



Hordern, J. (2014) 'The logic and implications of school-based teacher formation', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 62 (3), pp. 231-248.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis Group in *British Journal of Educational Studies* on 15/10/2014 available online:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2014.955079>

ResearchSPAce

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

This pre-published version is made available in accordance with publisher policies.

Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the ResearchSPAce Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have permission to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

The logic and implications of school-based teacher formation

Jim Hordern

School of Education,

Bath Spa University,

Bath,

BA2 9BN

j.hordern@bathspa.ac.uk

Author's copy – accepted by British Journal of Educational Studies July 2014.

The logic and implications of school-based teacher formation

Abstract

This paper uses Bernsteinian concepts to identify how forms of power and control within teacher professional formation are exercised. Drawing on previous comparative work into collaborative models of teacher education and contemporary examples from school-based programmes, it is argued that current developments in England raise substantive questions for teachers' knowledge, learning and professional commitment.

Keywords: teacher education; professional learning; organisational professionalism.

Introduction

The last twenty years have seen substantive changes in the pathways and routes by which teachers can become qualified in numerous countries in Europe and beyond. Within England we have seen a series of changes driven by respective governments to encourage schools to take increased responsibility for the formation of teachers, with recent policy seeking to further constrain the influence of higher education institutions on the process (Furlong, 2013; Kirk, 2013). The imperative towards a greater role for the school is not confined to England. Countries such as the Netherlands and Sweden have also moved towards extending school-based elements of formation (Beach and Bagley, 2013; Maandag *et al.*, 2007), with arguments made in favour of substantially reducing input from higher education and better ‘technical preparation’ for teachers (Tatto, 2006). It is important to note that these trends in teacher education are not in themselves unique. We have seen, across a range of professions, moves towards increasing or enhancing practice-based formation with the suggestion that it is prolonged workplace experience that provides novice practitioners with access to the forms of knowledge, identity and behaviours that are valued by their professions and organisations (Billett, 2008), often over and above that offered by an educational institution. Such changes are often intertwined with the introduction of new processes for valuing and recognising learning and expertise that raise questions about the types of knowledge that are particularly valuable for professional work (Young and Muller, 2014). The relation between educational institutions and schools is fundamental to teacher education in the vast majority of countries within Europe and indeed the OECD, but the nature of the relation often differs substantially between countries and in many cases within countries (Maandag *et al.*, 2007). At the time of writing, the cartographies of teacher formation in England are further diversifying, with a range of substantive routes to acquiring qualified teacher status (QTS), although even this is currently only mandatory for certain teachers (DfE, n.d.).

If the aim of teacher education is to produce ‘good teachers’ who can enact and further develop forms of expert teaching practice, then it is important here to note that notions of expertise in teaching, and the mechanisms by which these notions are defined, vary widely across national and organisational contexts (European Commission, 2013). In England, for example, there is little doubt that notions of the ‘good teacher’ vary across government, the teaching unions and the teaching profession with emphasis placed variably and differentially on aspects of (inter alia) conduct, pedagogical knowledge and skill, and subject expertise (Education Select Committee 2012). The use of the Teaching Standards (DfE, 2011a) as a benchmark for the ‘good teacher’ enables government to wield considerable power over identifying the ‘products’ of teacher formation processes in England, but this may be increasingly complicated by systemic fragmentation resulting from recent reform. In particular, government policies that encourage schools to become academies, described as ‘publically funded independent schools that are not managed by a local authority’ (DfE 2014), and the increasing prevalence of chains of academies with powerful independent sponsors and considerable discretion over their organisation and curriculum, have the capacity to foster forms of ‘organisational’ or ‘corporate’ professionalism’ (Evetts, 2011; Muzio *et al.*, 2011) that husband variants of teaching practice with specific characteristics.

With workplace-learning to the fore, the contribution of educational institutions to teacher expertise is questioned. If the knowledge that new teachers require is to be found through engagement with expert teachers and workplace practice then what can the teacher education institution offer? Such questions challenge the existence of the relation between the school and the teacher education institution (TEI), and may stimulate TEIs to clarify the value of the pedagogy of teacher education and research-informed practice that they offer. It may also stimulate successful partnerships between TEIs and schools to be more explicit about the practice and knowledge into which they seek to induct novice teachers.

This article investigates the variable character and logic of teacher formation through an explication of the various forms of relation between and within schools and teacher education institutions in the provision of teacher education programmes. The starting point is a discussion of recent work by Maandag et al. (2007) that focuses on changes in teacher education across Europe. Using Bernstein's notions of classification and framing (Bernstein, 1971, 2000) a series of distinctions are made between different relations that have bearing on teacher education, and these are used to reappraise the categories delineated and developed by Maandag et al. and to appraise some of the current reforms afoot in England, with a particular emphasis on school-based teacher formation in academy chains. This process of (re)appraisal raises fundamental questions about the nature of teacher formation, professional identity, and the recognition and realisation of teacher expertise.

Relations between schools and TEIs in teacher education

Buitnik and Wouda (2001 cited in Maandag *et al.* 2007) developed five models of collaboration between Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) and schools. TEIs are understood here as higher education institutions of various types, including universities and colleges of higher education. Maandag et al. used the models to form the basis of an analysis of forms of co-ordination between TEI and school across a number of European countries, leading also into discussion of teacher formation. The suppositions and nuances of the models were further elaborated using a 'checklist for international comparison of teacher education in schools' that includes questions that relate to 'structure and context' of programmes, 'division of roles' and 'location of training activities' (Maandag *et al.* 2007, 155), in addition to those that relate to the curriculum, induction and examination. The models that frame the analysis are very briefly outlined below, with some additional commentary.

Model A: Work placement model - most training activities take place at the TEI, with the school seen as a place to gain practical experience. The TEI controls the programme.

Model B: Co-ordinator model – Most training activities take place at the TEI, but here the school takes on more responsibility for co-ordinating supervision of teachers in school.

Model C: Partner model – Training activities are shared between TEI and school. The TEI 'provides instruction in the subjects to be taught and the more conceptual themes of the course' (Maandag *et al.* 2007, 154), while the school covers the other parts of the programme and provides supervision.

Model D: Network model – Training activities are shared between TEI and school, with responsibilities similar to model C. However, here collaboration across and between staff in the TEI and the school is ‘very intensive’ (154).

Model E: Training school model – All training is provided by the school. The TEI is described as a ‘backup institution’ (154), undertaking some training of the teams and ‘developing teaching and training methods’ (154), although it is also possible to conceive of the TEI as absent from this model.

The five models present differing allocations of roles and responsibilities across the TEI and the school, with models A and E representing scenarios where either the TEI (Model A) or the school (Model E) exercise considerable control over the structure and character of the programme. In Models C and D there is a necessity for greater pedagogical and curricular collaboration between the school and TEI, although the extent and nature of this collaboration may vary considerably depending on the individual programme. For novice teachers in formation there may be less distinction between different elements of the programme or different locations of formation on Model D than other models, whereas in Model A or E processes of formation may be experienced as exclusively TEI or school-based.

The models suggest different conceptions of professional knowledge and learning, with the workplace or institution foregrounded as a prime locus of knowledge and learning to a greater or lesser extent. The TEI may be viewed as a better guide to the formation processes by virtue of its ‘distance’ from practice (as may be the case in model A), but this ‘distance’ may be perceived as a weakness by advocates of model E, who may suggest that the notions of teaching expertise advocated by TEIs are poorly aligned to contemporary requirements. Immersion in the cut and thrust of practice may be advocated by those who subscribe to fluency models of expertise (i.e. Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 2005), or socio-cultural approaches that emphasise participation in practice rather than acquisition of knowledge (Wenger, 1998), the assumptions of which have become prominent in discussion about teacher professional development (i.e. Ball and Cohen, 1999). However, whatever the value of certain types of situated knowledge, any neglect of a role for knowledge and learning away from the workplace in professional formation is surely problematic (Fuller and Unwin, 2004; Young and Muller 2014). Individual workplace experience is necessarily bounded by the variable affordance of opportunities to learn (Billett, 2008) and how people are managed (Eraut and Hirsch, 2007). Furthermore, organisations and the wider ‘productive systems’ in which they are located can assert considerable influence on what is learnt (Felstead *et al.*, 2009).

Absent from much discussion of professional learning is the centrality of conceptions of knowledge, with implications for professional authority and identity. If certain forms of abstract knowledge engender thinking beyond the bounds of experience (Bernstein 1999; Young and Muller, 2014), and the capacity to use this knowledge is strongly related to induction into forms of procedural and inferential know-how that are co-dependent with that abstract knowledge within particular forms of discourse (Winch 2010, 2013), then it is important to ask whether a given model of teacher education offers access to this knowledge and to its ancillary discourse. If teacher expertise can primarily be extended to novice

teachers through a process of workplace participation and engagement with expert teachers, then is it possible to suggest that this expertise can be located and iterated in training or teaching schools as much as it can within higher education? What are the implications for knowledge and professionalism if TEIs do not contribute to the constitution of teacher expertise? To examine this question we move now to develop a greater delineation of the logics of teacher formation.

Classification, framing and teacher formation

Analysis of teacher formation arguably needs to examine both relations *between* the school and the TEI and the nature of the teaching or learning discourse *within* each site of formation (i.e. within the school and within the TEI). Depending on the model examined above discourses within the school and within the TEI may integrate or correlate to a greater or lesser extent, and this is likely to be partially dependent on relations between the school and the TEI. This suggests the possibility of using Bernstein's (1971, 2000) notions of classification and framing to delineate the 'degree of insulation' (2000, 6) between the school and the TEI (classification) and 'how meanings are put together' (12) within the contexts of the school and TEI (Framing). Classification focuses on the strength or weakness of boundaries or levels of insulation 'between agencies, between agents, between discourses, between practices' (6), with stronger insulation enabling the 'dislocation in the potential flow of discourse which is crucial to the specialisation of any category' (6). If strong classification, or strong insulation, exists between X and Y, Bernstein argued, then X and Y have the means of developing distinct identities, 'the crucial space which creates the specialisation of the category' (2000, 6). In terms of both the development of knowledge and pedagogy, a degree of classification can be seen as essential for deepening, elaborating and iterating specialised discourses (Bernstein 1999, 2000), and for providing the means by which those in formation can recognise expert practice. Neves et al. (2004) identify how power relations are distributed in teacher education through strength of classification, resulting in the potential for different types of boundaries between novice teachers, between teacher educator and novice, and between aspects of disciplinary discourse and novice teachers' practical knowledge.

Framing, with a focus on the ways in which control is exercised within contexts, enables the identification of how meanings are legitimated in teaching and learning discourses. For Bernstein framing is about 'who controls what', 'the internal logic of the pedagogic practice' and 'the nature of control over the selection of communication...its sequencing...its pacing...the criteria; and the control over the social base which makes this transmission possible' (2000, 12-13). Strong framing implies that the educator has 'explicit control' (13) over the dimensions listed above, whereas in weak framing the novice teacher or trainee has more 'apparent control' (13). Importantly, Bernstein emphasises the existence of 'two systems of rules regulated by framing' (13), the one related to the 'rules of social order' (regulative discourse) and concerned with 'the form that hierarchical relations take in the pedagogic relation and to expectations about conduct, character and manner' (13), and the second the 'rules of discursive order' (instructional discourse) (13) that 'refer to selection, sequence, pacing and criteria of the knowledge' (13). The instructional discourse is, in Bernstein's terms 'embedded in the regulative discourse, and the regulative discourse is the

dominant discourse' (13). Each aspect of framing can vary independently of the others, although Bernstein underlines that 'where there is weak framing over the instructional discourse there must be weak framing over the regulative discourse' (13). Neves et al. (2004), in their study of teacher education discourses, indicate the significance of the 'distinction between... instructional and regulative components', with a 'weakening of framing at the level of the hierarchical rules...clearly favourable to teachers' performance (in discussing and confronting ideas, giving opinions and so on)' (183).

For the analysis that follows framing is seen not only as a valuable analytical lens for the differentiation of forms of educational discourse, but also in terms of how work itself is organised within workplaces. Schools, and indeed organisations in general, are subject to, forms of regulative discourse which structure the norms of conduct and behaviour expected of employees. Influential agents within the organisation and management of the school may seek to constitute or re-shape the regulative discourse, but the discourse is also shaped by wider expectations generated socio-historically and as a consequence of policy and contemporary societal expectations. Equally, the way work is organised can be seen in terms of an 'instructional discourse' or perhaps a 'discourse of work organisation', with employees having variable levels of control over how work is selected, sequenced, paced and how it is evaluated. Research into workplace learning emphasises the importance of a level of autonomy and discretion at work and the role of 'expansive' environments in providing for the extension of knowledge (Felstead *et al.* 2009; Fuller *et al.*, 2007), in addition to the 'pedagogic qualities of workplaces' (Billett 2008, 11) and the significance of individual dispositions. The extent to which novice teachers are able to manage their own work, structure their own pedagogic practice and obtain clarity about how this is to be evaluated are fundamental constituent elements of their formation.

Classification and framing are bound to the notions of recognition and realisation, which are suggestive of how different articulations of the relations discussed above play out in terms of individual formation. For Bernstein, classification 'provides us with our voice and the means of its recognition', while framing 'is the means of acquiring the legitimate message' (2000, 12). Modalities of classification provide the 'recognition rules' which enable novice teachers to identify notions of 'good teaching practice' and therefore distinguish the object of their formation from other possible objects. Modalities of framing, on the other hand, provide the 'realisation rules' that enable novice teachers to 'acquire' or 'become' the object of their formation. It can clearly be argued that without a sufficient degree of classification, providing a sufficiently specialised knowledge and identity (or professional 'habitus'), then recognition rules cannot be developed and therefore, as a consequence, there is no clear model of the effective practitioner that can be 'realised'. In such circumstances the profession has failed to develop a recognisable 'normative basis' (Winch 2010, 78-95) that can provide a guide for the evaluation of expertise. The field is then open for all manner of folk theories about 'what works' in teaching to gain prominence (Winch et al. 2013), with multiple 'knowledges' and identities capable of achieving some form of validity in the absence of a lack of a recognisable arbiter of valid practice.

The focus on classification and framing does not imply a neglect of the broader macro and meso-level context for the professional formation of teachers. Teacher formation in many countries is dominated by bodies external to the profession, and is subject to increasing demands for accountability to government, parents, employers and professional bodies. In England, the role of the government and its agencies has considerable potency in determining the modalities of classification and framing that become most prevalent. Arguably, with the rise of school autonomy and the increasing power of independently sponsored and controlled academy chains, and the continued absence of forms of professional association to regulate teachers' work, forms of accountability to the employer are considerably enhanced. Systemic reorientations towards bureaucratic or market logics have implications for professional identity. Strongly classified knowledge and identity has historically engendered the preservation of forms of 'inner dedication' (Bernstein, 2000) which enable the sustenance of professional values and professional organisation distinct from that of the market and bureaucracy (Beck and Young 2005; Friedson 2001). However, as Beck and Young (2005) identify, pressures of accountability and the intrusion of market logics have eroded the boundaries that enable distinct professional identities to form, weakening the resistance to commercial concerns and to government intervention. Bernstein suggests that such weakening of classification means that individuals seek new sources of recognition, through 'the materialities of consumption, by its distributions, by its absences' (2000, 59). Bernstein emphasises the 'temporary stabilities' (59) and 'short termism' (59) reflective of market power, that prioritise 'flexible transferable potential' and 'trainability' (59). The way is open for professional values and notions of commitment to give way to the professional career as a 'project of the self' (Grey 1994). Prime referents for professional success become linked to progression within organisational hierarchies, supplanting professional communities as vehicles for status recognition.

Re-appraising the models of teacher formation

The use of classification and framing enables a further deliberation on the models outlined by Maandag et al. (2007) to address issues arising in the English context. Firstly, however, it is important to consider some of the most significant ways in which classification and framing can be utilised to delineate between different relations and arrangements between TEIs and schools and within teacher education contexts.

1. Firstly, the relation between teaching and learning discourses *between* sites of formation can be strongly or weakly classified. In other words the teaching discourse of the TEI can be strongly insulated from learning or workplace practice within the school. Equally, this insulation may be weak, with a similar teaching and learning discourse operating across sites of formation.
2. Secondly, the specific teaching and learning discourses *within* the remit of the TEI and the school can be strongly or weakly framed, both in terms of the regulative discourse and the instructional discourse. It seems reasonable to suggest that a weakly classified discourse across sites of formation (as in 1) could result in similar modalities of framing across the teaching and learning discourses in schools and the TEI, although this may not necessarily eventuate. The work of Neves et al. (2004) and

Ensor (2004) elaborates on how the various dimensions of teacher education discourses can be differentially framed.

3. Thirdly, and as discussed above, the organisation of work within schools can be described as strongly or weakly framed, both in terms of the regulative and instructional discourse, with implications for how and what novice teachers learn. The workplace discourse may, or may not, cohere with the specific teaching and learning discourse foregrounded in the school.
4. Fourthly, the roles of those involved in teaching novice teachers may be strongly or weakly classified from each other. Roles may be clearly delineated with 'teacher' and 'supervisor' or 'mentor' insulated from each other, and from other significant roles within workplaces, such as that of 'manager'. In some modes of formation, the role of teacher, supervisor and manager could inhere in one person, whereas in others these roles will necessarily be taken by different people.
5. Fifthly, the role of the novice teacher may itself be strongly and weakly insulated from the role of the employee, with significant potential implications for interaction and learning within workplaces and for how the novice teacher is encouraged to view the process of formation.

It is possible to make some further distinctions about which of these five dimensions will be particularly salient for analysis of the models outlined by Maandag et al. (2007). Model A, the 'work placement model', suggests a strong classification between the teaching and learning discourses of the TEI and that of the school, and that the framing of the discourses within each site is highly likely to be very different. In this model, the TEI has control of teacher formation, suggesting that the organisation of work in the school may have little relation to the structure of the programme, even though the way that work is organised and framed within the school could have considerable bearing on how the novice teacher perceives the nature of teachers' work. There is likely to be strong classification between the roles of those involved in teaching/ mentoring and managing the novice teacher, with the TEI extending its responsibility into the workplace by visiting the novice teacher on placement, and the school organisation remote from the training process. Classification between the role of the 'trainee' and other employees also remains strong; in a work placement model, the trainee teacher is there on placement temporarily, rather than as part of a team. Maandag et al. (2007) identify teacher education in Germany and Sweden as characteristic of Model A, with control over programmes remaining in the hands of TEIs within agreed statutory frameworks, and an 'academically-focused (Maandag *et al.* 2007, 164) curriculum. Furlong et al. (2000, 61) note that the reforms to teacher education in England in the late 1980s eradicated any remaining programmes that gave complete control over teacher formation to TEIs, with the majority of programmes from the 1990s onwards demonstrating greater collaboration between TEI and school. Model B is likely to see a continuation of model A in most respects, although here the classification between roles of supervisor, manager and colleague are likely to be weakened as the school takes on more responsibility for workplace formation, although still within the context of a programme led by a TEI.

In Model C, the partnership model, the roles and teaching discourses of the TEI and the school remain relatively strongly classified, but the teaching discourse in operation in the school starts to become much more significant for formation as here the school has taken on a greater role in terms of the teacher education programme. The framing of the teaching programme in the TEI and in the school may start to correlate to a greater extent as there is a degree of collaboration across the sites, although this may also depend on the manner in which the notion of 'partnership' translates into the structure of the programme (Furlong et al., 2000). The greater role of the school suggests that both the 'regulative' framing of conduct and the organisation of work within the school is likely to have a substantive bearing on formation. The emphasis on training within the school results in engagement with school workplace practice, and with a wider range of school employees in terms of learning activity. Maandag et al. (2007) recognise the existence of aspects of Model C in England, and it seems to correspond to many of the 'integrated' models outlined as existing in the 1990s (Furlong et al., 2000, 61), where partnership is primarily 'complementary' rather than truly 'collaborative' (78-81).

In Model D, the network model, the classification between the TEI and the school is at its weakest, with 'intensive' collaboration (Maandag et al., 2007, 154) aiming at a coherent programme that reduces the degree of insulation between the sites. Although the TEI and the school are still likely to be responsible for different teaching activities the collaborative atmosphere is likely to result in a greater coherence of framing of the instructional discourse and greater coherence in terms of the regulative discourse. It should be remembered again here that the regulative discourse that shapes teaching, learning and work within the school is constituted in ways that only partially involve those responsible for teacher education in a given school or TEI; the 'social order' (Bernstein 2000, 13) is sociologically constituted. Roles of educators, supervisors and managers become more weakly classified and the novice teacher is likely to be involved in training activities with employees within the school. The model has resonance with the 'jointly-led' and 'strong school base' approach outlined by Furlong et al. (2000, 61), where partnership arrangements are more generally 'collaborative' (79). In England, key examples can be found in collaborations that developed through the Articled Teacher Scheme and also in the programme pioneered by Oxford University from the 1980s onwards (Furlong et al., 2000).

It is possible to conceive of versions of model D, and perhaps also model C, that become particularly distinctive teacher education programmes, partially as a result of the weakening of classification between the school and the TEI. The programme itself, transcending boundaries of sites of formation, can acquire strength of insulation from other activities within the TEI and the school. The programme thus develops a specialised model of the 'good teacher' that is particularly associated with the programme, developing its own forms of recognition and realisation rules that provide its novice teachers with a distinct identity.

In Model E, the training programme is driven by the school, and therefore there is strong insulation around the school as a site of formation. The framing of the teaching and learning discourse specified by the school is vital to the shape of the teacher education programme, and the roles and responsibilities of teachers, supervisors and managers are likely to become

weakly classified, often inhering within the same individuals. The centrality of the school to the mode of formation increases the salience of the framing of workplace activities, suggesting that ‘affordances’ within the structure of work, and the extent to which novice teachers have discretion to innovate and experiment within the school environment are key concerns. The novice teacher may well be an employee of the school, or seen as a future employee, and therefore there is a weak classification between the roles of novice teacher and employee, with implications in terms of the types of workplace activity, and levels of expectation of performance, for the novice teacher. Various versions of this model have been developed in England from the 1990s onwards, including the Licensed Teacher Scheme, and School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT).

Table 1 below sets out the various models in terms of two key variables discussed above. C- is used to denote weak classification and C+ strong classification, while C++ is a particularly strong classification.

Table 1 (about here)

The enhanced role of the school in teacher formation in England: the advance of organisational professionalism

It is beyond the scope of this article to attempt to summarise all aspects of the current changes to teacher education in England. We concentrate here on changes most relevant to the models and conceptual development above, in particular the implications of the enhanced role of school-based teacher formation, and for teacher professionalism.

The Coalition government in the U.K. has been emphatic about placing the school at the centre of teacher formation (DfE, 2011b), increasing school autonomy from local authority control, and introducing new forms of school into the educational landscape, including schools run by chain organisations, in addition to curriculum reform. School Direct, based upon the notion of putting greater control of teacher education into the hands of schools, is paralleled by the roll out of teaching schools. Many emerging models of School Direct rely on forms of partnership with TEIs, as there have been suggestions that few schools have the resources or infrastructure to manage their own teacher education programmes. It could be argued, as Maandag et al. (2007) do, that School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) represents aspects of Model E, the training school model, and some arrangements developed by SCITTs may be taken on by emerging School Direct models. At the advent of SCITT, however, the school landscape was still relatively homogenous across England and Wales, with all schools subject to the same national-level reforms and local arrangements (Furlong et al. 2000). The roll-out and extension of the academy programme introduces a new heterogeneity of school organisation.

Recent reforms to diversify the organisation of schooling add a new dimension to school-based teacher education by potentially introducing templates of professionalism to teaching that have an ‘organisational’ or even a ‘corporate’ aspect (Evetts, 2011; Muzio *et al.*, 2011). The increasing scale of academy-sponsoring organisations such as AET, ARK and the Harris Federation, with specific conceptions of ‘good education’ or ‘good teaching’ suggests

a new stage in the fragmentation of national-level models of teaching professionalism in England. Although 'governmental' forms (Beck, 2008) still have purchase, there is little doubt of the potential for a professionalism based more explicitly on the values and identity of the employing organisation, particularly in the academy chains. As Evetts (2011) outlines, moves away from 'occupational' towards 'organisational' professionalism involves a transition from 'partnership' and 'collegiality' towards 'managerialism' and 'bureaucracy', and into contexts in which professionalism can be shaped and imposed 'from above' within organisational hierarchies (407-408). Professionalism ceases to be a 'value' and becomes merely a 'discourse' to be manipulated in the service of organisational ends (Evetts, 2011; Fournier, 1999). The consequence is not only profound for teacher identity, it is also considerable for educational practice within schools as 'organizational objectives (which are sometimes political)' begin to 'define practitioner-client relations' (Evetts, 2011, 408), thus shaping pedagogic practice.

As schools diversify, so do conceptions of the 'good teacher', the object of teacher formation. Through the use of versions of model E and training programmes that are exclusively school based, organisations with distinctive identities have the capacity to strongly classify and insulate their version of teacher expertise. Arguably, models C and D above could also be used for this purpose, providing a suitable TEI, or training partner, can be found that concurs with the underlying values of the dominant organisation; thus the training programme can be used to support the development of a distinctive identity. Additionally, the 'post training employment expectation' suggested as part of the School Direct places considerable power in the hands of the school and sponsoring organisations, as employment is clearly not guaranteed (DfE 2013, 30), but can be used to incentivise and to cajole novice teachers. Harris Federation state that 'a high proportion of our trainees are offered a permanent role on completion of the programme' (2014a), but it is clear this is not an 'entitlement' for those on the programme – appropriate performance must be demonstrated. Teacher Education also becomes linked with broader learning and career development across the organisation. In the case of the Academies Enterprise Trust '*the AET talent programme*', advertised to recruits onto the AET School Direct programme, offers '*opportunities across all our academies throughout your career*' (AET, 2014), while at the Harris Federation Teaching School Alliance trainees on the School Direct programme have the opportunity to 'interact and network with other trainees from across the Federation' (Harris Federation TSA, 2014a) as part of their professional development. While there may be value in learning from others (Eraut and Hirsh, 2007), the communities of practice appear 'bounded', constraining opportunities to engage across 'multiple communities' (Fuller and Unwin, 2004).

A form of apprenticeship training is foregrounded in the 'training school model' within some academy chains, but without the requirement for engagement with others from different organisations identified as crucially important for learning of this type (Fuller and Unwin, 2004). Importantly, this means there may be limited opportunities to challenge the 'corporate' approach to teaching. The Harris Federation Training School Alliance assert, for example, that they 'believe the most effective way to experience all aspects of school life is to be based

in a school environment, learning to teach with expert classroom practitioners’, and this can be achieved through ‘learning on the job’ and attending ‘a series of practical-training sessions...facilitated by our expert practitioners, who role model outstanding practice’ (Harris Federation TSA, 2014b). The implication is that professional development is by technical imitation, a narrow conception of professional learning that enables that the ‘techniques’ promoted by the Alliance are foregrounded to the exclusion of alternative approaches. Organisational practice supplants professional practice, the capability to exercise professional judgement thoughtfully in a variety of contexts is not fully developed, and there are limitations on the process of ‘epistemic ascent’ towards genuine expertise (Winch 2010, 2013). Professional judgement is surely limited if it relies solely on imitating others, without a full examination of the reasoning behind the practice.

Recognition and realisation in school-based formation

In Model E power is held by the schools within the ambit of the organisation, and recognition rules are set through an organisational dynamic, tempered of course by the degree of specification of statutory frameworks. The embedding of strong recognition rules within a model, does not, of course, imply that novice teachers acquire the realisation rules that enable them to demonstrate ‘good’ teaching practice, the object of formation. While recognition rules may be a pre-requisite for realisation, this is not sufficient for required capabilities to be acquired. In Model E, schools, within the ambit of their sponsoring organisations, are able to adjust the framing of the teaching and learning discourse within their teaching programmes to facilitate realisation, although simply because there is this potential for strong framing does not necessarily mean that realisation will occur. Equally salient for the development of realisation rules are the framing of workplace practices and routines. The selection, pacing and evaluation of work may be strongly framed in many academy chains with their own corporate ethos and vision for education. As ‘independent employers’ academies ‘do not have to recognise ...previous service in the maintained sector or in other academies’ (ATL, 2013, 4), and can set their own terms and conditions for new recruits, and develop their own appraisal and observation regimes without regard to previous practice, offering considerable scope for the exercise of management prerogative. There are suggestions that work within academy chain schools can be tightly specified and rigorously evaluated, with limited autonomy afforded to the teachers, ‘the absence of staff rooms’, ‘excessive classroom observations’ (NUT 2014a, 4) and lack of ‘limits on teachers’ working time’ (NUT, 2014b, 4) in specific chains. Framing within workplaces can be strengthened to suit organisational objectives if national terms and conditions are optional and subject to local negotiation.

There is no doubting the potential for academy sponsoring organisations to generate a powerful ‘social order’ (Bernstein, 2000, 13) that regulates practice within and across their schools with a strong framing of the regulative discourse that penetrates norms and conduct within schools. Taking advantage of the weakening of ‘professional’ classification for teacher education outlined by Beck and Young (2005), sponsoring organisations can strengthen the ‘organisational’ classification, replacing the ‘inner dedication’ to professional values with a dedication to the organisation and its values. The process of ‘silencing’ that involves ‘denying ‘trainees’ access to the forms of knowledge that permit alternative possibilities to be

thought' (Beck and Young, 2005, 193), which has resulted from thirty years of reform to teacher education in England, is supplemented by the requirement for teachers in formation to 'voice' the 'values' of their employing organisation, to 'perform' compliance with the ethos of the sponsoring employers in order to obtain employment. While this may not always translate directly into pedagogy, it increases the risk of reductive modes of formation, as novice teachers are offered fewer tools to conceptualise their practice in the variety of contexts they may encounter during their careers. These issues appear to be unjustifiably marginal in public discourse about education in England, with otherwise comprehensive review exercises not discussing the implications of academisation on the teaching profession in depth (Academies Commission, 2013).

Prospects for the professional knowledge and learning of teachers in England

Moving towards greater insulation between school-based teacher formation and TEIs has implications for the nature of professional knowledge, and the extent to which subject knowledge or forms of pedagogical knowledge are considered priorities for novice teachers. Where school-based formation (i.e. Model E) has acquired a strong form of classification then the knowledge promoted as valuable by the school takes precedence. This strong classification interrupts the flow of discourses (Bernstein, 2000) between sites of formation and may prioritise the context-specific 'horizontal discourse' found within organisations, thus severing the links with specialised discourse generated within academic institutions that could be used to conceive of alternative forms of professional practice (Bernstein 1999; Beach and Bagley 2013). This also leads to the potential rejection of the value of any induction into pedagogy whatsoever, with subject knowledge considered sufficient preparation for teaching followed by learning 'on the job' in the classroom, a 'technical preparation' (Tatto, 2006, 237). It is plausible that forms of situated or 'organisational' knowledge very specific to the context of the school, or its parent sponsoring organisation, will be foregrounded. The basis of the curriculum of teacher formation programmes can thus be constituted by the organisation alone, and be framed in terms of competence or outcomes based models that focus primarily on the demonstration of requisite behaviours. Meeting the teacher standards and learning the techniques necessary for performance in the host school environment are all that is necessary to realise formation. There is a sense of the 'inevitable obsolescence of accumulated knowledge' (Beck and Young, 2005, 191), as novice teachers are encouraged to view learning knowledge for teaching as an instrumental process with the sole objective of increasing pupil exam performance, or, even more worryingly, enhancing organisational reputation. The professional knowledge advocated by teachers or institutions not sanctioned by the organisation can be considered irrelevant, and forms of research enquiry advocated by TEIs can be seen as an impediment to successful practice (Winch *et al.*, 2013).

The fragmentation of schooling and teacher education may further weaken the system through which teacher knowledge is constituted until it becomes a 'generic' (Bernstein, 2000, 53), with no connection to any form of disciplinary or professional sociality that might sustain its validity, and no sense of a commitment to 'truth' and 'truthfulness' (Young and Muller, 2007) that would rigorously examine the purpose and value of the knowledge held up

as significant for practice. In England, at a systemic level, multiple normatively-based frameworks of teacher competence (Winch, 2010) are being generated by different organisations with different perspectives on what it means to be a ‘good teacher’; and many of these risk resulting in narrow and reductive conceptions of teacher formation. Instead of a clear consensus across those involved in education around notions of teacher expertise, there is a fragmentation that is encouraged by government policy. Changing the direction of travel requires a stronger shared conception of valuable teacher knowledge, fortified by the social conditions within the academic and professional community that guarantee the validity, conceptuality and contextual purchase of that knowledge (Young and Muller 2007, 2014). Taking this forward, however, necessitates forms of professional association that transcend organisational boundaries, recognising the value of the contributions of teacher educators, educational researchers, representative bodies and teaching professionals, and forging agreements which advance a knowledge-based professionalism. Such a strengthening of professionalism could offer teachers, researchers and teacher educators more scope to influence change in education systems and formation processes, and better conserve a distinctive professional, rather than increasingly organisational, identity.

References

Academies Commission. (2013) *Unleashing greatness: getting the best from an academised system* (London, Royal Society of Arts).

Academies Enterprise Trust 2014. School Direct. Available at: <https://sites.google.com/a/aetinet.org/aet-national-teaching-school-alliance/school-direct> (accessed 10th May 2014).

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL). 2013. *Working in an academy* (London, ATL).

Ball, D.L. and Cohen, D.K. (1999) Developing Practice, developing practitioners. In G.Sykes and L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (San Francisco, Jossey Bass), 3-32.

Beach, D. and Bagley, C. (2013) Changing professional discourses in teacher education policy back towards a training paradigm: a comparative study, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (4), 379-392.

Beck, J. (2008) Governmental professionalism: re-professionalising or de-professionalising teachers in England, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56 (2), 119-143.

Beck, J. and Young, M.(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), 183-197

Bernstein, B. (1971) On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In MFD Young (Ed). *Knowledge and Control: New directions for the sociology of education*. (London, Collier MacMillan), 47-69

Bernstein, B. (1999) Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20 (2), 157-173.

Bernstein, B. (2000) *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity* (Revised Edition) (New York and Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers).

Billett, S. (2008) Emerging perspectives on workplace learning. In S. Billett, C. Harteis, and A. Eteläpelto (Eds.) *Emerging perspectives on learning through work* (Rotterdam, Sense), 1-16.

Department for Education (DfE). (N.D.) *Qualified Teacher Status*. Available at: <http://www.education.gov.uk/get-into-teaching/teacher-training-options/qualified-teacher-status> (accessed 9th May 2014).

Department for Education (DfE). 2011a. *Teachers' Standards*. London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE) 2011b. *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers*. London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE) 2013. *School Direct: Operations manual academic year 2013 to 2014*. London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE) 2014. *Become an academy: information for schools*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/become-an-academy-information-for-schools> (accessed 29th July 2014).

Dreyfus, H.L. and Dreyfus, S.E. (2005) Peripheral vision: Expertise in Real World Contexts, *Organization Studies*, 26 (5), 779-792.

Education Select Committee (2012) *Great teachers: attracting, training and retaining the best*. 9th report of the Education Select Committee (London: HMSO).

Ensor, P. (2004) Modalities of Teacher Education discourse and the education of effective practitioners, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 12 (2), 217-232.

Eraut, M. and Hirsh, W. (2007) *The significance of workplace learning for individuals, groups and organisations* (Cardiff, SKOPE).

European Commission. (2013) *Supporting teacher competence development* (Brussels, European Commission).

Evetts, J. (2011) A new professionalism: challenges and opportunities, *Current Sociology*, 59 (4), 404-422.

Felstead, A., Fuller, A., Jewson, N., and L. Unwin. (2009) *Improving Working as Learning* (London, Routledge).

Fournier, V. (1999) The Appeal to 'Professionalism' as a Disciplinary Mechanism, *The Sociological Review*, 47 (2), 280-307.

- Friedson, E. (2001) *Professionalism: The Third Logic* (London, Polity).
- Fuller, A. and Unwin, L. (2004) Expansive Learning Environments: Integrating organizational and personal development. In H.Rainbird, A. Fuller and A.Munro (Eds.) *Workplace Learning in Context* (London, Routledge).
- Fuller, A, Unwin, L, Felstead, A, Jewson, N & Kakavelakis, K. (2007) Creating and using knowledge: an analysis of the differentiated nature of workplace learning environments, *British Educational Research Journal*, 33 (5), 743-759.
- Furlong, J. (2013) Globalisation, Neoliberalism, and the reform of teacher education in England, *The Educational Forum*, 77 (1), 28-50.
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C. and Whitty, G. (2000) *Teacher Education in Transition: re-forming professionalism?* (Buckingham, OUP).
- Grey, C. (1994) Career as a project of the self and labour process discipline, *Sociology*, 28 (2), 479-497.
- Harris Federation Training School Alliance (2014a) School Direct. Available at: <http://www.harristeachingschool.com/55/school-direct> (Accessed 12th May 2014).
- Harris Federation Training School Alliance (2014b) ITT Overview. Available at: <http://www.harristeachingschool.com/121/itt-overview> (Accessed 12th May 2014).
- Kirk, G. (2013) *The Value of University-School Partnerships in Teacher Education* (London, University Council for the Education of Teachers). Available at: <http://www.ucet.ac.uk/4658> (Accessed 10th May 2014).
- National Union of Teachers (NUT) (2014a) *Working in Oasis Academies – an NUT guide* (London, NUT). Available at: <http://teachers.org.uk/taxonomy/term/1735> (Accessed 13th May 2014).
- National Union of Teachers (NUT) (2014b) *Working in ARK Academies – an NUT guide* (London, NUT). Available at: <http://teachers.org.uk/node/13610> (Accessed 15th May 2014).
- Neves, I., Morais, A. and Afonso, M. (2004) Teacher training contexts: Study of specific sociological characteristics. In Muller, J., Davies, B. and Morais, A. (Eds.) *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein* (London, RoutledgeFalmer), 168-186.
- Maandag, D.W., Deinum, J.F., Hofman, W.H. and Buitnik, J. (2007) Teacher education in schools: an international comparison, *European Journal of Teacher Education* 30 (2), 151-173.
- Muzio, D., Hodgson, D., Faulconbridge, J., Beaverstock, J., and S. Hall. (2011) Towards corporate professionalisation: the case of project management, management consultancy and executive search, *Current Sociology* 59 (4), 443-464.

Tatto, M. (2006) Education reform and the global regulation of teachers' education, development and work: A cross-cultural analysis, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 45 (4-5), 231-241.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: learning, meaning and identity* (New York, Cambridge University Press).

Winch, C. (2010) *Dimensions of Expertise: A Conceptual Exploration of Vocational Knowledge* (London, Continuum).

Winch, C. (2013) Curriculum Design and Epistemic ascent, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 47 (1), 128-146.

Winch, C., Oancea, A. and Orchard, J. (2013) *The contribution of Educational Research to Teachers' professional learning – philosophical understandings* (London, BERA/RSA).

Young, M. and Muller, J. (2007) Truth and truthfulness in the sociology of educational knowledge, *Theory & Research in Education*, 5 (2), 173 – 201.

Young, M. and Muller, J. (2014) From the sociology of the professions to the sociology of professional knowledge. In: Young, M. and Muller, J. (Eds.) *Knowledge, Expertise and the Professions* (Abingdon, Routledge), 3-17.

Table 1: Models of teacher formation: dimensions of classification

Variable / Model	Between Discourses across sites	Roles of novice teacher and employee(s)	Notes
Model A (work placement)	C++	C++	Strong classification between programme of formation and school experience
Model B (co-ordinator)	C+	C+	Weakening of classification as school takes on more responsibility
Model C (partnership)	C+/C-	C+	Greater role for the school in teacher formation; partnership usually 'complementary' (Furlong et al. 2000).
Model D (network)	C-	C-	Intense collaboration. The programme itself can achieve a distinctively strong classification
Model E (training school)	C++	C-	School-based formation strongly classified. Novice teacher more likely to be an employee or seen as future employee