusion. (It is irrelevant to my argument whether I am wrong about what the evidence suggested; what matters is that the pressure on my beliefs did not come from what I believed to be good reasons.)

Different academics will have different views about the most important ways in which the assessments imposed upon us have affected our activities. My hunch is that the RAE has been more likely to distort our activities and teaching assessments to distract us from them. There are, however, several ways in which TQA, QAA and any of their successors may distort teaching: for example, by over-systematising and hence depersonalising the relationship

between teachers and students, by encouraging standardised methods of teaching, and by tempting teachers and students to collude in lowering standards in order to avoid risk.

There are, of course, innumerable external pressures other than inspections which may distort our activities and even seduce us into changing our beliefs about them. The constant requirement to reduce expenditure is the most obvious of these. To take one important example: in the debate about the best size of teaching groups it is extremely difficult to disentangle genuinely pedagogic from pragmatic motives. Again and again we need to ask ourselves the questions: 'Is that how I would have argued fifteen years ago? If not, exactly why not?'

Epilogue: love and do what you will

You need not see what someone is doing
to know if it is his vocation,
you have only to watch his eyes:
a cook mixing a sauce, a surgeon
making a primary incision,
a clerk completing a bill of lading,
wear the same rapt expression,
forgetting themselves in a function . . .
There should be monuments, there should be odes, . . .
to the first flaker of flints
who forgot his dinner...[6]

The expressions of Auden's workers are 'rapt', because they are drawn out of themselves, to focus on what they are doing. They focus on it precisely as something good or desirable: *this* is how to make the incision; *this* is how to mix the sauce. They do not think their activity good because it gives them pleasure; it gives them pleasure because they think it good. Specifically, it gives them pleasure because they know that they are doing it well. They 'know', or they 'feel': either word is too narrow to capture the richness of being engaged with one's mind and body - muscle and nerve and sense - in an activity to which one feels called.

The Epicurean, and modern, mistake is to believe that we act, at our best, for the sake of pleasure, as if we think, 'I'll make the effort to do it well, because then I will feel good.' Of course, in our weaker moments, we sometimes need to give ourselves such encouragement - few professional athletes would survive their gruelling training without occasionally reminding themselves how good it feels to run a winning race. But they will not actually get to feel good by aiming to feel good. They will only get to feel good by focusing on the activity in question; furthermore, what will feel good to them is, precisely, doing that activity well. It is simply a fact about the world that providence, or chance, has made us into creatures that enjoy doing things well.

I have argued that distorting secondary goals make us carry out our activities less well, in our own eyes, than we otherwise would. It is no surprise, then, that such goals can also diminish or destroy the delight that we naturally take in doing things well. Peter will enjoy his piping less when he knows he is playing badly in order to please Patricia. (Whatever extra pleasure he find in the experience - say, from Patricia's appreciative glances - will not be pleasure

taken *in piping*.) In other words, distorted goals can demotivate, in the literal sense of deprive us of our motives.

This diminishment of joy may happen simply at the level of specific actions: when playing *this* piece, or teaching *this* lesson, badly for the sake of a distorting goal. It can also happen over a longer time, to an extended project. Perhaps the ways in which I am forced or bullied or bribed into carrying out my craft badly are limited: maybe I am free to play Mozart, though not Bach, as well as I can; maybe I can teach my pupils in the manner I wish, so long as I submit them to monthly testing. The extent to which such interference diminishes the artist's pleasure will vary with the details of the case. However, it is important to remember that skilful artists see their projects as a whole; if individual elements are damaged, they may feel that the integrity and beauty of the project as a whole has been lost. Then there is a serious risk that their natural delight in their work as a whole will also fade.

Academics are no exception. Insofar as I come to teach or write in a way that is intended to please the inspectors, rather than in the way I think best, my original motive of teaching or writing for its own sake will be lost. What used to make me enjoy teaching or writing well was my belief that they were in themselves good activities. It is unfortunate that the better the teacher or scholar, the more likely it is that a small reduction in the standard of her work will lead to a large diminution of the delight that she takes in it.

It would take a different essay to argue that the fact that people find joy in their work is evidence that they are doing it well. The practical reader is unlikely to need the argument. Would you choose a carpenter or a builder or a garage mechanic who despised or disliked his job over one who loved it? Would you leave your toddler with a childminder who appeared to hate looking after children? Would you call a tune from a piper who was piping *only* for pay? I rest my case. The tragedy is that we have forgotten in public life the solid traditional wisdom which every householder and every parent still takes for granted.

We will not 'solve the problems' of education by holding each other to account, however sophisticated the systems with which we do so. I would prefer to adopt the more modest aim of helping each other to teach and study more competently, more creatively and more contentedly. I have argued that we will not achieve even this until we possess a sounder public understanding of professional motivation. Equipped with that, we might learn to set one another free to act in accordance with what each honestly believes to be the good. Perhaps we could then begin to aspire to a system of education in which those who work are motivated not by fear, but by love. For that is what makes the flaker of flints forget his dinner.

Margaret Atkins *Trinity and All Saints, Leeds*

Notes

[1] See further F. P. Wilson, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs*, and B. J. Whiting, *Modern Proverbs and Proverbial Sayings*.

[2] *Letters written by the late right honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, to his son Philip Stanhope esq., 25 December 1753.*

[3] *Daily News*, 18 December 1895.

[4] He saw himself, presumably, as the delegated representative of the tax-payers.

[5] I accept that the inspectors' conclusions could have been reached in a manner that was fair or unfair, but that is a different point.

[6] *Collected Poems*, ed. Edward Mendelson, pp. 62930.

Classics and Ancient History at University: Shaping Future Directions in Teaching and Learning

Lorna Hardwick

It's a paradox that while universities in general are being squeezed between pressure for change and lack of financial resources, Classics and Ancient History now have opportunities to bid for funding for sizeable projects in teaching and learning. These could give added impetus and influence to the imaginative work that is already being done in curriculum development and in the creation of teaching and learning strategies that are responsive to the needs of new constituencies of students. Projects funded by LTSN Teaching Development Grants are now being completed and others are in progress.[1] Contributors to the LTSN panels at the next Classical Association Conference in Leeds in April 2004 will discuss the implications of these projects as well as focusing on the school-university interface.

The interest of classicists and ancient historians in subject-based practitioner-led teaching development projects was strongly evident in the report of the recent independent evaluation of the first phase of the work of the LTSN.[2] The evaluation was qualitative in approach and was based on nineteen interviews, seven of which were with academics in classical subjects. Of the three subject areas considered, academics in Classics Ancient History emerged as particularly committed to the idea that progress was best achieved through debate and exchange of information and ideas. There was a strong desire for rigorous subject-led research which would inform debates on classical teaching. Areas which were thought to be of particular importance included exploration of different approaches to seminar work around texts and the development of computer-assisted learning and on-line materials. Some of those interviewed thought that while small projects could show the way there was now a need for larger substantially funded research and development which would have wide application in classical subjects. This represents a substantial shift in opinion over the last few years and in particular a recognition that important research in teaching and learning can and should be undertaken by classicists and ancient historians, rather than being the preserve of educational researchers.

There are two forthcoming initiatives that will enable these aspirations to be turned into reality.

1. ***Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL)***. The fifth phase of FDTL has now been launched by Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the call for bids has been published on their web-site.[3] Each phase of

FDTL has covered subjects which were recently subject to QAA and this time it is the turn of Classics and Ancient History.[4] The closing date for the first stage of the bidding process is 5 December 2003. There is provision for three sized projects: large (up to £250k over three years, collaborative projects only), medium projects (up to £150k over two years), and small (up to £75k over two years). Bidding departments should have attained a maximum QAA score in the heading under which they bid (e.g. Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation; Teaching, Learning and Assessment; Student Progression and Achievement etc). The other point to note is that lead bidders should be departments in England or the North of Ireland. Colleagues in Scotland and Wales may be included as consultants or partners. LTSN has organised two information meetings for potential bidders (in Manchester on 15 October 2003 and London on 22 October 2003). Subsequently, informal subject based meetings will be arranged as needed to facilitate collaborative bids. LTSN Classics and Ancient History prepared background papers at the request of HEFCE summarising the comments of the QAA reviewers and listing the perceived needs and issues raised by the subject community. These papers were prepared in consultation with representatives of CUCD and other classical subject associations, the Benchmarking group and the Classics Ancient History Advisory Panel. This material is available on the LTSN subject centre website[5] and is (mostly) reflected in the subject based information included in the HEFCE call for bids. LTSN is a facilitator in the process but will not be involved in the assessment of bids.

2. ***Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL)***. The second initiative which might provide potential for development work in classical subjects is the establishment of the CETLs. At the time of writing, this initiative is at the consultation stage.[6] The proposals have already been developed from the rather vague outline in the White Paper and there may be provision for more than seventy centres, funded at between £200k and £500k per annum for five years, with substantial capital support. The concept has still to be refined, but it seems that the CETLs will reward proven excellence and provide a basis for future projects. Bids will need institutional sponsorship and it seems likely that CETLs will be diverse in composition and focus. Dissemination will be an important part of their activity, probably in conjunction with the LTSN subject centres. It is likely that the call for bids will go out in January 2004, so now is the time to find out what kinds of bid your university is proposing and to make sure that work in classical subjects is well represented.

Currently the plans for the establishment of The Higher Education Academy are also being publicised.[7] This will be a UK-wide umbrella organisation incorporating the LTSN subject centres and the ILTHE (if its members vote to join) and is to be developed from early 2004.[8] The Academy prospectus indicates that it intends to work with a wide range of partner organisations, including subject and professional organisations, in order to further curriculum and pedagogic development and that it will promote and support relevant research and scholarship. It will also aim to 'facilitate the professional development and increase the professional standing of all staff in higher education'. The Academy's role is also intended to cover 'the leadership and co-ordination of national quality enhancement policy and practice'. The success of the LTSN subject centres so far has been based on their work for and as part of their subject communities and a good deal of determination may be needed to make sure that this distinctiveness and devolved activity is not weakened by incorporation in a much larger structure. The voices of the subject communities will need to be heard loud and strong in the forthcoming months as plans for the Academy are firmed up.

In the face of all these developments, my mood is one of cautious optimism. The Classics and Ancient History community is cohesive, with strong subject associations and excellent links between school and university sectors. It is well placed to prepare strong bids for FDTL5 and to contribute to the proposed CETLs. For the first time there will now be substantial funding available for sustained research and development work on the curriculum and on teaching and learning. In spite of all the other demands on academics' time, now is the moment to seize those opportunities. They will not come again.

Lorna Hardwick

LTSN HCA--Classics and Ancient History

The Open University

-
- [1] Completed reports include 'The Flexible Electronic Ancient Greek Teaching and Learning Project' led by Dr Jon Hesk (University of St Andrews), 'Hellenizein: A Flexible Structure for Teaching Greek to Archaeologists and Ancient Historians' led by Professor Graham Shipley (University of Leicester), 'Study Skills: Plato's *Protagoras*' by Dr Catherine Osborne (University of Liverpool), 'Rethinking "Unseen" Translation: a Pilot Scheme for Developing Students' Reading Skills in Greek and Latin' by Dr Emily Greenwood (University of St Andrews) and Dr Elizabeth Irwin (University of Cambridge) *et al.* The reports are available on the LTSN HCA web-site, <http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/>.
 - [2] James Wisdom, *Evaluation of the History, Classics and Archaeology Subject Centre*, July 2003. A copy of the evaluation is to be made available on the LTSN HCA web-site.
 - [3] The invitation to bid is on the HEFCE web-site at http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/hefce/2003/03_46/. Some subject specific information is on the LTSN HCA web-site at <http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/FDTL5/>.
 - [4] As well as Archaeology, there is a very broad range of other subject disciplines. They are: Theology and Religious Studies; Politics; Philosophy; Celtic Studies; Economics; Business and Management; Hospitality, Leisure, Recreation, Sport and Tourism; Management; Education; Librarianship and Information.
 - [5] It is in PDF format at http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/fdtl5/C-AH_state_of_nation_report.pdf.
 - [6] Details on HEFCE web-site at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2003/03%5F36.htm>.
 - [7] Its interim web-site is available at <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/>.
 - [8] It seems that the LTSN will continue until the end of 2005 to allow a smooth transition from and integration of the various subject centres into the Academy.

CLASSICS AT BRITISH UNIVERSITIES, 2002-3: STATISTICS

Graham Shipley

Once again I am grateful to member institutions for a 100 per cent return. (For the future, can departments please take care in returning beginners' language data? I hope the instructions with the new form will be clearer.)

As last year, the data are divided into (a) 'traditional' classics courses such as BA Classics, Greek, or Latin, (b) 'modern' variants such as classical civilization, classical studies, ancient history, and classical art and archaeology, and (c) 'others' such as combined honours, supplementary students, and non-honours students. Groups (a) and (b) are further divided into single and joint honours students. The grouping of the data is exactly as last year, except that some refinements have been made to the calculations of staff and postgraduate numbers. Open University data are fully integrated except where noted.

Across the board, the picture is more positive (see **Table A**), though one year does not make a trend. Full-time equivalent (FTE) student numbers, which reflect the proportion of their time that each student spends in classical courses, rose overall by a healthy 3 per cent, and by a spectacular 10 per cent if the Open University is discounted. Single and joint honours accounted for most of the increase, as the graph (**Fig. 1**, following the tables) shows clearly. It also confirms the underlying, if slow, downward trend in 'traditional' classical courses. Most of the increase is in single honours 'modern' classical courses.

Table B makes the same point in another way, revealing a 15 per cent increase in these single honours 'modern' degrees. The unpublished details underlying Table B show an 11 per cent increase in the first-year intake for single honours classical civilization and classical studies, the same increase in first-year ancient history, and - from a much lower base - a fourfold increase in first-year classical art and archaeology. First-year intakes in joint honours 'modern' degrees were in fact somewhat down on last year, suggesting greater interest in single honours; this kept the overall increase in 'modern' joint honours to just 3 per cent. From a lower base, 'traditional' classics single honours courses recovered the 5 per cent they lost last year, but still stand 16 per cent down on 1992-3. Joint honours classics, a small proportion of the total, slipped further back. (More details are given in **Table C**.)

In these respects, the pattern of the last few years continues, and the bulk of undergraduates who keep classical teaching alive in the UK reside in non-traditional courses. CUCD needs to redouble its efforts, in concert with other national bodies, to maintain the viability of our 'core business' of language-based classics courses.

The figures for mature students, other than at the OU, are impressionistic but appear to show a fall from just under 500 to just over 400. Future years will show whether this is a trend.

Staff numbers increased, whether one counts only 'core' staff or makes allowance for staff on leave and 'non-core' replacements (**Table A**). There was a small rise in the numbers of temporary and part-time staff (**Table D**). Since this exercise is not designed to elicit finer details one cannot tell whether the change simply reflects, for example, success in securing research grants and replacement costs. Whichever way one looks at the figures, there seems

to have been a real increase of 7 10 per cent in staff numbers. Given increased undergraduate numbers, however, the student staff ratio necessarily becomes somewhat worse (**Table A**) - again, this is the case whether one counts effective staff or counts 'core' staff, ignoring study leave and replacement. Full-time temporary staff, which had represented 7 per cent of personnel (9 per cent of the FTE) last year, now form a slightly higher proportion (8 per cent on a head-count, but nearer 10 than 9 per cent of FTE). Again, this is a data series that should be watched closely in future.

Beginners' languages appear to dip slightly. Fewer students appear to have entered the still new OU courses, though large numbers of last year's OU beginners continued to study Greek and Latin, which is encouraging (**Table E**). Perhaps worryingly, the number of taught and research postgraduates studying *ab initio* language fell both in Latin and Greek. (We are aware, however, of cases where students at one institution take language training at the OU.) If this is a real change, it is surprising given the 8 per cent increase in FTE taught postgraduates and the 4 per cent increase in research student FTE) (**Table F**). I am confident that the postgraduate figures for at least the past two years are as accurate as they can be.

Optimism about postgraduate numbers should be tempered by HEFCE's proposal to cap the postgraduate funding stream at the 2003 4 level. More seriously, the tide of government policy runs strongly in favour of concentrating research in fewer universities. This would entail denying opportunities to students in certain regions. Since classics recruits many mature and part-time students who fund themselves and are not in a position to relocate to another part of the country, the creation of an élite of 'research-led' universities poses a real threat.

Graham Shipley

University of Leicester