This is the published version of a paper published in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*.

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Socialisation and citizenship preparation in vocational education: Pedagogic codes and democratic rights in VET-subjects

Mattias Nylund, Kristina Ledman, Per-Åke Rosvall & Maria Rönnlund

Published online: 17 Oct 2019.

Submit your article to this journal ☑

Article views: 653

View related articles ☑

View Crossmark data ☑

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Socialisation and citizenship preparation in vocational education: Pedagogic codes and democratic rights in VET-subjects

Mattias Nylund[a] , Kristina Ledman[b] , Per-Åke Rosvall[c] and Maria Rönnlund[c]

[a]Department of Education and Special Education, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden; [b]Department of Education, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden; [c]Department of Applied Educational Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

ABSTRACT

Previous studies of citizenship preparation in upper secondary school, including studies on vocational programmes, have primarily focused on general subjects. Potential and actual roles of vocational subjects in this context have received little attention, so we have little knowledge of what is likely a significant part of the citizenship preparation that occurs in vocational programmes. Drawing on the work of Basil Bernstein and ethnographic data, this study presents an analysis of socialisation processes in vocational elements of three vocational programmes in Swedish upper secondary school. The analysis addresses the formation of pedagogic codes in various vocational programmes and subjects, and how these codes condition students' practice of citizenship at individual, social and political levels. The results show how different pedagogic codes have different implications for the students' practice of citizenship, and thus raise questions about factors and processes that may either constrain or strengthen, this aspect in vocational subject classes.

The focal problem and purpose of the study

There is a long history of differentiation in education, that prepares young people from different class backgrounds for unequal future life chances and experiences and channels them into very different positions in society and the division of labour (Bernstein 2000; Bourdieu and Passeron 1970). Vocational education, in Sweden and elsewhere, is embedded and plays key roles in such contexts by primarily attracting working-class students and socializing them for working-class jobs. However, part of the mission of modern mass educational systems in liberal democracies is to foster formally equal citizens by promoting reproduction of essential conditions for democratic governance. The tension between these two processes highlights the importance of raising and addressing questions about citizenship preparation in education, particularly in contexts such as vocational programmes.

Moreover, previous studies of citizenship preparation in upper secondary school, including studies on vocational programmes, have primarily focused on general subjects. The potential and actual roles of vocational subjects in this context have received little attention, so we have little knowledge of what is likely a significant part of the citizenship preparation that occurs in vocational programmes. Thus, in this study we focus on the socialisation that occurs in vocational elements of three vocational programmes in Swedish upper secondary school and how this socialisation can be understood in terms of citizenship preparation.

Based on an analysis of ethnographic data, the aim is to generate knowledge about young people's socialisation in various vocational programmes and subject classes, and the implications of this socialisation for citizenship preparation. The results may extend both fundamental sociological understanding of socialisation and citizenship preparation in VET programmes and important didactic understanding for teachers and educational planners when organizing VET in the context of citizenship preparation. In our analysis we draw on the work of Bernstein (2000).

Pedagogic codes and democratic rights

Much research on VET has focused on skills, and less on socialisation or 'values' (Colley et al. 2003; Eriksdottir and Rosvall 2019). In this study, the teaching and learning of skills is understood as an expression of values, i.e. we understand these dimensions of knowledge (skills/ values) as closely related (Fine 1985). Bernstein (2000) discussed how this relation can be understood by postulating that an instructional discourse (of skills) is always embedded in a regulative discourse (of social order). Furthermore, Bernstein also claimed that a discourse of social order not only permeates, but also always dominates, the teaching of skills. Although this may be an exaggeration, as Muller and Hoadley (2010) point out, it seems to be a reasonable assumption in the context of vocational education, as suggested by much earlier research (see more below). Teaching is always based on principles of social order, e.g. rules about how to behave and communicate. Teaching and learning also have a socialising dimension as our actions in the world are based on our assumed knowledge of it. To learn something is thus connected to becoming someone (Colley et al. 2003; Young 2008).

In order to unveil the underlying principles and processes of socialisation in the vocational programmes we use the 'pedagogic code' concept introduced by Bernstein (2000). According to Bernsteinian theory, a pedagogic code is an expression of the classification and framing of education that emerges from the principles governing the organisation of knowledge and learning. Briefly, classification refers to the strength of boundaries between categories of subject matter, actors, and discourses, as well as the social division of labour (at macro level) and organisational/structural facets of pedagogic practice (at micro level). If the boundaries are clear and explicit, classification is strong (C+) and if the separation of categories is blurred classification is weak (C−). Framing is a concept that directs the analytical focus towards the principles regulating communication and learning in education. It concerns the relationships set up within a given classification, particularly the relation between teacher and student, and aspects such as the order and tempo at which knowledge is to be learned, and how learning is to be evaluated. Like classification, framing may have strong or weak forms. When rules and principles for classroom practices are clear and explicit, framing is regarded as strong (F+). When rules and principles for learning are

rather implicit, framing is weak (F−). In sum: a pedagogic code emerges from the principles that govern how knowledge and learning are organized and any pedagogic practice can be described in terms of a particular combination of certain strengths of classification and framing. Analysing education through the lens of pedagogic codes places socialisation at the centre of the investigation:

> Code shapes who we are, who we think we can become and what we think we can do. Code is embedded in human consciousness; that is, in the relationship between the inner worlds of individuals and the outer world of systems and structures. … And, following Bernstein, the main issue is the extent to which students have access to the capacity to be agents who can change the inner self/outer world relationship so that 'an alternative order, an alternative society and an alternative power relation' might be realized. (McLean, Abbas, and Ashwin 2013, 265)

The theoretical rationale of our empirical investigation is as follows. First, we analyse the pedagogic codes, i.e. core principles regulating the what (classification) and how (framing) of the 'instructional discourse' (educational practice) in the vocational programmes. We then apply the acquired insights in an analysis of the regulative discourses permeating different vocational programmes, and the relation between instructional and regulative discourses, to address the actual and potential roles of vocational elements of the programmes in citizenship preparation.

There are many citizenship theories that could be used in such analysis. Space precludes thorough discussion of them. Here, when discussing implications of pedagogic codes for citizenship, we continue to draw on Bernsteinian theory, applying his idea of basic democratic rights that need to be ensured in schools if they are to play a meaningful part in maintaining democratic governance. These rights operate on different levels and are described in Bernstein (2000) as; the right to individual enhancement (individual level), the right to social inclusion (social level) and the right to political participation (political level). These rights, according to Bernstein, can be seen as a minimum requirement for students to get access to in schools if they are to have any stake, or confidence, in the school or, in the long run, the society they live in. Individual enhancement is, at its core, about education offering each student 'tension points condensing the past *and* opening possible futures' or, in other words, 'the right to the means of critical understanding and to new possibilities' (Bernstein 2000, xx). Social inclusion, at its core, is about 'the right to be included, socially, intellectually, culturally and personally' (Bernstein 2000, xx). Bernstein did not elaborate much on the precise meaning of such inclusion, but included the right to be autonomous on this level. In our understanding this is a very context-sensitive right, i.e. the kind of belonging that empowers an individual is highly dependent on the context. The right to political participation is, at its core, 'the right to participate in procedures whereby order is constructed, maintained and changed' (Bernstein 2000, xxi).

The context

Previous studies have shown that a 'regulative discourse' often plays a prominent role in education for working class positions, including vocational programmes in Sweden (Berner 1989; Frykholm and Nitzler 1993; Norlund 2011). Focusing on issues of socialisation and distribution of knowledge in the educational system, major highlighted principles in this

discourse include punctuality, orderliness and 'good habits', while much less importance is attached to knowledge of a more theoretical and critical kind (Anyon 1983; Apple 2004; Beach 2018). In previous studies (Ledman, Rosvall, and Nylund 2018; Nylund, Rosvall, and Ledman 2017) we have shown how this is expressed in the contemporary Swedish upper secondary curriculum. However, the principles guiding actual pedagogic practice, and how they differ between different vocational programmes and relate to democratic rights, have not been thoroughly explored. Other authors have highlighted needs to understand close connections between the socialisation in VET programmes and structures in the labour market (Colley et al. 2003; Frykholm and Nitzler 1993; Ledman, Rosvall, and Nylund 2018; Riseborough 1992). This implies a need to recognize key structures in the labour market when analysing regulative discourses in VET. These may include gendered discourses reproducing a view that men's work is oriented towards 'production' and women's work towards 'consumption' (Connell 2006; Odih 2007), and features of 'good worker dispositions' recognized in relevant segments of the labour market (Colley et al. 2003).

Studies of citizenship preparation and related aspects such as critical thinking in upper secondary school in Sweden have primarily focused on structures and practices associated with general subjects such as Social science, Swedish or History (Andersson 2012; Ledman 2015; Norlund 2011). Studies in sociology of knowledge, conducted both in Sweden and elsewhere, have shown that the organisation and distribution of educational content has consequences for the roles students are prepared for as both workers and citizens (Apple 2004; Davies 2015). However, with few exceptions (see Colley et al. 2003; Wheelahan 2010; Young and Gamble 2006) such studies have not been directed towards vocational education or vocational elements of vocational programmes. There is thus a need for more knowledge and understanding of citizenship preparation in VET, particularly its vocational elements.

Sweden provides an interesting context for such investigation since, together with the other Nordic countries, it has been widely regarded as a strong proponent of equality and the preparation of all students to be active, critical workers and citizens (Fejes, Nylund, and Wallin 2018; Lappalainen, Nylund, and Rosvall 2018). The post-war educational policies in Sweden, reducing differences between educational pathways recruiting pupils from different social classes, should be seen in this context (Nicaise et al. 2005). Upper secondary school is a case in point. In 1971, a new organisational structure for upper secondary school was created, in which vocational programmes and academic programmes preparing students for higher education were integrated. Since then, there has been one common overarching curriculum for all upper secondary school students. This re-organisation of vocational education also dramatically changed conditions for knowledge and learning. Vocational education became primarily school-based, located in school settings, and educational content of a less context-bound character was prioritised. Over time, this also increased access to higher education for students in vocational education (Nylund, 2012). This organisation of VET in Sweden provided less differentiation from 'academic' pathways than in other similar countries (Brockmann, Clarke, and Winch 2010), and stronger prioritisation of general content.

However, as noted in a number of studies (Beach, 2018; Lappalainen, Nylund, and Rosvall 2018; Nylund, Rosvall, and Ledman 2017), in recent decades policy goals such as promoting unification, equality and citizenship have largely been replaced, or reinterpreted, by the promotion of goals such as competition and employability, with clear influences from international policy discourses (Sundberg and Wahlström, 2012). In this process, the proportions

of time assigned to general subjects in VET programmes has been reduced, and curricula of the subjects have narrowed to link them more closely with labour market segments the programmes are oriented towards (Nylund, Rosvall, and Ledman 2017). This has further increased the importance of vocational subjects' role in citizenship preparation. Furthermore, since VET programmes differ strongly in key respects such as knowledge content, traditions of workplace learning, proportions of boys and girls enrolled and transitions to higher education, the citizenship preparation in vocational subjects is likely to vary significantly among programmes.

Methods, methodology and empirics

This study is based on ethnographic data produced in an ongoing research project intended to generate knowledge concerning the extent and nature of learning processes that can be characterized as civic education in vocational subjects, and to what extent and why these processes vary among programmes and school contexts. The data considered here consist of 85 field days of classroom observations, supplemented with collected teaching materials and interviews with 81 students and 10 teachers. Four researchers adopted a 'collective ethnography' approach (Beach et al. 2018; Gordon et al. 2006), in which each researcher followed two VET classes. In total, two Vehicle and Transport (VT), two Restaurant Management (RM) and two Health and Social care (HC) programme classes were followed. The data were collected during the first year of the students´ upper secondary education. As we primarily focus on the 85 field days of classroom observations, the amount of data could be regarded as 'thin' compared to that of classical ethnographic studies (Jeffrey and Troman 2003). However, the research team collectively have many years of previous ethnographic research experience in school contexts connected to VET.

These VET programmes differ in important respects, for instance in the ratio of girls to boys enrolled: in the HC, RM and VT programmes approximately 80, 58 and 14% of the student population are female, respectively (Ledman, Rosvall, and Nylund 2018). There are also curriculum-level differences, in that the HC programme includes more knowledge of a disciplinary and theoretical character than the VT and RM programmes. This is reflected in patterns of transition to higher education (HE), as very few of the VT (0%) and RM programme (2%) students transition to HE a year after completing their upper secondary education, but a much larger proportion of HC students (14%) (Swedish National Agency of Education 2018). The programmes included in the project were selected to capture the diverse nature of different VET programmes, representing *inter alia* different sectors, ratios of girls/boys enrolled and proportion of immigrants. However, the purpose of this study is not to focus on specific aspects such as gender or ethnicity, but to capture the general principles of socialisation in these programmes in the context of citizenship preparation.

At the onset of our data collection, we set out with a very broad research objective: to investigate the extent and nature of learning processes that can be characterized as civic education in the vocational elements of the vocational programmes we followed. All four researchers recorded observations for full days in the assigned classes, focusing on lessons and activities associated with the vocational subjects. In parallel to the observations we had regular meetings to discuss our data. When the first school year ended, we had identified a number of themes that we regarded as important to understand the vocational

elements' role in citizenship preparations, including implications of the basic principles of socialisation in the programmes. Initial analysis of these implications identified a number of themes concerning apparently relevant factors, such as time-keeping, tempo, solidarity, discipline, theory/practice and school/workplace boundaries, space, and worker-citizen identities. However, after some initial writing and discussion we concluded that the concept 'pedagogic code' would be helpful to unpack the similarities and differences we had identified between the programmes and the implications for citizenship preparation.[1]

Analysis

The analysis presented below is structured as follows. First, we present our analysis of the framing and classification of the pedagogic practice. Then, we condense these findings in a discussion of different pedagogic codes and how they promote differences in 'how to be' and 'how not to be' in the three programmes. Finally, we address implications of these codes for citizenship preparation.

The 'how' in vocational subjects

There were great variations in framing among the programmes. In the RM classes the framing was generally strong. Much of the time in the vocational elements was spent in locales such as kitchens or bakeries within the school, simulating workplace-like environments. The students were given explicit instructions, such as recipes to follow, the importance of sequence, time-keeping and tempo was emphasised, and the teacher often commented on the monetary value of their work, as illustrated in the excerpt below.

> The students are working on making sausages.
>
> Teacher: Some tempo now! You cost a company half a Euro a minute.
>
> Student: Half a Euro?
>
> Teacher: Yes, if you don't do anything for one minute you will cost the company half a Euro.
>
> (Field note, RM-programme).

In one of the RM classes, most of the things the students worked on during their lessons were subsequently offered for sale in one of the schools' shops or cafés. This created strong framing in the sense that time, price and precise instructions were important. The importance of tempo was also stressed by several teachers in informal conversations they had with researchers outside the lessons. One of the teachers said that for her "This is the hardest thing; to accept that they (the students) are so slow in comparison to how we work in real working life". The observed framing starkly differed in the HC classes, where the students often continued working on a certain assignment given in a course in a lesson on another subject, so the sequencing was less important. Generally, the instructions for tasks were also framed much more weakly, sometimes resulting in confusion about what was to be done, as illustrated by the following conversation:

The students are in a 'practical room'. Some are practicing lifting each other, the others are working with the coursebook.

Teacher: So, you who can't work on lifts, work with the coursebook. In chapter five, there are a number of questions you need to answer.

The students open their books and start to read. After a short while a student asks:

Student: Do we need the book to be able to answer the questions?

Teacher: Yes, No. Well… The book can provide inspiration, but you don´t need it.

The teacher elaborates that the students need to think about how it would feel to be in a certain position as a care recipient.

Student: But, if it's only about what I think, why should I even read the book?

Teacher: Well, look at this picture – how do you think this girl feels? Think about the situation. Think about how it feels. To be taken care of in different ways.

Student: Should I write what I think?

Teacher: Nooo, it's about that thing we call 'treatment' (bemötande in Swedish).

The conversation continues for a while in a similar vein. More students ask questions of a similar nature, e.g. 'Should I write how it would feel if it were me?' 'Should I write in first person?' There seems to be much confusion about what the students should do. (Field note, HC-programme).

Students in the HC classes often arrived late for the lessons. For the most part this did not provoke strong reactions from the teachers, in stark contrast to the RM classes. Moreover, students often came without their course-books, or other materials they needed for the lessons, again in stark contrast to the RM classes. Another illustration of the contrast in framing is that a teacher in an informal conversation said that she had rearranged for Medicine lessons to start at 08.30 instead of at 08.00, since so few students came on time. Conversely, a teacher from one of the RM classes explained that he started bakery lessons early on Fridays, at 07.00, to make the school more like a real workplace.

The framing in the VT classes differed from that in both HC and RM classes. It was even weaker than in the HC classes in terms of tempo, sequence and instructions from teachers. The teachers rarely commented that the students needed to finish tasks or work more quickly. On the contrary, the tempo was often strikingly slow, and the students often did things in an order and tempo of their own choosing. However, late arrivals were taken more seriously in the VT classes than in the HC classes and the students did quite a lot of tasks in the coursebook of a 'connecting the dots' kind. Sometimes the tasks were related to machinery in the school's machine hall, as in the following excerpt:

Two girls are sitting, working on a section in the coursebook called 'Clutch'.

Researcher: What are you doing then when you're done? Do you correct the tasks yourself or?

Girl: No, the teachers correct for you. […]

In another corner of the room another girl sits and asks the teacher who just came in for help correcting the task she has finished in the book, by saying: 'You must correct this.'

Teacher: Then I need to know which engine you looked at when you wrote your answers. Show me which it was.

They disappear into the machine hall. When they return, the girl sits down, and the teacher looks at her answers in the book. He asks questions about what she wrote and the questions she has answered incorrectly receive particular attention. Sometimes they go back to the machine hall to see the engine again. (Field note, VT-programme).

These tasks can be described as quite strongly framed, and part of a 'right-or-wrong discourse' of knowledge, which was very rare in the HC setting. Although we observed exceptions, the tasks in the VT classes were not generally framed with much instruction from the teachers or given any time-frames.

There was substantial variation in degrees to which the students individually, in pairs or in group in all the classes. However, we found that there was most group-based work in the RM classes. Their tasks often involved doing different parts of a recipe and participation in a work process with dependence on one another. This was perhaps most explicitly illustrated at the end of lessons in the bakery where they spent quite a lot of time (often about 45 minutes) cleaning the locale. In VT classes the students often worked individually or in pairs. In HC classes there was much individual work, but also – to a larger extent than in the other classes – discussions and groupwork in which the teacher played an active role.

In summary, there were great variations in the kind of framing we observed in the three programmes concerning diverse aspects, such as time-keeping, tempo, instructions, sequence and types of tasks (from those with 'right or wrong' answers to invitations for students to write about something from different perspectives). Generally, the RM classes had strong framing, the HC classes weak framing and the VT classes 'mixed' framing (as most teaching and learning of educational content was very weakly framed, but the 'behavioural aspects' had stronger framing).

The 'what' in vocational subjects

We also found great variation in classification among the programmes. Starting at the most general level, every VET programme can be viewed as classified in relation to one or more 'core objects' and 'core relations'. For instance, a feature distinguishing the VT programme from other VET programmes is that it is classified in relation to vehicles. Other such 'core objects' for VET programmes are food, health, industry, forests and animals. These core objects can be contextualized in various ways, for instance in relation to society, history, workplaces, biology or chemistry. The following sections outline observations of the basic classification in the three focal VET programmes.

The core object ('Health') and relation (caregiver-care recipient) in HC were weakly classified as they were included in diverse subject discourses, such as medicine, ethics, social science and psychology. Furthermore, as already highlighted, in many of these courses the students could continue their work from other courses, indicating weak internal classification. Due to this classification of the core object it is, at least in part, viewed from multiple perspectives. Furthermore, these subject discourses were quite heavily conceptual, that is, rather than just 'doing healthcare' in practice, much of the teaching was oriented towards students learning concepts to enable them to understand their core object from different perspectives.

The classification starkly differed in the RM programme, where the core object (food) was classified much more strongly, in several ways. Most importantly, the classification was dominated by a 'practical' discourse; the primary thing to learn was how to 'bake the cake', rather than (for instance), understand it as a historical product or its chemical properties. Although we observed some examples of food being classified in relation to society – for instance in discussions on the TTIP (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership) and GMO (Genetically Modified Organisms) – these examples were rare. Furthermore, there was also very strong internal classification in that a practical discourse strongly dominated in the 'practical rooms' (kitchens, bakeries, etc.), while the few discussions and different contextualisations we observed occurred in the more ordinary classrooms. The practical discourse also promoted a 'feel' for how to do things, rather than reliance on conceptual knowledge. For instance, the students were supposed to stroke dough to feel if was ready rather than discuss why the dough behaved as it did with the help of conceptual knowledge.

As in the RM programme, the core object in the VT programme (vehicles) was quite strongly classified and dominated by a 'practical' discourse. However, it was more of a practical 'school discourse' than the 'workplace discourse' observed in the RM classes. Furthermore, in contrast to the RM programme, the internal classification between different vocational subjects was very weak in the VT classes; the students worked with the coursebook and in the vehicle hall, and often it did not seem to matter what subject was listed in the schedule. However, the stronger classification in the VT programme could be observed in the relation between 'theory' and 'practice', in terms of a big difference between how students worked in the classroom (with the coursebook) and the vehicle hall ('practice').

As already indicated in the discussion on framing (e.g. the illustrative changes in times lessons started, the reasons for the changes, and reactions to late arrivals), the classification between the school and workplace differed among the programmes. This seemed to be a key aspect of the shaping of the programmes' pedagogic codes. The coding in RM classes seemed, to a large degree, intended to imitate working life, with lessons starting early and high prioritization of fast tempo. The production of goods for sale in many lessons also affected the RM students' activities, as manufacture of products that would be attractive to customers became as important as the students' need to learn to do something. In the HC classes, it was very different. Very little that the students did imitated how things are done in working life. It was very much 'schoolwork', as in much time spend in ordinary classrooms doing 'ordinary' schoolwork. The VT classes were positioned somewhere between these poles, imitating working life to a certain degree, with (for example) much time spent in the vehicle hall, use of work clothes and highlighting of the importance of safety regulations. However, the tempo was very slow and a 'schoolified' teaching practice dominated. Time and tempo are, of course, crucial aspects of working life in the vehicle and healthcare sectors, as well as the restaurant sector, but they were not emphasized in school practice in the HC and VT programmes.

How to be and not to be

The above analysis regarding framing and classification of the instructional discourse can be summarized as follows. The pedagogic code organizing the RM, HC and VT programmes can be respectively described as expressions of strong classification and framing (C+/F+),

weak classification and framing (C-/F-), and strong classification and weak framing (C+/F-). With respect to the classification towards 'working life', the instructional discourse of the HC programme can be described as an expression of a 'school code'; the logic of schooling dominates how the programme is organized. The RM programme is rather an expression of a 'working-life code', in that organisational principles of the vocational elements are largely borrowed from working life. The VT programme's code is a mixture of these two codes; some of its principles are borrowed from working life, but activities in the vocational elements differ strongly from working life, e.g. in terms of tempo, sequence and evaluation. These principles have implications for how, and what, meanings are organised, as discussed in the following sections.

These codes seem to promote different models of learners: the focus in HC is on 'how to *be*' in a quite broad and abstract sense, while the other programmes promote a way of being that is more concrete and focuses more on 'how to *do*'. That is, a discourse of social values is much more explicit and visible in the instructional discourse of the HC programme than in the other programmes. The RM students' performance is often evaluated by the teacher immediately, using concrete outputs such as baked cakes, but criteria used to evaluate the HC students' performance are more abstract. Moreover, the rules concerning all dimensions of performance (e.g. time-keeping, price/cost, instruction and evaluation) differ, resulting in a different ethos regarding the meaning of knowledge and how it should be communicated. Much of the learning in vocational elements of the HC classes was about 'treatment' ('bemötande' in Swedish), in the sense of learning to behave in accordance with a specific social role in relation to care recipients. Besides the excerpt above from the HC class (the example of weak framing) we have numerous notes on observations of HC teachers stressing the importance of feelings and empathy.

> The teacher writes on the whiteboard: 'To take care of is to care for' and underlines 'care for'. The teacher continues to stress the importance of empathy in healthcare and says: 'This is extremely important for us healthcare workers.' A little later the teacher says: 'The ability to put your own feelings into words, that is extremely important.' (Field note, HC-programme).

In the HC programme feelings were to be articulated. The students considered topics such as millennium goals, global poverty, ethics and honour violence, and they were often introduced to a number of concepts related to these themes. When the HC students 'practiced', in the practical rooms, integrity was a key value that permeated the purpose and evaluation of their activities, for instance when they fed each other or cleaned 'practice dolls', pretending they were care recipients. This 'caring disposition' was also visible in how the teachers displayed understanding for students who arrived late for lessons, failed to complete tasks within a set timeframe or in reactions to disruptive talk during lessons, as illustrated in the following excerpt[2]:

> A student arrives 09.48 (one of the boys) and apologizes for missing the lesson that is just about to end. The teachers say: 'No worries. You were here at 8 o'clock for the Medicine lesson this Tuesday.' (Field note, HC-programme).

This disciplinary aspect was expressed very differently in the RM and VT programmes, not only concerning late arrivals, but more generally. For instance, in one RM programme the teachers collected students' mobile phones before lessons started and in the other mobile phones were confiscated by the teacher if they were used during class. There were very

strong responses to disruptive talk by students. There were explicit rules (strictly followed) regarding hygiene, clothing and time-keeping. Most of these identified features of the RM programme were also evident in the VT programme, where the importance of keeping tools in order, hygiene[3] and cleaning the locale was stressed. However, as discussed above, rules concerning the teaching were much less strict. In summary, the regulative discourses framing the 'how to be' modality expressed in the RM and VT programmes clearly differed from the one discerned in the HC programme.

Another stark contrast was in expressions of feelings and integrity. There was no indication of this kind of being as a student in the RM and VT classes, where the human body was treated as a tool, rather than with great sensitivity as in the HC classes. Students hurt themselves in the machine halls or kitchens quite often, but wounds were generally quickly treated with a bandage or plaster then they got straight back to work. We observed very few examples of these students getting access to concepts that would enable acquisition of language to communicate about their feelings or issues of integrity. However, in the RM programme another kind of 'how to be' was developed. By wearing the same clothes, complying with the same clear rules and working a lot together on tasks that required their cooperation, the students learnt how to be solidary with one another. In one of the classes this was clearly expressed by the cleaning of the bakery at the end of each day, in which students (after some time during year one) helped each other without complaining about who did what in their division of labour. However, this solidarity was not articulated and received no conceptual support in the teaching.

In the VT programme, both the abstract kind of solidarity observed in the HC programme and group-oriented solidarity observed in the RM programme were less visible. Our only clear observations of 'training solidarity', where the teacher also stressed a principle of solidarity, were in cleaning the machine hall and one of the classes attending a team-building event financed by a labour union. However, there was a form of 'how to be a vehicle programme student', and a sense of identification, on a group level. These students are not afraid to get their hands dirty, and with a sense of pride they can express awareness that they might be viewed as loud 'wage-slaves' by others. Within the groups we observed examples of harsh behaviour and pranks towards one another, like locking each other out from the work-shop and being left out in the freezing cold. However, such pranks, and the ability to laugh at unpleasant emotions, can also be seen as parts of the creation of identification with the group.

Thus, the regulative discourses that permeate the programmes seem to be based on quite different logics that could be called 'the logic of production' and 'the logic of caring'. These logics promote different types of classification and framing of the education, leading to different educational practices carrying very different messages on 'how to be'. There are also sharp differences in the nature of key student performance criteria ('treatment'/'productivity'/'doing right'), which were clearly expressed not only in educational practices, but also by the teachers in formal and informal interviews.

One effect of a 'logic of production' is that it makes 'why-questions' difficult to ask. For example, the observed framing in the RM class was very strong, e.g. students may have been required to make 100 cakes in three hours, but it left little room for asking why things were done or worked in a certain way. While the VT classes also followed, to a certain extent, a 'logic of production', it was of a different kind. Here, instructions and tempo were very weak, leaving the students very much to themselves in their work. Thus, in the VT programme

the weak framing was responsible for the rarity of discussions and 'why-questions'. Similarly, although the absence of why-questions was less characteristic of the HC classes, sometimes both the classification and framing were so weak, particularly in one of our observed classes, that the students did not clearly understand what they were supposed to do. This, we believe, has to do with the core performance of 'treatment' permeating the teaching, which seemed vague to the students, as expressed in multiple ways in interviews with the students and illustrated by the following excerpt of an interview with three students:

> Interviewer: What do you think is the most important thing you have learned during this first year?
>
> Student: Íve learned, sort of, when it comes to… Patience, you listen to people, you satisfy their needs and not only, sort of, what you yourself think is best. A lot about people and stuff, I feel like I've learned…. It feels like we've learned a lot but can't really explain it in words. The other two girls are nodding in agreement.

The discourse of 'order' in the RM classes seemed to permeate not only the practical rooms but also the classrooms. When the teachers were not talking, the students were often given instructions to work individually when they were in ordinary classrooms, which can be seen as a way of working that is in line with 'order'. Thus, despite our three vocational programmes representing different pedagogical codes, all of them largely converged in that there were few discussions (especially in the VT and RM classes). When the teacher asked questions, in all the classes we observed, they were often of an I-R-E (initiation-response-evaluation) kind.

Codes and democratic rights

A key question is what do these pedagogic codes imply for the prospects of students practicing citizenship at individual, social and political levels? At the individual (enhancement) level, the crucial right Bernstein stresses is 'the right to the means of critical understanding and to new possibilities.' Of the three programmes considered here, this right appears to be most clearly expressed in the HC programme, primarily due to the classification of knowledge allowing consideration of the 'core object' in multiple contexts, and thus enabling alternative ways of understanding key phenomena. This aspect is further enhanced by the subjects having a more disciplinary and conceptual character than those in the VT and RM programmes, which seemed to provide very little opportunity for 'individual enhancement', despite some variations in classification. Most practice in these programmes appears to be geared towards learning about and adapting to 'how it is' or 'how to do', and very little towards questions about current arrangements in ways that would promote critical understanding. Although the classification may be the most crucial explanatory factor for the distribution of 'individual enhancement', the framing in the programmes also seems to play an important role here. The RM and VT programmes differ significantly in this regard, but in distinct ways the practice in both programmes seems to leave little space for 'why-questions' and discussions that could foster alternative understandings of 'how it is' or 'how it could be'. The findings could be summarized by stating that the behavioural aspects (expressed through the strong framing of rules for conduct) are more prominent than the knowledge aspects in the RM and VT programmes' pedagogic codes. However, as discussed below, in a certain important sense this might also be true for the HC programme. Another

way to summarize the results is that they illustrate a classical problem in VET; the separation of 'theory' and 'practice'.

The crucial social-level right is 'to be included socially, intellectually, culturally and personally'. If we regard this as the right to belong to groups with common conditions and interests, rather than being solitary and dealing with thoughts and problems in isolation, our data indicate that the RM programme offers this right most strongly. Through the pedagogical practice RM students acquire a collective identity, a sense of belonging to their groups. Our analysis indicates that development of this right is quite weak in the other programmes. The distinction seems to be largely due to framing in that RM students work more organically in groups than in the other programmes. However, since the RM programme provides few contexts or concepts to understand or acquire a critical perspective of the potential of this belonging, very little in their education can be regarded as offering students the political level right advocated by Bernstein, 'to participate in the construction, maintenance and transformation of social order'.

In a way, the problem is almost the opposite in the HC classes, where the students have partial access to a critical understanding. However, the right of 'belonging in groups' is quite weakly fostered and framed in a way that seems to direct solidarity almost exclusively towards care recipients rather than towards the group the students aspire to belong to ('care workers'). Furthermore, the collective identity promoted in the HC programme seems isolated from the knowledge the students are supposed to learn. In other words, there is little association between the rights of 'individual enhancement' and 'social inclusion'. That is, the knowledge is apparently rarely contextualized to raise critical questions about issues such as hierarchies and students' positions in them. Thus, taken together, in a crucial way the educational practice we observed in the HC classes is not clearly geared towards a critical understanding either, at least not one that is clearly connected to 'political participation'. The students are offered some collective identity and access to some relevant concepts, but the 'caring/treatment' logic, which permeates the educational practice in all vocational elements, directs these concepts and discussions almost solely towards how the students should behave in relation to care recipients. The right of 'social inclusion', like the right of 'individual enhancement', was weakly expressed in the VT classes, and did not seem to direct solidarity towards the group of belonging ('vehicle workers'). Thus, in our data we find little evidence that the students' right to 'political participation' is supported in the studied vocational programmes, especially the VT programme.

In summary the pedagogic code in the HC classes appears to offer some opportunity for 'individual enhancement' and 'social inclusion', the code in the RM classes offers some access to 'social inclusion', and the code in the VT classes offers little access to any of the rights. Briefly, we find different actualities, and thus different potentials, for civic preparation in the three programmes and there are different reasons for failure to actualise these potentials.

Furthermore, in our data we find very little in the educational practice that raises questions about power, in any context. There are of course explicit hierarchies in all these branches, but they are, in different ways, to a large extent made invisible. Thus, one conclusion is that a commonality in the programmes is that the regulative discourses are apparently geared towards 'being and learning for the sake of others' (guests, production orders, care recipients, etc.). There is, despite great variation, little in the vocational elements that fosters questioning

or participation in the construction of social order. The preparation for working life offered mostly seems to involve adaptation. For instance, few of the interviewed students could give examples of education helping them learn how to argue or act when something is wrong, and very few, in any programme, knew what labour unions are. These were identified features of all the programmes we observed, although least prominently in the HC programme.

Although only reporting on data from the students' first school year, our observations suggest that learning and becoming in the vocational subjects are closely connected (Colley et al. 2003; Young 2008). As one of the RM teachers commented:

> Parents come up to me and ask, "What have you done to my child?!" Hehe. However, the question is a positive one. They claim that their kids' behaviour is now much better at home; they clean their rooms without complaining and take more responsibility. They have become more adult. (Field note, RM-programme).

In the light of democratic rights, however, this socialization seems quite different from offering the students an education that promotes learning in which 'an alternative order, an alternative society and an alternative power relation' might be realized.' (McLean, Abbas, and Ashwin 2013, 265). Particularly, isolation from the political level right of preparation for participation in a 'civic discourse' is evident in our data. So, in the context of social reproduction the results from this study in many ways echo findings of many previous studies that individuals from subordinated class positions are trained to occupy subordinate positions in the future too (Anyon 1983; Apple 2004; Beach 2018; Frykholm and Nitzler 1993; Nylund 2012). The results also resonate with other previous findings. For instance, strongly gendered discourses seem to be at play, where a discourse of 'caring' (Colley et al. 2003), or 'consumption' (Odih 2007) permeates the female-dominated HC programme, while the male-dominated VT programme is permeated by a discourse of 'production'. It would be important to better understand, that is investigate and theorize, these regulative discourses in a wider societal context. Such investigation, our analysis suggests, should recognize that vocational programmes seem to be permeated, indeed dominated, by specific regulative discourses. However, although this insight is consistent with previous findings (Anyon 1983; Apple 2004; Beach 2018), our analysis suggests that this is a very complex issue, i.e. one that cannot be reduced to a simple metaphor of social reproduction. This connects to our final, and perhaps most important, conclusion. Vocational programmes do indeed seem to differ in potential for development in the context of citizenship preparation. As highlighted in previous studies, the programmes are conditioned by their relation to specific segments of the labour market, but as the pedagogic code concept helps to unpack, the relations between school and workplace, teacher and student, and different subjects, vary substantially. This implies that there is room for change. If schools are to play a meaningful part in maintaining democratic governance and not just reproducing dispositions suitable for certain positions in the division of labour, the democratic rights discussed in this paper need to be strengthened in the vocational elements. Understanding pedagogical practice through the lens of pedagogic codes can perhaps play a part in such an endeavour.

Notes

1. Three clarifications with regards to the analysis should be noted. Firstly, there were differences between the pairs of classes of the same programmes. For instance, the RM classes largely had similar characteristics, but strengths of these characteristics often differed between them

(this, we believe, was largely due to important contextual differences between the classes; the schools were of different sizes, located in different geographical areas, and varied in terms of access to resources. Crucially, one of the schools had less resources to facilitate simulations of 'real work' than the other school). However, apparently relevant similarities (for the focal issues) were much stronger than the differences. Secondly, although touching on such variations, we mostly discuss general patterns we identified, but an important observation is that the classification and framing seemed to be dependent on subject discourses to some extent. For instance, the Medicine courses of the HC programme were regarded as based on more 'objective' knowledge than other courses of the programme, and this affected the classification and framing. Thirdly, different teachers also affected the classification and framing in some cases, but again we largely focus on general identified patterns.

2. This is not to suggest that the HC teachers did not have rules or try to maintain order in the classroom. However, in comparison to the other programmes, order was upheld through a more 'caring disposition'.

3. The importance of hygiene is also stressed in the HC classes. However, it is dominated by 'talk' rather than permeating the 'doings' in the teaching.

Disclosure statement

Funding

ORCID

Mattias Nylund http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0530-6378
Kristina Ledman http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5222-6229
Per-Åke Rosvall http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3737-3244
Maria Rönnlund http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5308-7002

References

Andersson, K. 2012. *Deliberativ undervisning - en empirisk studie. [Deliberative Teaching – An Empirical Study]*. Göteborg: Göteborg Studies in Politics, 128.

Anyon, J. 1983. "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum." In *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education: Deception or Discovery?* edited by H. A. Giroux and D. E. Purpel. Berkeley CA: McCutchan.

Apple, M. 2004. *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Beach, D. 2018. *Structural Injustices in Swedish Education. Academic Selection and Educational Inequalities*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beach, D., M. Johansson, E. Öhrn, M. Rönnlund, and P-Å. Rosvall. 2018. "Rurality and Education Relations: Metro-Centricity and Local Values in Rural Communities and Rural Schools." *European Educational Research Journal* 18 (1): 19–33. doi:10.1177/1474904118780420.

Berner, B. 1989. *Kunskapens vägar: teknik och lärande i skola och arbetsliv. [The Routes of Knowledge: Technology and Learning in School and Working Life]*. Lund: Arkiv.

Bernstein, B. 2000. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bourdieu, P., and J. C. Passeron. 1970. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Brockmann, M., L. Clarke, and C. Winch. 2010. "The Apprenticeship Framework in England: A New Beginning or a Continuing Sham?" *Journal of Education and Work* 23 (2): 111–127. doi:10.1080/13639081003627439.

Colley, H., D. James, K. Diment, and M. Tedder. 2003. "Learning as Becoming in Vocational Education and Training: Class, Gender and the Role of Vocational Habitus." *Journal of Vocational Education & Training* 55 (4): 471–498. doi:10.1080/13636820300200240.

Connell, R. W. 2006. "Glass Ceilings or Gendered Institutions? Mapping the Gender Regimes of Public Sector Worksites." *Public Administration Review* 66 (6): 837–849. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00652.x.

Davies, P. 2015. "Towards a Framework for Financial Literacy in the Context of Democracy." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 47 (2): 300–316. doi:10.1080/00220272.2014.934717.

Eriksdottir, E., and P-Å. Rosvall. 2019. "VET Teachers' Interpretations of Individualisation and Teaching of Skills and Social Order – Analysis in Two Nordic Countries." *European Educational Research Journal* 18 (3): 355–375. doi:10.1177/1474904119830022.

Fejes, A., M. Nylund, and J. Wallin. 2018. "How Do Teachers Interpret and Transform Entrepreneurship Education?" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 51 (4): 554–566. doi:10.1080/00220272.2018.1488998.

Fine, G. A. 1985. "Occupational Aesthetics. How Trade School Students Learn to Cook." *Urban Life* 14 (1): 3–31. doi:10.1177/0098303985014001001.

Frykholm, C-U., and R. Nitzler. 1993. "Working Life as a Pedagogical Discourse: Empirical Studies of Vocational and Career Education Based on Theories of Bourdieu and Bernstein." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 25 (5): 433–444. doi:10.1080/0022027930250503.

Gordon, T., P. Hynninen, E. Lahelma, T. Metso, T. Palmu, and T. Tolonen. 2006. "Collective Ethnography, Joint Experiences and Individual Pathways." *Nordisk Pedagogik* 26 (1): 3–15.

Jeffrey, B., and G. Troman. 2003. "Time for Ethnography." *British Educational Research Journal* 30 (4): 535–548. doi:10.1080/0141192042000237220.

Lappalainen, S., M. Nylund, and P-Å. Rosvall. 2018. "Imagining Society through Discourses on Educational Equality: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Finnish and Swedish Upper-Secondary Curricula from 1970 to the 2010s." *European Educational Research Journal* 18 (3): 335–354. doi:10.1177/1474904118814140.

Ledman, K. 2015. "Navigating Historical Thinking in a Vocational Setting: Teachers Interpreting a History Curriculum for Students in Vocational Secondary Education." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 47 (1): 77–93. doi:10.1080/00220272.2014.984766.

Ledman, K., P-Å. Rosvall, and M. Nylund. 2018. "Gendered Distribution of 'Knowledge Required for Empowerment' in Swedish Vocational Education Curricula?" *Journal of Vocational Education & Training* 70 (1): 85–106. doi:10.1080/13636820.2017.1394358.

McLean, M., A. Abbas, and P. Ashwin. 2013. "The Use and Value of Bernstein's Work in Studying (in)Equalities in Undergraduate Social Science Education." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 34 (2): 262–280. doi:10.1080/01425692.2012.710007.

Muller, J., and U. Hoadley. 2010. "Pedagogy and Moral Order." In *Knowledge, Knowers and Pedagogic Modes: Building on the Sociology of Basil Bernstein*, edited by P. Singh and A. Sadovnik, 161–176. New York: Peter Lang.

Nicaise, I., G. Esping-Andersen, B. Pont, and P. Tunstall. 2005. *Equity in education thematic review: Sweden country note*. Paris: OECD. Accessed October 10, 2018. www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/5/35892546.pdf.

Norlund, A. 2011. "The Interplay between Subject Recontextualizers: Social Reproduction through Critical Reading." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 43 (5): 659–678. doi:10.1080/00220272.2011.585180.

Nylund, M. 2012. "The Relevance of Class in Education Policy and Research. The Case of Sweden's Vocational Education." *Education Inquiry* (3) (4): 591–613. doi:10.3402/edui.v3i4.22056.

Nylund, M., P-Å. Rosvall, and K. Ledman. 2017. "The Vocational–Academic Divide in Neoliberal Upper Secondary Curricula: The Swedish Case." *Journal of Education Policy* 32 (6): 788–808. doi:10.1080/02680939.2017.1318455.

Odih, P. 2007. *Gender and Work in Capitalist Economies*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Riseborough, G. F. 1992. "'The Cream Team': An Ethnography of BTEC National Diploma (Catering and Hotel Management) Students in a Tertiary College." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 13 (2): 215–245. doi:10.1080/0142569920130205.

Swedish National Agency of Education. 2018. *Uppföljning av gymnasieskolan 2018. [A Follow up on Upper-Secondary School]*. Stockholm: Skolverket.

Sundberg, D., and N. Wahlström. 2012. "Standards-Based Curricula in a Denationalised Conception of Education: The Case of Sweden." *European Educational Research Journal* 11 (3): 342–356. doi:10.2304/eerj.2012.11.3.342.

Wheelahan, L. 2010. *Why Knowledge Matters in Curriculum. A Social Realist Argument*. London: Routledge.

Young, M. 2008. *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge.

Young, M. and J. Gamble. (eds.). 2006. *Knowledge, Curriculum and Qualifications for South African Further Education*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.