CHANGING LANES:

YOUNG PEOPLE MAKING SENSE OF PATHWAYS

Karen Vaughan
New Zealand Council for Educational Research

FROM TRANSITION TO PATHWAYS

The purpose of this paper is to sketch a picture of young people's experiences and thoughts about their schooling, identities, and future career opportunities. It's basically the result of some thinking I've been doing as NZCER begins a new longitudinal project in transition. And transition is currently a hot topic – the government have just allocated millions to a Training and Education Package, covering a number of transition initiatives.

The picture I want to sketch of young people's experiences is an *emerging* picture because there is relatively little research that places young people's experiences at the centre. Current policy doesn't entirely match with the lived experiences of young people. Instead research and policy are structured by quite particular concepts of "youth", "adulthood", and "transition". And within these, young people are seen as problematic – and youth itself is seen as a kind of transition.

When I began writing this paper, I started thinking about the research possibilities around a fairly ordinary question that most young people are faced with at some point: what do I want to be (or do for a job)? The meaning of that question today can tell us a lot about policy frameworks and how transition is considered as transition-to-work. That type of framework is interesting for how it renders young people governable in particular ways.

But before I get into exploring the question of becoming somebody, let's look at what transition means today.

Generally transition policy is focussed on an endpoint as being a job or training and study towards a particular career or job. Underlying transition policy is the concept of "pathways". The term "pathways" implies seamlessness, in keeping with some of the aims of the National Qualifications Framework. Ideally people will experience progression and continuity between educational institutions, between education or training courses, and between careers. I've even heard pathways used as a verb lately – one can be "pathwaying" along a particular route in life. Or a student can be "pathwayed" into a Modern Apprenticeship.

Before the idea of "pathways", transition represented a kind of failure. Like pathways, "transition" meant transition to work; the labour market dominated what it meant to make a successful transition beyond school, as it does today. But in earlier times, transition was the poor cousin of academic achievement. For students who were not achieving academically, there were transition classes or programmes. Students could take "work experience" at school. Often they became "early school leavers", taking up semi-skilled or un-skilled work

(Higgins, 2002).   At this time, the academic pathway was the only recognised successful pathway through school.

Now, the term "pathways" is an attempt to recognise success as something more than just academic achievement in schools.   Other, non-academic pathways are as valid as the academic ones. You can see this in the way the status and profile of non-academic pathways has been raised, in the past year in particular. For example, Industry Training Organisations are now recognised as Tertiary Education Organisations alongside polytechnics and universities.   Modern Apprenticeships are increasing in number, with demand for them outstripping availability.   School transition programmes like STAR and Gateway are increasingly popular with students, schools, and tertiary institutions. The Tertiary Education Commission's "Skills Action Plan" is attempting to speed up the match between people's skills and available job opportunities. There is a greater push to generate information which will help people make better decisions about education and training.

The idea of pathways is important because it signals a shift – not only in *how* we think about young people moving beyond school but in *who* we're talking about, *which* young people. In general, "pathways" gives an implicit recognition of the complexity in the school to work transition period.   There is an acknowledgement that the circumstances in which young people grow up today appear to be quite different from those experienced by previous generations (Furlong & Cartmel, 1997).

But it also refers to *all* young people, not just those who don't achieve in academic areas. So there is increasingly an *imperative* for all young people be on a pathway of some sort. Coming of age today involves achieving independence in a labour market that values just-in-time approaches, flexibility, and a labour force willing to engage in frequent up-skilling. Young people's futures are marked with an imperative to be "perpetually responsive", for them to make what could be called "a continual enterprise" of themselves (Gordon, 1991).

Becoming Somebody

With the concept of pathways, young people's active involvement in decision-making and choice-making in relation to transition has intensified.   Students are involved in making decisions and considering options about their school subjects, their overall school programme, future plans they might have, institutions they might attend. This can be understood as part of a wider focus in schools on student-directed activities within certain constraints. For students perceived as "good students", there are programmes which foster self-assessment and students setting goals for their own learning. For students perceived as "bad students" (not achieving or with behavioural issues), there are behavioural or course completion contracts between students and teachers, and an ideal to develop an awareness of self, perhaps through a focus on building self-esteem or life-skills.

To get an idea of the expectations upon students today, consider how unthinkable it is becoming for a young person NOT to be deeply involved in making decisions about their schooling. Imagine if a student said, "Oh I don't mind whether I do History or Chemistry". Or "I'm interested in being a truck driver or an automotive mechanic but I'll just wait and see happens".

I'm not saying young people don't sometimes say this sort of thing – they do – but my point is that it has become ever more problematic for a young person to not get involved in making

choices about their future in terms of work. Active involvement of the individual is a characteristic of modern Western society generally. But it is *explicitly* embedded in transition policy. So in today's terms, a young person who refuses to decide becomes a young person "at risk" in two senses. Firstly they risk economic marginalisation; they are *in danger*. Secondly the risk is one of liability; that person is *a danger to* a "normal" (economically-productive) society.

The active process that transition demands today can be thought of as a move away from people being rail passengers to people being car drivers:

> While trains remain on a predetermined set of rails, the car driver is able to select his or her route from a vast number of alternatives. Unlike the railway passenger, the individual car driver is faced with a series of decisions relating to routes which will take them from their point of origin to their destination…drivers maintain the impression of having some control over the speed and comfort of their journeys. They are able to monitor the progress of other road users, may come to hear of short-cuts through access to useful information networks and perhaps develop advanced driving techniques. The experience of driving one's car rather than travelling as a passenger on public transport leads to the impression that individual skills and decisions are crucial to the determination of outcomes (Furlong & Cartmel, 1997).

One of the things I'd like to look at in more detail in NZCER's new project is the way that a framework requiring that kind of involvement can mask structural constraints like influence social class influences. For example, we still need to acknowledge that there are different types of cars, which have been allocated at the start of the journey – and these are significant predictors of a journey's outcome. In other words, the current pathways focus might mean that young people come to think of their particular routes, and any challenges they face along them, as unique to them as individuals (Furlong & Cartmel, 1997). That's something we must look out for when we look at patterns for particular groups of young people.

Deregulation and "seamlessness": consumer progress along pathways

Being a car driver, as opposed to rail passenger, has in part been made possible by the deregulated education environment in New Zealand. There is an increasing *number* of programmes and combinations of credits leading towards qualifications.

When the tertiary sector was re-modelled in the 1990s, the emphasis went onto private returns from tertiary education, student choice, and wide participation. Some of the unintended effects of this – like a bums-on-seats approach being privileged over quality of provision – has only recently been revisited through the Tertiary Education Strategy. But the net effect has been a reorientation of tertiary education away from an elite system to one of mass participation (McLaughlin, 2003).

Around the same time in the 1990s, the National Qualifications Framework introduced the idea that the attainment and provision of qualifications could be "seamless". Schools and tertiary institutions could work more closely together. They could even offer the same National Certificates. Some tertiary institutions have focussed on staircasing students into their institutions or aligning their and their local school's curriculum. Transition initiatives like STAR and Gateway have deliberately fostered closer secondary-tertiary relationships. Schools have been able to develop their own programmes for addressing the learning needs of their students', the skill needs of local industry, and the recruitment needs of tertiary providers – though there have

also been tensions between those different needs (Boyd, McDowall, & Cooper, 2002; Vaughan & Kenneally, 2003). And though the quality of it varies, all schools are legally required to provide some form of career guidance to their students (Ministry of Education, 1997); so many have extensive systems in place and a huge information base about pathways and career options available for students.

So with the closer relationships and a certain amount of deregulation of tertiary provision, secondary students' choices are influenced by a wide range of factors, presented as consumer information. Students can consider:
- type of training or education provider
- entry criteria
- course location
- course focus
- cost
- availability of scholarships or wages while learning
- provider or employer reputation
- length of course or apprenticeship
- and opportunities for cross-crediting or changing direction.

A number of websites enable tertiary students to calculate opportunity cost (how much they might miss in earnings while studying) and potential future earnings with qualifications. (Incidentally, calculating your net worth like this can be a really frightening exercise if you've got a PhD! There's of course an assumption that the main motivation is money. Or that one's life has been a well thought out plan).

With all the information that is now available, there is greater potential for young people to make "bad choices". Not only is there potentially a greater range of choices available today – thought different, wider or narrower, for different groups of young people - more choices need to be made throughout the process. And the process is increasingly individualised as schools strive to define and meet specific individual learning needs. Accountability for choices is expected as a result of more information about where those choices may lead.

So the effect of all this is a kind of extended responsibility placed on young people. However paradoxically it occurs at the same time as their dependence is extended and their *non*-adult status emphasised. The dependency can be seen through the mismatch of legal statuses – for example, sexual activity is permissable at 16 but voting is isn't until 18. Tertiary students are ineligible for most student allowances until they are 25; before that they are seen as the responsibility of their parents. The school leaving age is currently 16 but the unemployable benefit is not available until the age of 18.

Research questions about young people's interests or futures

Now back to the question I raised at the beginning of this paper - what do you want to be when you leave school? That question is very much structured by transition policy and research.

The question of becoming something or somebody is a modern, Western, one. I've asked this question of older people – what *did* you want to be when you were younger? - and I quickly realised that this is almost a redundant question for people over a certain age. For example, most women over the age of about 50 today had one of five options open to them for their careers: they could be a secretary, a housewife, a nurse, a dental nurse, or a teacher. And not

all of these were open to every woman. During the 1800s in particular, explicit processes of colonisation intersected with notions of gender and social class. Research into parliamentary records from around this time show that Maori boys and girls were specifically schooled to become farmers and farmer's wives, respectively, or house servants (Vaughan, 1993). So at different moments in history, for different groups of people, the question has a new meaning. Today the question has a especially central meaning to all young people.

I've also been involved in asking the question – what do you want to be or do - of young people at school as part of several research projects. And the question has been pitched in terms that relate it to career or work, or to study or training leading to a career. For example, in the Learning Curves project (Hipkins & Vaughan, 2002), we asked students to tick boxes indicating which activities, of a number of options we gave them, they expected to be doing next year and then in five years time. The options were staying at school; raising a family; travelling; studying at a university; studying at a polytechnic or PTE; and paid work. In the evaluation of STAR project (Vaughan & Kenneally, 2003), we talked to young people in focus groups and asked them what their future work-related plans were.

The recent "Aspirations and Destinations" questionnaires did something similar on a much larger and more detailed scale. The survey was focussed on young people's work and study plans, and so it asked young people to tick a main destination from a list of possibilities (BRC Marketing & Social Research, 2003). Some combination responses were captured – like "work and study" - but there was no way to capture other combinations like travel AND study. The survey provides lots of interesting data about aspirations and destinations – it does what it set out to do. But it would be great to capture the complexity of meaning in destinations. It would be great to know not only about the *factors*, but the *processes*, involved in decision-making.

The *way* our research questions are asked of young people says something about the way in which we structure young people's responses. Why even ask about future work or career, and the study towards it? Because there is an assumption that the importance placed on subject choice or career focus or work experience is important to young people *in the same way* as it's important to policy-makers. This is a critically limiting assumption to make.

Because transition-as-pathways focuses on all young people, and because it requires longer and longer periods in formal education, there is a pull for transition research to focus on retention at school and destinations upon leaving school. What I believe we really need is a focus on the *meaning* young people give to the retention, the destinations, and the pathways. In other words, it's not so much the pathways, but the *navigation* of them, that is significant for research at this time.

Navigation

If we pay attention to young people's own understandings, motivations, and desires, we can make "navigations" a complementary metaphor to "pathways". This differentiates the policy focus of "pathways" from the active role played by young people in shaping their own lives, within certain constraints (Furlong & Cartmel, 1997). The distinction between the two is particularly important. Overseas research has highlighted mismatches between policy and young people's experiences (Wyn & Dwyer, 1999) and there appear to be similar mismatches in New Zealand.

It seems clear that typical ideas about transition assume that development of a career is the biggest priority for young people. And many research questions reflect this assumption. They pick up on an economic model which has been generalised to so many other areas of life or society. However while work, career, or employment is not *in*significant to young people – because work is fairly central to inclusion in society - it is also not of *sole* importance in negotiating the transition beyond school, and does not necessarily have the *same kind* of importance or meaning as it does to older people.

Part of the reason that career or work is not necessarily a driving force or the sole one for young people, may be that there are no longer discrete compartments of adulthood. Work no longer constitutes the major source of identity, with the addition of family-formation and some hobbies or sport thrown in on the side. Instead there is evidence that music, fashion, and leisure are more central to how young people think of themselves (Ball, Maguire, & Macrae, 2000). With the decline of the youth labour market, it has been argued that youth consumption is a place to purchase identity as a substitute for the work identity (Furlong & Cartmel, 1997 citing Miles 1995). Some of these changes in identity have been theorised in terms of demarcations between education, entertainment, and advertising being collapsed so that young people are constructed in new ways (Kenway & Bullen, 2001). Others theorists have emphasised heavy targeting of young people by consumerism and how these have made possible new ways for young people to constitute themselves (Côté & Allahard, 1996).

I recently came across an example of the assumption about the centrality of career when I was talking to a group of careers teachers or co-ordinators. I was talking about some NZCER research which found that senior secondary students generally chose subjects based on enjoyment (as opposed to choosing them for other reasons, like an explicit career link or because they thought the subject was easy). However we were still in the process of breaking down exactly what students meant by "enjoyment" in relation to subjects, though it seemed that "liking the teacher" could be a big factor (Hipkins & Vaughan, 2002).

The careers co-ordinators suggested that this way of choosing subjects was a whim-based approach and therefore not to be taken seriously. What were students doing choosing subjects because they liked the teacher? What about their careers! The attitude of the co-ordinators here illustrates the way policy sets up certain assumptions about what is supposed to be important to young people.

I put it to the co-ordinators that they probably thought about their relationships with colleagues when they considered taking the jobs they now have; that when they had to spend their day at work, they probably felt their relationship with their boss or principal was important and if they enjoyed it, that made it more likely they would enjoy their job. So why wasn't it okay for students to think about the quality of relationships they have with teachers?

It isn't surprising that young people value the relationship with the teachers – recent research shows that "the quality of teaching practices…is the largest influence on the achievement of children in schooling" (Mallard, 2003). What is surprising is the way the value of relationships can be made unavailable to students; to the school career co-ordinators, these students spoke the unspeakable about what interested them in their subject choices. In transition terms, teacher-student relationships were supposed to be functional ones.

(Alternatively, those relationships could have been seen as functional in another way – drawing students in to particular careers through their relationship with a teacher of a particular subject).

Yet we already know that relationships are really important to young people when it comes to making decisions. Family influences are particularly strong throughout research on transition. Several recent evaluations and pieces of research on STAR and Gateway transition programmes have shown the importance of relationships are to young people. Most of these programmes emphasise students gaining a range of social and personal outcomes. And they are highly valued by students who enjoyed what they called being "treated like adults" (Boyd et al., 2002; Skill New Zealand, 2002; Vaughan & Kenneally, 2003). This was particularly so for young people with a problematic history with their school or particular teachers. Since most STAR and Gateway courses take place away from the school site or are taught by non-school staff – tertiary providers or employers - the students were able to work with a "clean slate" and gained new confidence. Students also reported developing new communication skills and the ability to relate to more diverse groups of people. Some students described social situations as being outside their comfort zone and being delighted by the discovery that they could build relationships with peers or mentors - students from other schools, adults in the workforce, and non-school teaching staff (Boyd, McDowall, & Bolstad, 2003 in press; Vaughan & Kenneally, 2003). A similar importance of relationships has been shown in research on alternative schools and Alternative Education programmes (Vaughan, 2002).

This actually came up recently during a haircut. My hairdresser, Moorfid, is 22 and I was asking him about how he came into hairdressing, what he thought about it, and what school had been like for him. During the conversation he said there should be more emphasis on life-skills at school. At first I thought: oh yes, lots of people – including students – say this. I started to make some assumptions in my head about the kinds of lifeskills that people learn in school through foundation skills classes – making a CV and so on. But then I asked: what exactly do you mean by "life-skills". And he said: well, it would be good to know how to get along with people, how to get to know and work with lots of different kinds of people. I suddenly had the thought that what commonly gets called "life-skills" isn't necessarily the same as the skills-for-life that he prized. It will be interesting to see how the significance and role of foundation skills is explored as part the government's Education and Training package.

Work identity

It appears that while young people are not focussed on career in quite the way some policy would have them, they do have some kinds of work identities. However these are not fixed and do not necessarily relate to career.

Work is no longer something that happens after schooling; many young people now combine school and employment, which is likely to be partly about economic pressures and partly about the preference of young people for blending elements of the transition process (Wyn & Dwyer, 1999). In New Zealand, Department of Labour statistics show that while 85% of 16 and 17 year olds are engaged in education or training, 43% of those are also in work (mostly part-time) (2003). Gateway and STAR possibly have fostered this preference of young people by making industry-specific courses and workplace learning (including workplace-based assessment) part of the school programme. For young people at this stage, work is likely to be a series of trials, or mainly for the purpose of gaining experience in a particular workplace or industry. The work young people do out of school is often intellectually undemanding and bears little relationship to any future work or career they might aspire to; it is simply a way to earn money.

Milling and churning

Some young people may quite deliberately try to postpone the development of work identities in favour of other identities. It is possible that this represents an unwillingness to commit to particular training or education programmes leading directly into careers. This is essentially what the OECD have described as the period of "milling and churning" - the process of "moving between a diverse set of activities, only one of which is work, before settling into permanent work: unemployment; labour market programmes; out of the labour force; back into education for short spells; part-time jobs; brief full-time jobs" (2000: 76). This has been theorised as a coping strategy in response to the plethora of choices faced by, and decision-making required of, young people (du Bois-Reymond, 1998). One senior secondary student who recently wrote a column in the New Zealand Herald claimed that the abundance of choices and pressures to make them according to a set timescale was actually overwhelming and paralysing more than it was enabling (Clanachan, 2003).

Two possible readings of the "milling and churning" period contain the seeds of a conundrum facing policy-makers in New Zealand. Is milling and churning a useful "growing up" or trial period for young people? Could too speedy a matching of young person to paid employment be detrimental to both the young person and the employer? Or is milling and churning a problematic and economically-wasteful period of time? Does milling and churning disadvantage young people economically. Does it contribute to existing economic inequalities in society? Does milling and churning in fact require tight administration, with better support and direction for young people?

It appears that policy-makers are interpreting milling and churning to be dangerous. With career guidance being compulsory in schools, milling and churning is brought back within the scope of the school, to be reoriented as a pathway. Even some tertiary study has been cast in these terms. Recently the Associate Minister of Education was reported as saying that Industry Training Organisations needed to increase their presence to ensure that young people did not go to a tertiary education provider as a default option to avoid making "genuine if difficult decisions" (Industry Training Federation, 2003).

Yet students have reported their experiences on transition programmes in ways that suggest milling and churning is useful to them. For example, STAR and Gateway programmes are often championed as moving students into careers. But the students themselves may use the programmes as a way to experiment with different careers. Research on STAR shows that many students see value in STAR "taster" courses in terms of the opportunity not only to confirm interest in a particular career, but also in terms of being able to eliminate it from the range of possibilities. Other STAR students report have enjoyed having exposure to a tertiary environment (Vaughan & Kenneally, 2003) and some Gateway students report liking knowing more about what is involved in employment situations (Skill New Zealand, 2002) – but these may be benefits that are not specific to a particular career.

And that is likely to be because people – young and older – change their minds about what they want to do. Probably most of us also know from our own experiences that sometimes changes almost get made for you – by unexpected life events that have you rethink your priorities. Studies like Beyond School, (Boyd, Chalmers, & Kumekawa, 2001), Innovative Pathways (Boyd et al., 2003 in press), and the Aspirations and Destinations Survey (BRC Marketing & Social Research, 2003) show significant proportions of students have changed their minds about their plans, often within a short period of time. The latest issue of the

Career Edge magazine mentions some Australian psychologist researchers looking into *random* influences on career decisions (Career Services, 2003). Perhaps we might start to look at the place of serendipity in relation to transition.

Here's another possible example of milling and churning: there are significant numbers of young people doing the big O.E[1]. That might well be a significant number of *middle class Pakeha* as opposed to representing *all* young people. Overseas travel away from New Zealand is now fairly widely accepted as a formative life event for young people.

Conclusion

In summary, both interpretations of milling and churning – as useful or as dangerous – demand that we should support young people. But the type of support in each case is going to be different. It doesn't make sense to replace milling and churning with greater pressure on young people to choose pathways, especially if we're driven by boosting participation numbers in training or tertiary education. We have to think about what young people are really doing if they do participate. For example, what young people are telling us about the relationships they value with adults means that the kind of support they want is not just *informational.* What they really might be on about is having *relationships* that enable them to try things, make mistakes, and change their minds – and then be able to put it all together in creative ways. So making the transition work for young people means supporting them *through* the confusing times and the changes of heart; but it doesn't necessarily mean eradicating those things.

Perhaps a way of approaching the milling and churning issue is to examine about how well the National Qualifications Framework is truly seamless in practice. Or how lifelong learning is understood and realised in practice. How is lifelong learning, a "knowledge economy" and well-being in life linked for young people?

If we're going to be rethink transition policy, we will also have to re-examine the concept of "adulthood" as well. Transition has lengthened beyond what used to be a fairly compact timeframe. The starting and ending points of the transition process are increasingly indeterminate (Raffe, 2000).

I suggest that a useful re-conception of transition – and therefore of "youth" and "adulthood" - would involve examining questions of the kind that Nikolas Rose raises in his book, Governing the Soul:

> What kinds of creatures have we become, the men and women who inhabit our present? How do we understand ourselves, and how are we understood by those who would administer, manage, organise, improve, police and control us? What kinds of presuppositions about human beings are built into our practices of production and consumption, of pedagogy and reform, of pleasure and erotics? And what images, values, beliefs, norms do we employ when we think about, enact and assess our existence? (Rose, 1989: viii)

Another way of putting it is to say that transition policies say a lot about concepts of "youth". Transition policy doesn't necessarily mirror youth; it mirrors a particular representation of youth. And we need to think about the assumptions involved because if policy does not match with lived experience, it will fail. For example, if policy over-emphasises human

[1] Overseas Experience

capital theory or rational decision-making processes, at the expense of all the other things that go into how young people make decisions, the pathways made available will not match the ones that actually get chosen.

Transition policy is a representation of particular "interests". There are employment interests, economic interests, social interests, equity interests, and educational interests (Raffe, 2000). The critical turning points or "fateful moments" in transition will likely to encompass all these interests in *interconnected* ways. They are less likely to fit with any human capital theory-based, or labour market driven, transition policy.

So transition research in New Zealand has to get beyond linear models of transition-to-work. It needs to take more of a "life-course" approach. It needs to come to terms with all the dimensions and meanings of work and other life experiences. It needs to examine the different ways that those dimensions are structured and limited, and maintained and challenged. And finally, it needs to put young people's perspectives at the centre, to acknowledge the different meanings of life events, and the different forms that can be given to adulthood.

References

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Macrae, S. (2000). *Choice, Pathways and Transitions Post-16: New youth, new economies in the global city*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Boyd, S., Chalmers, A., & Kumekawa, E. (2001). *Beyond School: Final Year School Students' Experiences of the Transition to Tertiary Study or Employment*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Boyd, S., McDowall, S., & Bolstad, R. (2003 in press). *Innovative pathways from school: The school outcomes* (Phase 2 report). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Boyd, S., McDowall, S., & Cooper, G. (2002). *Innovative pathways from school: The case studies* (Phase 1 report). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

BRC Marketing & Social Research. (2003). *2002/03 Destinations and Tracking Pilot: Full Survey Report*. Wellington: Career Services, The Tertiary Education Commission, and Manukau City Council.

Career Services. (2003, July). Random Influences. *Career Edge. The Magazine for the Careers Industry.*

Clanachan, A. (2003, 24 June). Sorry, I can't predict the future yet. *New Zealand Herald,* pp. E2.

Côté, J. E., & Allahard, A. L. (1996). *Generation on Hold: Coming of Age in the Late Twentieth Century*. New York: New York University Press.

Department of Labour. (2003). Youth Pathways: the Big Picture. *WorkINSIGHT*(2).

du Bois-Reymond, M. (1998). 'I Don't Want to Commit Myself Yet': Young People's Life Concepts. *Journal of Youth Studies, 1*(1), 63-79.

Furlong, A., & Cartmel, F. (1997). *Young People and Social Change: Individualization and risk in late modernity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental Rationality: An Introduction. In C. G. G. Burchell, and P. Miller (Ed.), *The Foucault Effect*. England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Higgins, J. (2002). Young People and Transitions Policies in New Zealand. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*(18), 44-61.

Hipkins, R., & Vaughan, K. (2002). *Learning curves: Meeting student needs in an evolving qualifications regime. From Cabbages to Kings. A first report*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Industry Training Federation. (2003, 28 July). Minister champions the value of Industry Training. *Training Federation Update, 94,* 1.

Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2001). *Consuming Children: education-entertainment-advertising.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mallard, T. (2003, 29 July). Research on teaching to help students achievement. *Media statement from Minister of Education.*

McLaughlin, M. (2003). *Tertiary Education Policy in New Zealand.* Wellington: The Ian Axford New Zealand Fellowship in Public Policy.

Ministry of Education. (1997). *Career Information and Guidance in New Zealand Schools.* Wellington: Ministry of Education/Learning Media.

Raffe, D. (2000, 7-9 September). *Strategies for Collecting Cross-National Data on Education-to-Work Transitions: Recommendations of the CATEWE Project. Comparative Analysis of Transitions from Education to Work in Europe, deliverable no.8.* Paper presented at the European Research Network on Transitions in Youth, Antwerp.

Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the Soul: the Shaping of the Private Self.* London: Routledge.

Skill New Zealand. (2002). *Interim Process Evaluation of the Gateway Pilots.* Wellington: Skill New Zealand.

Vaughan, K. (1993). *Colonising by Gender: An Analysis of State Policies for Maori 1847-1867.* Paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society Conference, University of Melbourne, Melbourne.

Vaughan, K. (2002). Some Like it Liminal: Finding a place for the last alternative state high school in New Zealand. *Education and Social Justice, 4*(3 Autumn), 52-59.

Vaughan, K., & Kenneally, N. (2003). *A Constellation of Prospects: A Review of the Secondary-Tertiary Alignment Resource (STAR).* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Wyn, J., & Dwyer, P. (1999). New Directions in Research on Youth in Transition. *Journal of Youth Studies, 2*(1), 5-21.

Changing lanes: young people making sense of pathways. Article. Jan 2003. Â Innovative Pathways from School examines the models used in schools to support students to make the step from school by examining the influence, on students' career decision making and post-school destinations, of the transition support (that is, information, advice, guidance, and career development activities) that is provided to students. Request PDF | On Jan 1, 2003, Karen Vaughan published CHANGING LANES: YOUNG PEOPLE MAKING SENSE OF PATHWAYS | Find, read and cite all the research you need on ResearchGate. Â As a result, young people are required to make decisions about a far greater range of possibilities throughout secondary school, including making choices and decisions about school subject choice and school programmes in a way that produces an individualised pathway for themselves through to tertiary education and/or work (Hipkins et al., 2005;Vaughan, 2003). Increasingly government ministers emphasise the gravity of these decisions, suggesting young people 'consider what's at stake' when choosing tertiary education programmes (Maharey cited in Career services, 2004, p. 12). Being around young people and being invested in their world and how they communicate, indirectly resulted in two of the biggest moments in my career. Days were lost to discussing hot political topics and reading the words of the strongest and most opinionated voices online, in shortform, to-the-point essays that mixed the personal and the political, memoir and fact. Â Learning from my young colleagues how to make the resulting video work online resulted in the stunt going viral. Â The biggest change the job brought, though, was to my wellbeing. It is rare you find yourself in a job you love, that you are happy to go into each day, and the bad bits of which donâ€™t turn you into that post-work whinger who runs through every tiny thing that is wrong with their employer.