

**This is the author's version of this paper. It was later published as:**

**Parlo Singh (2015): Pedagogic governance: theorising with/after Bernstein, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2015.1081052**

**To link to this article:**

**<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1081052>**

**Copyright: Taylor & Francis Group**

**Pedagogic Governance: Theorising with/after Bernstein**

Parlo Singh

*Griffith Institute for Educational Research, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia*

parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au

Professor Parlo Singh

Griffith Institute for Educational Research (GIER)

Mt Gravatt campus

Griffith University

176 Messines Ridge Road

Mt Gravatt Qld 4122

Australia

Phone: +617 3735 1833

Parlo Singh is Professor of Education (Sociology) in the Griffith Institute for Educational Research (GIER), Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia.

### **Pedagogic Governance: Theorising with/after Bernstein**

Researchers interested in new modes of social control and regulation through pedagogic means have increasingly drawn on Bernstein's theories of social control through pedagogic means and the emergence of a totally pedagogised society. This article explores this aspect of the Bernsteinian theoretical project by extrapolating and contrasting Foucault's and Bernstein's theories of power knowledge relations, pedagogic discourse, and different types of knowledge structures. It elaborates on Bernstein's theory of the complex division of labour within the field of symbolic control, consisting of agents from different class factions engaged in conflicts and struggles over the production and recontextualisation of different types of scientific knowledge. The article provides two case studies of empirical research to illustrate how Bernstein's concepts can be used to theorise different modes of pedagogic governance. It demonstrates the possibilities of Bernstein's later theoretical oeuvre to studies of social reproduction, interruption and change in and through pedagogic relations.

**Keywords:** pedagogic governance; totally pedagogised society; Bernstein; pedagogic discourse; pedagogic relays

#### **Introduction**

The conceptual framework of pedagogic relations in an emergent pedagogised society – or what Bernstein (2001a) provocatively describes as a totally pedagogised society (TPS) – is increasingly being used by education scholars to analyse new modes of social control, regulation and governance by pedagogic means. For example, a number of scholars have made use of the TPS concept to examine the reform and governance of teachers' work (Bonal and Rambla 2003; Robertson 2012) and pedagogic practices (Kanes, Morgan and Tsatsaroni 2014; Lingard 2013; Tyler 2001, 2010) by international agencies such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank. In addition, scholars writing about education reforms in the United Kingdom (Pykett 2009: 108), have drawn on Bernstein's work to examine the pedagogical form of state–citizen relations, whereby populations are increasingly governed by consent rather than coercion, 'through policies which seek to enable, empower, transfer responsibility to and activate people'. Moreover, scholars writing about education reforms in Singapore (Lim 2015) and China (Cheung 1996; Cheung and Pan 2006) have drawn on Bernstein's theories to examine how illiberal, neoliberal and meritocratic discourses are increasingly being used to govern populations, not only by coercion but also by consent.

In his last writings, Bernstein (2001a, 2001b) repeatedly mentions the TPS concept, and links it to his earlier work on pedagogic discourses, devices and codes. Yet this concept has not been subjected to systematic interpretation or extension. Even within the burgeoning field of ‘Bernstein studies’ (Atkinson 2014: 217), little attention has been paid to investigating, expanding on or explaining the TPS concept (see Muller 2004; Tyler 2004, 2010; Singh 2015). This article aims to address this gap. It undertakes the task in three sections. The first section examines the concept of pedagogic governance and power and control relations, distinguishing between Foucault’s (1972, 1979, 1989) and Bernstein’s (1985, 1988, 1990, 1996, 2000) theoretical frameworks. The second section reviews Bernstein’s empirical exploration of pedagogic devices/relays through his account of the complex division of labour for the production, recontextualisation, and dissemination or pedagogisation of knowledge. This section elaborates on the agencies and agents of the new middle-class factions operating within the fields of economic production (cultural field) and symbolic control, and examines the struggles within and between these agencies around the production and pedagogisation of knowledge (Singh 2002, 2015). The final section summarises key ideas about pedagogic governance and the emergent TPS developed throughout the article.

### **Governmental power and pedagogy**

According to Bernstein (2000: 3), governmental power is exercised through pedagogic means in the wide-ranging sense of cultural production-reproduction-interruption, and in the narrow sense of the everyday rituals of interactions between teachers and students (see also Collins 1994). Writing about education reforms in the United Kingdom, Bernstein (2001a: 365) suggests that social relations are increasingly governed by pedagogic means:

we learn that every teenager is to have a counsellor to enable the adolescent to map an appropriate career; a rather strange choice when careers are being replaced by jobs. Teenagers are then to be positioned in flexible time which translates as being able to be re-positioned whenever and wherever external change requires. Family units, whatever form they take, are new sites for parenting skills. So another pedagogic translation is possible, family units become parenting skills. The world of work translates pedagogically into Life Long Learning  
...

From this perspective, pedagogic reformations become the means for governing whole populations through training and retraining schemes, to cope with continuous change in work and everyday life (see also Beck and Young, 2005; Magalhaes and Soer 2003). The ‘state–citizen relation’ is ‘essentially pedagogical’, engaged in governing conduct through developing competencies in all aspects of life rather than ‘directly instructing citizens or interfering in their otherwise free lives’ (Pykett 2009: 108).

In addressing concerns about governmental power and pedagogy, scholars have often deployed Foucault’s (1979) theory of power relations, along with Bernstein’s theory of the TPS.

But few studies have clarified the distinctly different conceptions of power relations developed and deployed by these two scholars (see Diaz 1984; Bernstein 1985, 1988). On the one hand, scholars such as Kaner, Morgan and Tsatsaroni (2014) and Pykett (2009, 2010) suggest that, compared with Foucault, Bernstein provides a deterministic account of power relations, governance and identity formation. The state here refers to the apparatuses and technologies of governance of increasingly mobile individuals and social groups, engaging with a diversity of ideas, information and images, relayed instantly across the globe via increasingly 'smart' technologies. On the other hand, scholars such as Arnot and Reay (2006), Atkinson (1985), Diaz (1984), Moore (2013), Robertson (2012) and Tyler (2010) draw attention to Bernstein's relational notion of power, including the ways in which power relations are contested, challenged, interrupted and changed through the control relations of pedagogic communication. These scholars argue that Foucault's work did not focus explicitly on pedagogic governance, nor did it provide delicate and precise analytic tools for empirical inquiry into pedagogic relations, practices and identities.

The next section turns to an exploration of the similarities and differences between the work of Bernstein and that of Foucault on pedagogic governance and power relations.

### **Pedagogic governance**

Pedagogy and pedagogical science in the European context, following the work of Durkheim, has a long history related to explorations of the transmission processes of knowledge as forms of governmentality (Davies 1994; Evans et al. 2005). For example, Foucault (1979: 5–6) argues that the 'government of children, which involved the great problematic of pedagogy as it appears and develops in the 16th century' was part of a 'double movement, then, of state centralisation on the one hand and of dispersion and religious dissidence on the other'. Pastoral pedagogy was 'about the government of souls and lives' (1979: 6). Within this framework, governmentality and governance are defined as

the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security (1979: 20).

A number of scholars have pointed to Bernstein's engagement with Foucault's work in the development of his own research on the pedagogic device and pedagogic discourse (Bernstein 1985, 1988, 1996; Bernstein and Diaz 1984; Singh 1993, 2015). For example, Atkinson (1985: 100) argues that Bernstein's position on power is 'much closer to that of Foucault, who insists that power is multi-faceted, diffuse and ubiquitous ... Power, for both Foucault and Bernstein, is not separate from other relationships, of production and knowledge, but immanent in them.' Like Foucault, Bernstein is interested in the ways in which 'the exercise of power is refracted through the articulation of discourse' (Atkinson 1985: 178). But there are also important differences in the theoretical frameworks of Foucault and Bernstein. Atkinson

(1985: 177) argues that:

Foucault's overall work – whether its substantive focus be on medicine, insanity, sexuality or punishment – is concerned with difference, discontinuity and boundary. He is preoccupied with the processes and rules whereby 'discourse' or 'discursive formations' emerge and are constituted.

In Foucault's work, 'discursive formations and practices obey their own laws of transformation' (Atkinson 1985: 178). For Bernstein, by contrast, 'the distribution and circulation of texts are determined by social relationships' (Atkinson 1985: 178). Crucially, Bernstein is interested in the social basis and division of labour of power relations and pedagogic relations, and how these are constituted by, and in turn constitute (produce, relay, change and reform), discursive formations and practices. The pedagogic relation is defined as any relationship

where there is a purposeful intention to initiate, modify, develop or change knowledge, conduct or practice over time by someone or something ... who already possesses, or has access to, the necessary resources and the means of evaluating acquisition (Bernstein and Solomon 1999: 267).

Moreover, Bernstein's definition of pedagogic relations is much broader than the notion of the teacher–school student relation, and encapsulates the concept of andragogy, as well as numerous other techno-social relations, such as parent–child, doctor–patient, priest–parishioner, analyst–analysand, therapist–client, supervisor–supervisee, trainer–trainee, master–apprentice, YouTube presenter–consumer, lawyer–client and so on. As Bernstein stated in an interview with Joseph Solomon (Bernstein and Solomon 1999: 269),

pedagogy is the focus of my theory to the extent that pedagogic modalities are crucial realisations of symbolic control, and thus of the process of cultural production and reproduction. Symbolic control, through its pedagogic modalities, attempts to shape and distribute forms of consciousness, identity and desire. Here, one can distinguish between official pedagogic modalities and local pedagogic modalities. The former are official symbolic controls and give rise to macro/micro regulation of contexts, practices, evaluations and acquisitions at institutional levels. The latter, local pedagogic modalities, are familial, peer and 'community' regulations.

By his use of the term 'social basis of pedagogy', Bernstein (2001a) signalled the different class factions responsible for designing, promoting and disseminating particular modes of pedagogy and pedagogic discourses to different social groups. The term 'pedagogic discourse' refers to

the rules or principles for selecting and organising what is to be taught, how it is to be taught and how it is deemed to have been acquired. Thus the promotion of new forms of pedagogy and pedagogic discourses is always questioned in the Bernsteinian framework, in terms of whose interests are being served, what types of social/pedagogic relations are being constituted and what social/pedagogic identities are being formed, with what potential consequences (Singh 1993, 2002). Consequently, Bernstein's theoretical framework is interested in the social division of labour for the production, circulation, distribution and transmission of different discourses, and how conflict and contestation within this division of labour produce different configurations of discourses and are realised in different material practices (Diaz 1984). A Bernsteinian research project is interested in 'the distinctive features of a form of discourse which gives it its speciality and the principle of the social division of labour created for its transmission and reproduction' (Diaz, 1984: 348). From this theoretical perspective 'class relations regulate the unequal distribution of power and the unequal positioning in power' (Diaz 1984: 352).

While the earlier Bernsteinian work focused on the pedagogisation of everyday and scientific discourses – that is, the selection, organisation, teaching and evaluation of school knowledge – the later work examined the rules of formation of horizontal (realised as everyday knowledges) and vertical discourses (realised as scientific knowledges), the relations within and between these discourses, and the formation of different disciplines (humanities, social sciences – psychology, sociology, linguistics, etc.) within vertical discursive formations (Bernstein 1999; Muller, 2011a, 2011b). In his later work, Bernstein (1999) was particularly concerned with the growth and splintering of social scientific discourses produced by middle-class factions in the field of symbolic control, and the relation of these discourses to everyday experiences. Like Foucault (1979, 1989), his object of inquiry was the structuring principles internal to the discourses. But unlike Foucault, Bernstein (1999) was interested in empirically investigating the agencies and agents in the increasingly complex field of symbolic control producing new knowledge forms, and the differential distribution, recontextualisation and acquisition of these new knowledge forms (see also Beck 2014; Wheelahan 2010).

### **Power/knowledge, power/control relations**

Bernstein's theoretical work provides inimitable insights 'into the constitutive properties of postmodern power' (Tyler 1999: 272). For Bernstein, power relations 'spring from a relational system of specific positions occupied by specific categories, whether agents, agencies or discourses' (Diaz 1984: 350). Thus power relations are not invested in individual agents or specific agencies; rather, they are articulated in the strength of the insulation boundaries demarcating symbolic categories. Strong insulation boundaries signal strong power relations, and thus restriction or closure between categories of agents, discourses and spaces. Weak insulation boundaries signal weaker power relations, and thus open interactions between agents, discourses and spaces (see Tyler 1999). Power relations are negotiated, contested and challenged, in and through the networks of communication that exist within and across agencies. Thus Bernstein's theory of the TPS interprets power

in terms of a circulatory system of signs rather than a distributive system of hierarchical relations ... This conception of power is particularly appropriate for an age of globalized, virtualized electronic culture. Its logic is grounded in paradoxes, reversals and regressions of the semiotic processes of 'postculture' ... rather than in the thematics of domination and resistance. (Tyler 1999: 274)

Bernstein (1990: 134) acknowledges the significant contribution of Foucault to 'new forms of the discursive positioning of the subject'. He also points to the gaps and limitations in Foucault's work:

[T]here is no substantive analysis of the complex of agencies, agents, social relations through which power, knowledge, and discourse are brought into play as regulative devices; nor any discussion of the modalities of control. In a way it is discourse without social relations. Further, Foucault ignores almost completely any systematic analysis of the common denominator of all discourses, education and the modalities of its transmission. (Bernstein 1990: 134)

Crucially, while Foucault's (1979) work shows how power relations are not simply repressive but also productive, there is little or no analysis of how power relations can be contested and transformed by different agencies and agents. By contrast, for Bernstein (1985; 1988; 1990), power relations are always open to contestation, challenge and change through the principles of control realised in the rituals and interactions of communication.

The explicit distinction of Bernstein between power and control makes it possible to analyse the modalities of pedagogic practices within a given distribution of power, to explain the transformations of modalities within a given distribution of power, and the transformations of modalities from the transformations in the distribution of power. (Diaz 1984: 358)

### **Pedagogic discourses, relays and devices**

Bernstein's concept of an emergent TPS speculates about how new modes of social control might be realised and enacted in the formation of new pedagogic agencies, agents and discourses. It is a theory that translates into an empirical method for investigating the pedagogic agencies and agents constituting a division of labour for the production, distribution and acquisition of discursive resources (Bernstein 2001b). The TPS concept gestures towards thinking about pedagogic practices at three different levels, which cannot simply be described as macro, mezzo and micro. These three levels of pedagogic governance through cultural relays or pedagogic devices are:



1. *Distributive* – the formation of new pedagogic agencies, agents and discourses as a consequence of changes in the modes of economic production. These agencies and actors are responsible for determining what constitutes valid knowledge, how this knowledge should be organised and distributed, and what measures will be used to assess acquisition of knowledge.
2. *Recontextualising* – the recontextualisation by various agencies of official or valid knowledge(s) selected for cultural transmission. The struggles of agents within and between agencies over the production of learning resources are intense, because these are struggles over what is deemed worth knowing, how this knowledge should be taught, to whom, by whom, and to what level of proficiency, at what stage of the life journey.
3. *Evaluative* – learning resources realised in specific pedagogic practices (Bernstein 1990, 1996, 2000).

These generative principles constitute the pedagogic device. Bernstein (1990) argues that the pedagogic device 'is the principal producer of symbolic control as well as of social destinies' (Tyler 2010: 149). The device sets the conditions for 'the production, reproduction and transformation of culture' (Bernstein 1990: 180):

These rules are themselves hierarchically related in the sense that the nature of the distributive rules regulates the recontextualizing rules, which in turn, regulate the rules of evaluation. These distributive rules regulate the fundamental relation between power, social groups, forms of consciousness and practice, and their reproductions and productions. The recontextualizing rules regulate the constitution of specific pedagogic discourse. The rules of evaluation are constituted in pedagogic practice. (1990: 80)

Bernstein's (2000, 1996) approach and focus on pedagogic devices, relays, discourses and practices pick up on themes of new class factions and nodal points of global communication learning circuits in his formulation of a TPS. He follows the logic of the Durkheimian problematic, which suggests that cultural processes must be interpreted in terms of modalities of communication before the generative dynamics of new modes of governance/governmentality can be explained adequately (see Halewood 2014; Schatzki 2004). He offers a way of thinking about the circuits of pedagogic power in an increasingly globalised, networked society. The phrase 'totally pedagogised society' signals that the 'site of the social' (Schatzki 2004) is increasingly constituted in the relations and practices of pedagogy. In other words, pedagogic relations constitute the dominant modes of social solidarity, cohesion and collectivity across global capitalism (Halewood 2014).<sup>1</sup> From this perspective, policy discourses such as 'learning or earning' constitute specific forms of moral and material constraints on the practices of individuals, and constitute particular forms of social and pedagogic identities.

Bernstein (2001a) argues that the 'weak state of the Global Economy' becomes the strong pedagogic state,<sup>2</sup> increasingly regulating social conduct through pedagogical power relations. On this point, Bernstein (2001a: 367) argues that

the TPS is state driven and state funded, state focussed and state assessed. Today the State through processes of centralised decentralisation, with its management strategies of resources following achieved targets, is making and distributing the possibilities of new pedagogic 'knowledges' through a range of formal and informal agencies.

Pedagogy and pedagogic relations – increasingly allied with technology – move outside the confines of state-centralised bureaucratic boundaries to constitute the primary or totalising binding agency for social cohesion (see Tyler 2004). Central to Bernstein's theory of an emergent TPS is an exposition of the complex division of labour for the production, dissemination and acquisition of discursive resources. He begins by suggesting that the new middle class 'was a middle late twentieth century formation, arising out of corporate capitalism, new technologies of production and management, but also arising out of the general application of discourses of symbolic control made available in universities' (Bernstein 2001b: 23). He is interested in examining the power relations between factions of this new middle class, and crucially the role that agencies and agents of the new middle class play in constituting new modes of social governance/control. To this end, Bernstein (2001b) distinguishes between the field of economic production and the field of symbolic control: the former specialises in production codes, while the latter focuses on discursive codes:

Agents of symbolic control specialize in dominant discursive codes increasingly made available in the higher reaches of the educational system. These discursive codes shape legitimate ways of thinking, ways of relating, ways of feeling, forms of innovation and so specialize and distribute forms of consciousness, disposition and desire. (2001b: 25)

He distinguishes between those agents of symbolic control that function in the cultural field, a sub-set of the economic field, and those that function within the field of symbolic control (see also Apple 2002; Muller 2004). The differences relate to the type of agents employed in the different fields, and the type of services provided. For example, Bernstein distinguishes between teachers, doctors, lawyers, social workers and so forth working in the public and private sectors, as well the types of work unique to cultural fields in the economic field, such as design work in the fashion and cosmetic industries. He then goes on to explicate a division of labour consisting of six main categories, 'based upon the differentiation of discursive codes appropriated by agents favourably placed in the class structure by pedagogic capital obtained from higher education' (Bernstein 2001b: 25). These categories include regulators (religious, legal, prison agencies), repairers (medical, psychiatric, social services), reproducers (school

teachers), diffusers/recontextualisers/propagators (mass and specialised media), shapers (creators and designers – arts, crafts, sciences, humanities) and executors (public/civil servants). He notes five agencies in the field of symbolic control that are ‘directly or indirectly regulated by the State and closely subject to its policies’ (Bernstein 2001b: 26):

1. *Repairers*: Medicine, psychiatric, social service counselling, child guidance, etc.
2. *Reproducers*: School systems.
3. *Diffusers/Recontextualisers/Propagators*: State-regulated media agencies, state-controlled national theatres, opera, ballet, music, galleries.
4. *Shapers*: Universities and cognate agencies, research centres, research councils, private foundations.
5. *Executors*: Civil service, central and local governments.

Bernstein (2001b: 26) argues that, historically, the state has increased its regulation over the field of symbolic control as the division of labour within this field has ‘increased in complexity and differentiation’. He also suggests that the field of symbolic control is becoming increasingly feminised, with women dominating the so-called ‘caring’ professions of social work, psychology and teaching, and explores the relation between these professional identities, relations and modes of conduct with those that exist in the family/home, also increasingly sites of women’s labour in terms of paid and unpaid care (see Banks 1995). Moreover, Bernstein (2000) develops a framework for examining the different factions and ideological positions within the agencies of ‘caring’ professions in the field of symbolic control.

In developing a theory of state governance through the power of pedagogy, Bernstein (2000: 66) identifies four discursive pedagogic identity positions ‘in the official arena’, which represent ‘different approaches to regulating and managing change, moral, cultural and economic’. In broad terms, these pedagogic identity positions are depicted as: retrospective (RI); prospective (PI); de-centred market (DCM); and de-centred therapeutic (DCT). Thus two positions, RI and PI are state-centralising tendencies, while the DCM and DCT positions are de-centralising tendencies.<sup>3</sup> These pedagogic identity positions exemplify what Foucault (1979: 6) describes as the ‘peculiar intensity’ of the ‘two tendencies’ of modern governments: state centralisation, and de-centralised power and control. The problem of governmentality comes to pose itself in terms ‘of how to be ruled, by whom, to what extent, with what methods, etc.’ (1979: 6). For Bernstein (2000), individual and collective human agency and agents are not negated within this perspective, but what is foregrounded is the generative rules of pedagogic discourse, which projects different possibilities for the formation of pedagogic identities. In other words, the generative rules of pedagogic discourse refer to the power relations structuring the insulation boundaries between agencies, discourses and practices, and the control relations regulating modes of communication within and between these insulation boundaries. With the use of the terms ‘agencies’ and ‘agents’, Bernstein (2000) is clearly signalling that it is not ‘possible to treat social relations as arising simply from human relations’ (Gane 2004: 1). Rather, he signposts the increasingly important power relations exercised by discursive codes, objects and technologies in the constitution of pedagogised social relations.

Much has already been written about the performativity agenda of the de-centred market pedagogic identities constructed by the state (national, supranational, international), and the affect/effect of these policy discourses on teacher and student identities and pedagogic practices. So what does Bernstein have to offer that is new to this epistemological terrain? According to Tyler:

Bernstein's analysis points to the *structural autonomy of pedagogic discourse* as a field of reproductive practices. His approach ... is non-reductionist, integrative and oriented to the relations of discourse rather than to the distributive arrangements of political economy ... Bernstein's project points away from the primordial, willing subject of resistance theories to the interconnectedness of symbolic forms as they position actors in the regionalized and de-centred modalities of specific discourses ... Bernstein's approach suggests that the apparent paradoxes and contradictions of homogenizing national curricula and marketized reform may therefore be explained more satisfactorily in terms of the deeper and less accessible mediations of pedagogic discourse. (Tyler 1999: 269–70, emphasis added)

Bernstein's (2001b) unique contribution is his insistence that these discursive pedagogic identity positions in the official arena constitute only one aspect of the pedagogic relay or device. Systematic empirical investigation must take into account the ways in which these discursive codes are translated or recontextualised through the power and control principles of pedagogic discourses into specific pedagogic practices or pedagogic relations of communication. For Bernstein, the problematic is how the relations between different discursive pedagogic identity positions in the official arena are recontextualised or pedagogised to constitute specific pedagogic relations or modes of pedagogic governance in the everyday, and in turn how everyday interactions reproduce and change the whole/social order. Thus the four discursive pedagogic identity positions identified by Bernstein as operating within the official arena are 'nodes in a circulatory medium of symbolic exchange' (Tyler 1999: 275). These four pedagogic positions are instruments of governmentality, which attempt to manage or regulate 'the extreme conditions of moral ambiguity, and the proliferating technical and legal innovations which accompany the excesses of consumerism' (Tyler 1999: 282). The point is not to view these pedagogic identity positions as descriptive accounts, but rather through the 'underlying cultural logic' and 'cultural dynamic' – that is, the networks of power relations realised in the 'strength of their knowledge boundaries and associational properties' (Tyler 1999: 276).

This is not a straightforward re/production model. In other words, modes of pedagogic governance do not simply reproduce unequal class, race, gender or ethnic relations, even though they contribute to maintaining unequal power relations through social stratification. Rather, Bernstein's theory of an emergent TPS is a radical departure from the reproduction

models of the 1970s new sociology of education (Moore,2013). As Rochex (2011) argues, ontologically Bernstein proposes that:

the social real ... is ambivalent, open. It is a whole, an open multiplicity from which that which does not yet exist ... can appear as an 'event', 'news' or as 'fresh air' ... Ideally, the aim of a 'fighting' sociology would be to map such 'events' and their possibilities, which would constitute a very powerful means to stopping history from becoming a closed and backward-looking chronicle of what are always the same things simply under different masks. (De Queiroz 2011: 57)

In terms of governance through pedagogic means, a Bernstein-inspired approach would focus on the performative work of pedagogic governance, the pedagogic identities and relations constituted in and through new modes of pedagogy, and the ways in which pedagogic relations are emerging as the dominant modes of social control (Rochex 2011). The focus here is not simply on reproduction of unequal class relations but on the performative constitution of new social and material configurations, the creation of new social and material worlds in and through new pedagogic modes of governance (see Beck 2009; Singh 2015). The performative power of new modes of pedagogic governance is continuously producing new social distinctions, forms of social stratification, and social orders.

### **Pedagogic governance: Empirical investigations**

In this section, I review two studies that have deployed Bernstein's notion of pedagogic governance to examine, first, the instruments or regulation of teachers' work by international organisations (Robertson 2012) and, second, the differential distribution of critical thinking curriculum in Singapore (Lim 2015). Bernstein (2001b) emphasises the importance of analytical empirical investigations that not only examine existing power-pedagogy relations, but also imagine and project alternative pedagogic futures. His work on pedagogic discourse offers researchers tools with which to engage in diachronic and synchronic analyses of the pedagogic instruments or devices of global testing regimes and teacher surveys (see Robertson 2012; Tyler 2010).

The first empirical study reported in this paper undertaken by Robertson (2012) draws on the TPS concept to analyse the instruments of regulation or governance of teachers' work produced by international organisations (see also Ball 2003). Specifically, Robertson (2012: 2) examines 'the nature and extent of the denationalisation of teachers' work, the consequences for teachers as professionals, and how these processes might be contested'. Her contribution to extending the concept of the TPS is twofold. First, she makes use of Bernstein's (2000) concept of the field of symbolic control, classification (power) and framing (control) relations to examine the new visibility of teachers in the 'unfolding education policy drama' (Robertson 2012: 3). Second, her empirical investigation engages in a diachronic and synchronic analysis of globalising teacher policies and practices. The diachronic analysis adopts an 'historical approach that aims to register epochal changes' in regulating or governing teachers' work' (2012: 4). A synchronic analysis examines the different pedagogic instruments around teachers' work or student evaluation produced by different international agencies such as the OECD, World Bank, Gates Foundation, Pearson Publishing, and non-government organisations

in the fields of symbolic control and cultural fields (field of economic production). It examines the complex power struggles between various class factions over control of various pedagogic devices – that is, devices of student evaluation, or teacher surveys – as well as the dominance of particular devices in any historical period, and the ways in which these devices are recontextualised within specific national and local contexts (Robertson 2012).

The analyses highlight, first, the increasing regulation or governance of teachers' work by global agencies and, second, the contradictions and tensions in global discourses about teachers' work projected by, for example, the OECD – which adopts a 'pragmatic, European ordo-liberal', humanist approach, keeping 'open a role for the state in managing the market' – and the World Bank – which views 'education problems and their solutions within a free market framework' (Robertson 2012: 7). The survey instruments devised by these two global agencies, the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) and the World Bank's System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results (SABER) programme, are interpreted as particular types of pedagogic devices that govern inside national territories through the production of knowledge about the 'good teacher', 'professional development practices' and 'good teaching methods', and link this knowledge to student results (PISA, TIMMS). Robertson (2012: 14) argues that:

[W]e can discern four distinct, though not disconnected, denationalising processes at work which are reconstituting the field of symbolic control over the governance of teachers. Concretely, these denationalising tendencies have the potential to further recalibrate the power and control of the global agencies, though I will argue that this process is both uneven, and contested. These processes include the invocation of a global imaginary of both shared risk and a shared future; the emergence of new forms of transboundary relations which further erode the national; the relationally interconnected nature of global teacher learning, and the rise of new forms of private authority that sits beyond national spaces of representation and democratic accountability.

The second empirical study reported in this paper by Lim (2015) undertakes a diachronic analysis of the official curriculum produced by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, and highlights the emergence and evolution of critical thinking within these official pedagogic discourses. Crucially, Lim (2015) suggests that although all students in Singapore are given access to critical thinking curriculum, there are clear distinctions between the power and control principles regulating the selection and organisation of critical thinking knowledge for students attending elite and less advantaged schools. Students attending elite schools acquire critical thinking curriculum in the form of content knowledge *of* philosophy, and the experience of *doing* philosophical inquiry. Through access and acquisition of philosophical esoteric knowledge, they are positioned to acquire capacities of building on the legacy of foundational, disciplinary knowledge and projecting into a future where this philosophical knowledge is used to problem-solve, innovate and think about the 'unthinkable'. Such a

curriculum also builds capacities for self-reflection and introspection. By contrast, the generic pedagogy of critical thinking acquired by students attending less advantaged schools is instrumentalist in form and content, with few meaningful connections to a past and projections to the future.

Pedagogic makeovers are only available to those actors have acquired the capacities to make themselves available to be trained and retrained to deal with the continuous processes of social, economic, cultural and technological changes of flexible, liquid capitalism. Such capacities are increasingly developed and acquired through long periods of pedagogic socialisation into powerful forms of knowledge, as illustrated by the example of the critical thinking curriculum of philosophical esoteric knowledge made available to students attending elite schools in Singapore. Increasingly, these pedagogic capacities are being differentially distributed to students, producing new forms of social stratification.

### **Pedagogic device/epistemic device**

So far in this article, I have discussed Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse, the pedagogic device and relations of power/pedagogised knowledge as modes of pedagogic governance. I have not discussed the power and control relations around the production of new forms of scientific knowledge, even though I have referred to the complex division of labour around knowledge production in the fields of symbolic control and economic production. Rather, the focus of this article has been on the agencies and agents within the field of pedagogic recontextualisation or the pedagogisation of knowledge. In the essay on horizontal and vertical discourses, Bernstein (1999) shifts his attention to the rules for the formation of different discourses, and the types of knowledge structures that emerge from these discursive formations (see also Foucault 1972, 1989). Moore (2013) describes this shift in Bernstein's work to a focus on the epistemic rather than pedagogic device. Specifically, Bernstein is interested in the growth of different branches of specialist knowledge, and the power and control relations structuring the formation of different knowledge types. In particular, Bernstein (1999) draws attention to the growth of specialist knowledge in the social sciences as new agents enter the field of symbolic control, and the relation of these knowledge forms to everyday knowledge(s). He focuses specifically on the 'number of practitioners', and the 'increase in the number of languages and procedures of inquiry' in the social sciences over the last 40 years (Bernstein 1999: 166). Astutely, he asks whether this growth in social scientific knowledge can be attributed to a number of factors such as: (1) new class habitus and rituals of those entering sites of knowledge production; (2) inbuilt redundancy of social scientific knowledge during periods of rapid social change; (3) the discursive shift from equality (of opportunity) to recognition of diversity; and (4) the colonisation of specialist knowledge by everyday knowledge. Bernstein's (1999) thesis on different types of specialist knowledge and the differential distribution and acquisition of specialist knowledge has been reformulated by Bernstein scholars to develop a distinction between powerful knowledge and knowledge of the powerful (Beck 2014; Rata 2015; Wheelahan 2010). These scholars argue that while increasing numbers of students from disadvantaged groups remain at school longer and enter higher education institutions, they are denied distributional justice via limited access to powerful knowledge forms (see Rata 2015). In particular, Gamble (2014a, 2014b) coins the

term 'epistemic selves' to theorise different pedagogic identities constituted through access and acquisition of different knowledge forms. As Lim (2015) explains, all students in Singapore are given access to critical thinking curriculum, but there are clear distinctions between the power and control principles regulating the selection and organisation of critical thinking knowledge for students attending elite and less-advantaged schools. The pedagogic relation constituted in and by critical thinking curriculum has a social, political and economic basis. A critical thinking curriculum is produced by different agencies and agents in the fields of symbolic control (Ministry of Education, University Departments of Philosophy, teacher education) and the cultural field within the field of economic production (commercial publishers), and recontextualised by school leaders and teachers (as they grapple with state visions and ideologies), then distributed to different cohorts of students. Elite and less advantaged schools in Singapore are differently resourced and enabled to hire teachers and enact a critical thinking curriculum.

### **Discussion**

This article has extrapolated Bernstein's (2001a, 2001b) notion of pedagogic governance – that is, the governance of whole populations through pedagogic means in an emergent totally pedagogised society. It argues that Bernstein's TPS concept commenced with his focus on pedagogic devices, discourses and identities, a project begun in the last decade of his theoretical oeuvre and culminated in this analysis of different specialised knowledge structures, the epistemic device. The article also compared Foucault and Bernstein's notions of power relations and pedagogic governance. Bernstein (2000: 77) suggests that the emergent TPS is characterised by a 'revival of forms of the sacred'. New routines and 'rituals of inwardness' (2000: 77) or introspection are evoked through globally networked pedagogic modes. He implores researchers to turn their gaze away from the surface features of new pedagogic modes, such as trainability, to an analysis of the conditions that make these pedagogic modes effective, and examine which groups are expected to acquire these pedagogic modes (see also Wheelahan 2010). So what are the conditions that make trainability as a pedagogic mode effective in the TPS?

The insidious effect of 'trainability' is that it renders invisible (or inaudible) the requirement of prior identity induction into a moral and discursive order that is overwhelmingly still provided at home and school for the middle class and almost solely at school for the old and new poor. We may say that the perniciousness of 'trainability' lies in its camouflage of the renewed importance of the school for the production of specialized identities and in the false, because unattainable, allure that attaches itself to the promise of 'trainability' as a consequence. (Muller 2004: 5)

The allure of continuous makeover by pedagogic means is supposedly available to all actors. But this is the fantasy of pedagogic makeovers. Implicit within the new pedagogic translations



is a model of the ideal learner that has the capacity (not ability) to ‘*meaningfully* rather than relevantly or instrumentally project’ themselves into a pedagogised future (Bernstein 2001: 366). How is this capacity for meaningful projection acquired? Bernstein (2001: 366) argues that induction into these capacities is through ‘a particular social order, through relations which the identities enters into with other identities of reciprocal recognition, support, and legitimation, and finally through a negotiated *collective* purpose’. In other words, pedagogic makeovers are not available to everyone on an equal or equitable basis. Rather, the pedagogic makeover is differentially distributed to those social groups that have acquired the necessary capacities through previous pedagogic socialisation.

Crucially, the concept of the TPS offers insights into a new object and mode of inquiry for sociologists of education, a radical departure from theories of social re/production to the central role of pedagogy in social production or formation (Tyler 2004).<sup>4</sup> Bernstein’s work is generative in that it develops scenarios of possible futures, with the central role of pedagogy constituting these possible futures (Muller 2004). As Tyler (1999; 2004) argues the TPS signals the global spread of invisible modes of pedagogy, which are designed, disseminated and enacted by a new faction of the middle class, to interrupt patterns of class formation and stratification. This is the prediction of the concept of the totally pedagogised society – constant change, renewal and interruption through pedagogic means.

## References

- Apple, M.W. (2002). ‘Does Education Have Independent Power? Bernstein and the Question of Relative Autonomy’. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4): 607–16.
- Arnot, M. and Reay, D. (2006). ‘Power, Pedagogic Voices and Pupil Talk: The Implications for Pupil Consultation as Transformative Practice’. In R. Moore, M. Arnot, J. Beck and H. Daniels (eds), *Knowledge, Power and Social Change*. London: Routledge, pp. 75–93.
- Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, Structure and Reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Methuen.
- Atkinson, P. (2014). ‘Book Review: *Basil Bernstein: The Thinker and the Field* by Rob Moore’. *The Sociological Review*, 62: 217–28.
- Ball, S.J. (2003). ‘The Teacher’s Soul and the Terrors of Performativity’. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2): 215–28.
- Banks, O. (1995). ‘The Legacy of Bernstein’. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16(2): 255–8.
- Beck, J. (2009). ‘Appropriating Professionalism: Restructuring the Official Knowledge Base of England’s “Modernised” Teaching Profession’. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(1): 3–14.

- Beck, J. (2014). 'Powerful Knowledge, Esoteric Knowledge, Curriculum Knowledge'. In B.D. Barrett and E. Rata (eds), *Knowledge and the Future of the Curriculum International Studies in Social Realism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 65–78.
- Beck, J. and Young, M.F.D. (2005). 'The Assault on the Professions and the Restructuring of Academic and Professional Identities: A Bernsteinian Analysis'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2): 183–97.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions (Class, Codes and Control Vol. 3)*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1985). 'On Pedagogic Discourse'. In J. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research in the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press, pp. 205–40).
- Bernstein, B. (1988). 'On Pedagogic Discourse (Revised)'. *Collected Original Reports in Education (CORE)*, 12(1): 1–86.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1995). 'A Response.' In A. Sadovnik (ed.), *Knowledge and Pedagogy. The Sociology of Basil Bernstein*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 385–424.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity. Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and Horizontal Discourses: an essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 157-173.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*, 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernstein, B. (2001a). 'From Pedagogies to Knowledges'. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies and H. Daniels (eds), *Towards A Sociology of Pedagogy: The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 363–8.
- Bernstein, B. (2001b). 'Symbolic Control: Issues of Empirical Description of Agencies and Agents'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(1): 21–33.
- Bernstein, B. and Solomon, J. (1999). 'Pedagogy, Identity and the Construction of a Theory of Symbolic Control: Basil Bernstein questioned by Joseph Solomon'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2): 265–79.
- Bonal, X. and Rambla, X. (2003). 'Captured by the Totally Pedagogised Society'. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1(2): 169–84.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity. The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

- Cheung, K.W. (1996). 'The Regulation of Pedagogic Discourse: Relationships between the State and Intellectuals after the Cultural Revolution in China'. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 16(1): 41–55.
- Cheung, K.W. and Pan, S. (2006). 'Transition of Moral Education in China: Towards Regulated Individualism'. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2(2): 27–50.
- Collins, R. (1994). *Four Sociological Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Queiroz, J.-M. (2011). 'The Message the Voice'. In D. Frandji and P. Vitale (eds), *Knowledge, Pedagogy and Society: International Perspectives on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Education*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 49–61.
- Davies, B. (1994). 'Durkheim and the Sociology of Education in Britain'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15(1): 3–25.
- Diaz, M.V. (1984). 'A Model of Pedagogic Discourse with Special Application to the Colombian Primary Level of Education'. PhD thesis, University of London.
- Evans, J., Rich, E., Davies, B. and Allwood, R. (2005). 'The Embodiment of Learning: What the Sociology of Education Doesn't Say About "Risk" in Going to School'. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 15(2): 129–48.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. S. Smith, trans. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1979). 'Governmentality'. *Ideology and Consciousness*, 6: 5–21.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Gamble, J. (2014a). "'Approaching the Sacred": Directionality in the Relation between Curriculum and Knowledge Structure'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(1): 56–72.
- Gamble, J. (2014b). 'Sequencing Rules as a Condition of Knowledge Structure'. In B.D. Barrett and E. Rata (eds.), *Knowledge and the Future of the Curriculum: International Studies in Social Realism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 169–80.
- Gane, N. (2004). 'Introduction: Rethinking Social Theory'. In N. Gane (ed.), *The Future of Social Theory*, London: Continuum, pp. 1–16.
- Halewood, M. (2014). *Rethinking the Social Through Durkheim, Marx, Weber and Whitehead*. London: Anthem Press.
- Kanes, C., Morgan, C. and Tsatsaroni, A. (2014). 'The PISA Mathematics Regime: Knowledge Structures and Practices of the Self'. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 87(2): 145–65.

- Lim, L. (2015). 'Knowledge, Control and Critical Thinking in Singapore: State Ideology and the Politics of Pedagogic Recontextualization'. Singapore, Routledge.
- Lingard, B. (2013). 'The Impact of Research on Education Policy in an Era of Evidence-based Policy'. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2): 113–31.
- Magalhaes, A. and Soer, S. (2003). 'Performance, Citizenship and the Knowledge Society: A New Mandate for European Education Policy', *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1(1): 40–66.
- Moore, R. (2013). *Basil Bernstein: The Thinker and the Field*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Muller, J. (2004). 'Introduction: The Possibilities of Basil Bernstein.' In J. Muller, B. Davies and A. Morais (eds), *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–14.
- Muller, J. (2011a). 'The essential tension: an essay on sociology as knowledge'. In D. Frandji and P. Vitale (eds), *Knowledge, Pedagogy and Society. International Perspectives on Basil Bernstein's sociology of education*. London, New York: Routledge, pp.211-223.
- Muller, J. (2011b). 'Through Others' Eyes'. In F. Christie & K. Maton (ed.), *Disciplinary. Functional Linguistic and Sociological Perspectives*. London: Continuum, pp. 13-34.
- Pykett, J. (2009). 'Pedagogical Power: Lessons from School Spaces.' *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 4(2): 102–16.
- Pykett, J. (2010). 'Citizenship Education and Narratives of Pedagogy'. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(6): 621–35.
- Rata, E. (2015). 'A Pedagogy of Conceptual Progression and the Case for Academic Knowledge'. *British Educational Research Journal*, doi: 10.1002/berj.3195.
- [Rochex, J.-Y. \(2011\). 'The Work of Basil Bernstein: A Non-“Sociologistic” and Therefore Non-Deterministic Sociology'. In D. Frandji and P. Vitale \(eds.\), \*Knowledge, Pedagogy and Society: International Perspectives on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Education\*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 77–94.](#)
- Robertson, S.L. (2012). 'Placing Teachers in Global Governance Agendas'. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(4): 584–607.
- Singh, P. (1993). 'Institutional Discourse and Practice'. A Case Study of the Social Construction of Technological Competence in the Primary Classroom'. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 14(1): 39–58.
- Singh, P. (2002) 'Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's Theory of the Pedagogic Device'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4): 571–82.

- Singh, P. (2013). 'Unlocking Pedagogic Mazers: Extended Review'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(5): 799–807.
- Singh, P. (2015). 'Performativity and Pedagogising Knowledge: Globalising Educational Policy Formation, Dissemination and Enactment'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(3): 363–84.
- Tyler, W. (1995). 'Decoding School Reform: Bernstein's Market-Oriented Pedagogy and Postmodern Power'. In A. Sadovnik (ed.), *Knowledge and Pedagogy. The Sociology of Basil Bernstein*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 237–58.
- Tyler, W. (1999). 'Pedagogic Identities and Educational Reform in the 1990s: The Cultural Dynamics of National Curricula'. In F. Christie (ed.), *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness*, London: Continuum, pp. 262–89.
- Tyler, W. (2001). 'Crosswired: Hypertext, Critical Theory and Pedagogic Discourse', in A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies and H. Daniels (eds), *Towards A Sociology of Pedagogy: The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 339–56.
- Tyler, W. (2004). 'Silent, Invisible, Total: Pedagogic Discourse and the Age of Information'. In J. Muller, B. Davies and A. Morais (eds), *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein*. London: Routledge, pp. 15–29.
- Tyler, W. (2010). 'Towering TIMSS or Leaning PISA? Vertical and Horizontal Models of International Testing Regimes'. In P. Singh, A. Sadovnik and S. Semel (eds), *Toolkits, Translation Devices and Conceptual Accounts. Essays on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Peter Lang, , pp. 43–160.
- Schatzki, T.R. (2004). *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Whelehan, L. (2010). 'The Structure of Pedagogic Discourse as a Relay for Power: The Case of Competency-Based Training'. In P. Singh, A. Sadnovik and S. Semel (eds), *Toolkits, Translation Devices, and Conceptual Accounts*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 47–64.

## Notes

---

- <sup>1</sup> Both Halewood (2014) and Schatzki (2004) analyse Durkheim's concept of society by formulating new understandings of the relation between sociology and philosophy.
- <sup>2</sup> Castells (1977: 243–4) argues that, 'State control over space and time is increasingly bypassed by global flows of capital, goods, services, technology, communication and information. The state's capture of historical time through its appropriation of tradition and the (re)construction of national identity is challenged by plural identities as defined by autonomous subjects. The state's attempt to reassert its power in the global arena by

developing supranational institutions further undermines its sovereignty. And the state's effort to restore legitimacy by decentralizing administrative power to regional and local levels reinforces centrifugal tendencies by bringing citizens closer to government but increasing their aloofness toward the nation-state.'

<sup>3</sup> 'It is as if the complex contrary movement combines both of Durkheim's drives beyond all thresholds at the same time: greater totalitarian control (and fatalism) especially of the individual over him/herself on the one side, and deregulation beyond all norms (anomie) into the system itself (anomaly).' (Gane, cited in Tyler 1999: 282)

<sup>4</sup> As Tyler (2004: 15–16) argues, 'If pedagogic principles are so ubiquitous and pervasive (though invisible and voiceless) in defining many of the processes of contemporary culture, then what are conventionally accepted to be the social and communicative relations between school and society are inverted. No longer do educational processes merely reproduce society but, in some sense, they constitute and legitimate that society.'