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ABSTRACT

Teacher education in the UK is undergoing a period of active development. In order to identify the rationale offered for change and the direction of travel this article reports a textual analysis of two key policy texts recently published in England and Scotland: the English Schools White Paper *The Importance of Teaching* (Department for Education, 2010a) and *Teaching Scotland’s Future* (Donaldson, 2011). These influential documents are explicitly relevant to the study of teacher education in transition, specifically the extent to which policy formation is premised on different forms of deliberation, different models of professionalism and different visions of a socially just education system. The analysis presented here is ‘critical’ in the sense that it interrogates the claims made in policy language and explores their constitutive effect. Key themes include the construction of ‘partnership/collaboration’ and ‘professionalism’ within these texts and how the ‘re-conceptualisation’ of both is informed by different sets of interests and values. Whilst the focus here is on teacher education, this analysis raises wider questions about the relative health of the public sphere in different jurisdictions of the UK.

INTRODUCTION

There are very few comparative textual analyses of education policy in the four nations of the UK post-devolution (for an example see Laugherne and Baird, 2009). The purpose of this analysis is to better understand how policy on teacher education is being configured at a time of increasing possibilities for divergence in the post-devolution context. This comparison builds on earlier work that has sought to place education policy within its particular historical, political, social and cultural context (Raffe and Byrne 2005; Menter et al, 2006; Arnott and Ozga, 2010).

The two documents to be analysed here, *Teaching Scotland’s Future* (Donaldson, 2011) and *The Importance of Teaching* (Department for Education, 2010a) belong to the same genre of official secondary sources: consultation documents that take a conventional ‘problem-plus-solution’ structure (Wetherell et al, 2001). They are examples of formal and public policy texts intended to signal possible policy direction in education at a national level in line with prevailing assumptions of what is in the ‘national interest’ of the respective jurisdictions. Neither carries statutory force, but both represent dialogue with the public prior to the parliamentary and legislative stages of policy making. Both are concerned with improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness (variously defined) of the national system of school education in general (the main focus of *The Importance of Teaching Schools White Paper*)
and of teaching and teacher education in particular (the main focus of *Teaching Scotland’s Future*). These imperatives are based on questions of value and hence are not restricted to technical issues of efficiency but also connect with equity and therefore have political, cultural and ethical dimensions.

The interplay of ethics, political ideology and evidence is embedded in public policy texts and enacted in the process of policy production. The use of evidence drawn from commissioned contract research and other sources in the processes of text production is an interesting case. The ways in which evidence is presented in final reports of commissioned research is subject to mediation through successive re-drafting. Iterative summarising and distillation of ‘top line’ messages is required by government sponsors and built into research contracts (see Hulme and Menter, 2010). Within collectively generated formal texts (such as White Papers), these issues are often opaque, obfuscating issues of ‘authorship’ and influence.

The review process for *Teaching Scotland’s Future* generated data from a range of sources: an online questionnaire to serving teachers (which elicited 2,500 responses); a commissioned one hundred page *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the Twenty First Century* (Menter et al., 2010) which reviewed 290 items; 99 formal (individual and organisational) written submissions following an open call for evidence (April-June 2010); visits to university Schools of Education, selected schools and local authorities across the country; and a number of international visits to sites of interesting practice overseas (Menter and Hulme, 2011). The English White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching* (Department of Education, 2010a) was supported by the 35 page document, *The Case for Change* (Department of Education, 2010b). The White Paper itself, published one month later, contains 108 ‘Endnotes’ that list 128 sources of information. Following removal of duplicate references to the same source, there are 90 distinct sources (including 10 separate references to Department for Education (DfE) internal analyses in 2010) (pp.86-91).

The two selected texts differ in terms of *provenance* (authorship and national jurisdiction), *warrant* (the range of sources of evidence deployed), *purpose* (addressee) and *status. Teaching Scotland’s Future* is a different category of official document. It is the report of a government commissioned expert review rather than a White Paper. It is intended to present an analysis with recommendations. The review was conducted over a ten-month period (February-December 2010) by Graham Donaldson¹, a former Senior Chief Inspector of the Scottish schools inspectorate, HMIE, and made fifty recommendations. The report occupies a different place and weighting within the policy cycle. White Papers are command papers that set out the policy intentions of government in an accessible form before presenting a Bill to Parliament. Reviews and advisory groups are commissioned by government at an earlier consultation stage with a view to informing the formation of policy. As such, the two documents represent different approaches to participation.

¹ Graham Donaldson was supported by a small team that included professional support from Graeme Logan (seconded from HMIE) and Cathy Macaslan, education policy advisor to the Scottish Government. A ten-member Reference Group provided support and challenge throughout the Review; membership was drawn from NHS Education, the Law Society, two Scottish universities, a local authority, two high schools, two primaries and a special school.
in the public sphere: White Papers are published by government ostensibly to offer opportunities for feedback in advance of finalising the details of a Bill; expert reviews invite participation through systematic forms of (managed) public consultation presented to government. This is not to assume that participation is the same as influence, but that there are different strategies to engage the public based on different conceptions of policy making.

The two texts were also produced at different points in the electoral cycle. Teaching Scotland’s Future (TSF) was commissioned by a SNP-led minority government and published four months before the Scottish Parliamentary elections, which led to the first SNP-led majority government. The English White Paper was produced some six months after the Conservative-Liberal Democrat government took office following the UK General Election in May 2011.

Six months after the publication of the Schools White Paper in England, another document, Training our next generation of outstanding teachers (Department for Education, 2011a) was published. This document set out proposals for the reform of initial teacher training to take effect from September 2012. The Education Bill was introduced to the House of Commons in January 2011 and progressed to the House of Lords Committee stage in July 2011. Two months after the publication of Teaching Scotland’s Future, the Scottish Government published its response, Continuing to Build Excellence in Teaching (Scottish Government, 2011), which accepted in full or in part all of the recommendations of the Donaldson Review. A ‘National Partnership Group’ was convened to engage in further deliberation on operational details.

In addition to close analysis of the two main (conventional) texts, a limited range of supporting (unconventional) texts – such as online video and press releases - was analysed (see Table 1). These were available electronically from the Review of Teacher Education in Scotland website (archived by Learning and Teaching Scotland3), the Scottish Government4 and the Department for Education websites. The inclusion of associated semi-official texts is important as these contribute to the re-contextualisation of policy as it circulates and reaches a wider audience. Associated documents or ‘boundary genre’ accompanying key policy texts form a ‘genre chain’ (Wetherell et al, 2001:255). The multi-modal nature of contemporary political discourse (talk, text, style and image) encourages attention to informal and non-print communication. Fairclough (2000:4) has drawn attention to the ‘mediatisation’ of the ‘new politics’ and the ‘technologisation of discourse’ (2001:231). (See Table 1 on page 73)

2 http://scotland.gov.uk/About/NationalPartnershipGroup/
4 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education
Table 1: Selected texts in the genre chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teaching Scotland’s Future*  
(Donaldson, 2011) | *The Importance of Teaching*  
(Department for Education, 2010a) |
| *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the Twenty-First Century* (Menter, Hulme et al, 2010)  
*Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: an improvement strategy for discussion* (Department for Education, 2011a) |
| Scottish Government press release (09/03/2011) Teachers to be among world’s best  
| Scottish Government press release (13/01/2011) Gold standard for teachers  
[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XBDpwq515vQ](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XBDpwq515vQ) |
| Video: Teachers for Tomorrow. Graham Donaldson introduces the Review of Teacher Education in Scotland  
(4:26 mins)  
[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K6BBW2FVypc](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K6BBW2FVypc) |  |

**METHOD**

Triangulation was employed in analysing the texts using a combination of critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistic techniques (Baker et al, 2008). Digitised texts were exported in full to NVivo 9.1. Qualitative analysis involved line-by-line reading, re-reading and annotation. To enable comparison, it was necessary to establish analytical parameters. A text analysis protocol based on a common framework of questions was generated (see Figure 1) (Ozga, 2000:98-99). The protocol was informed by our reading of policy literature, and was tested and adapted during July-August 2011. The use of a protocol enables a degree of
replicability and reflects a concern with rendering research choices transparent (Ozga, 2000; Fairclough, 2003). Repeated readings enabled the marking up of key themes against the protocol or iterative ‘coding’ of sections of text. Extensive use of memos recorded developing ideas, especially in regard to notable absences and silences in the two texts.

**Figure 1. Text analysis protocol**

- What story is being presented? What is new or consistent about this story?
- What are the key organising principles or propositions (and presuppositions) in the text?
- What ideological assumptions underpin the narrative? (‘nominalisation’ of processes, expression of causality and attribution of responsibility) (Fairclough, 1992:236)
- How is government (national and local) and its relations with other social actors represented in the text? (Mulderigg, 2009)
- How are subjects (‘managed actors’) constructed in the text – teachers, learners, teacher educators?
- What ‘silences’ and omissions are there in the text?
- What range of ‘voices’/‘players’ is presented in the text? (uni- or multi-vocal)
- How is evidence used to support claims (and win consent)? (Set of arguments or assertions?) What pedagogical devices are deployed in the text?
- How coherent is the text? To what extent is the text ‘readerly’ (closed) or ‘writerly’ (open)? (Ball, 1994). How directive or ambivalent is the text?

Complementing the qualitative analysis a quantitative analysis was carried out using the text analysis software, WordSmith Tools 5 (Scott, 2010). This was conducted to establish the frequency of ‘key words’ and to suggest the significance of certain ideas and recurrent themes within each text and significant lexical difference between the texts. Corpus linguistic techniques were used to determine collocations (i.e. co-occurrence between words in the text) and colligation (connections between words) using the concordance and word cluster functions of WordSmith Tools (i.e. identifying the words that ‘keep company’ with key words). It should be noted that this process of enumeration has its limitations and was intended to supplement detailed qualitative analysis of the texts (Baker, 2004).

---

5 Nominalisation or ‘objectivation’, as defined by Fairclough (2000:162), is “the representation of a process as a noun – for instance the various aspects of social life changing in particular ways as simply ‘change’”.

6 The ‘keyness’ of a word is defined as ‘its frequency in the text when compared with its frequency in the reference corpus’ (Scott, 2010:168).
ANALYSIS
The Importance of Teaching (IoT)

The Schools White Paper is informed by a neo-liberal political rationality that has exerted a marked influence on public policy in the UK from the early 1980s and is finding fresh expression in the Westminster Government’s policies for schools. Neo-liberal forms of government - characterised by marketization, privatisation and individualisation – work to shape subjectivity in particular ways (influencing how we think and act upon ourselves and others). Citizenship is reframed within a conception of the good society as comprised of ‘individualists who cooperate’ (Green 2009). The neo-liberal conception of ‘competitive freedom’, premised on the development of ‘virtuous, disciplined and responsible autonomy’ (Dean, 1999:155), is an organising principle within the White Paper. The task of government is to help individuals play the role of actor in his or her own life.

It is only through reforming education that we can allow every child the chance to take their full and equal share in citizenship, shaping their own destiny, and becoming masters of their own fate...to choose a fulfilling job, to shape the society around them...to become authors of their own life stories. (Michael Gove, IoT, p.6)

In what follows we focus on what the Importance of Teaching says about teachers, teaching and teacher education in order to facilitate the comparison with Teaching Scotland’s Future.

Teachers

Given the title, The Importance of Teaching, it is notable how infrequent are references to teachers and teacher education in the English document. There are 371 references to teacher(s) in comparison with 1,155 in the Scottish document, Teaching Scotland’s Future. The scope of IoT is indeed much wider than is implied by the title. The marketisation and commodification of schooling is reconciled with the mission of restoring teachers’ discretion and ‘strengthening teachers’ authority in the classroom’ (p.3). In strategies of legitimation, teachers and school leaders are positioned as professionals for whom ‘micro-management’ from the centre is not necessary. ‘Good teachers’ and ‘good schools’ know what constitutes best practice and therefore government is justified in taking steps to ‘remove statutory duties and requirements which we do not think need to be a legal requirement’ (IoT, p.29). This is used in relation to the DfE review of Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) announced in July 2011 and the reform of the school curriculum.

Teachers, not bureaucrats or Ministers, know best how to teach – how to convey knowledge effectively and how to unlock understanding. (p.41)

It should be for teachers, not government, to design the lessons and the experiences which will engage students. Government can help by clearing away the clutter of unnecessary curricular detail, and restricting itself to outlining the core knowledge children should expect to acquire. (p.46)

7 In another paper we develop the analysis of IoT to incorporate what it has to say about schools, local authorities and its wider framing of education and society (Hulme and Menter, in preparation).
The proposals outlined in IoT are prefixed with the claim ‘teachers/headteachers consistently tell us’ (p.8, p.20). The evidence for these claims comes from a variety of sources that present particular readings of the standing of teaching in England. These sources are used to justify a return to the traditional conservative themes of discipline and subject-centred scholarship. Several teacher surveys commissioned by teachers’ unions and by, or for, the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE) are reported which serve to create an understanding of teaching as an unattractive, stressful and unsafe occupation. Establishing the problem of poor behaviour allows deliberation to focus on teachers’ authority as a core concern, but this is a particular reading of authority associated with institutional power. Concordances in IoT indicate that teachers’ ‘authority’ is associated with pupil ‘behaviour’ in the classroom. The empowerment of headteachers and class teachers in England is to include ‘new powers on detentions and searching’ (p.3) and ‘a new approach to exclusion’ (p.10). The teachers’ voice is used to give a mandate to an ordering of priorities that privileges this version of ‘authority’.

There are a number of contradictory strains within this discourse. On the one hand, the reader is told ‘the National Curriculum includes too much that is not essential knowledge, and there is too much prescription about how to teach’ (p.10). On the other, the government is to specify more tightly ‘the core knowledge children should expect to acquire’ (p.46) and promote adoption of ‘the best approaches to the teaching of early reading and early mathematics’ (p.26) without acknowledgement of any debate about ‘best approaches’. Innovation cannot be mandated but under new freedoms, ‘We envisage schools and teachers taking greater control over what is taught in schools, innovating in how they teach and developing new approaches to learning’ (p.40). Scope for innovation is contained within the parameters of a traditional subject focused curriculum, with fewer spaces for ‘disruptive pedagogies’ (Weiss and Fine, 2001). Pupils are to be helped towards self-government and rational choice making, whilst subject to increased levels of institutional authority over these choices. Teachers’ authority in the classroom is to be strengthened and the schools inspectorate, Ofsted, is to refocus inspection more strongly on behaviour (p.36). The concept of teacher authority is not problematised but presented as a common sense solution to the problem of ‘poorly disciplined children’ (p.9).

Teacher Education

Whilst teaching is described as a noble ‘calling’, it is not a calling that appears to demand extensive professional preparation or regulation by an independent body. The Education Bill proposes the abolition of the English General Teaching Council, established in 1998, and the transfer of ‘key functions’ of the Training and

---

8 Three reports focus on standards of pupil behaviour (NFER, 2008; ATL, 2009; NASUWT, 2010); a further two depict the impact of workload and behaviour on retention (MORI 2003, GTCE 2005). Opinion polls by YouGov (2007) for TeachersTV and ICM (2010) are also used to depict the declining standing of teaching as a career choice. The references for these opinion polls are incomplete and neither is currently available in the public domain.

9 Concern has been expressed over the involvement of Ruth Miskin of Read Write Inc. in the review of the English national curriculum. Miskin’s company (http://www.ruthmiskinliteracy.com/default.aspx) provides training courses and materials to support the synthetic phonics reading method (Times Educational Supplement, 3rd June 2011).
Development Agency to the Department for Education, increasing direct central control. The value of university–based teacher education and the professional knowledge base of teacher education are significant omissions. The new ‘free schools’, in common with independent schools, can employ teachers without teaching qualifications. The current discourse on teacher education in England refers to ‘ITT providers’ to reflect the diversification of providers. Attention is directed towards selection of high calibre candidates with the required ‘aptitude, personality and resilience’ (p.21). Initial Teacher Training is to be reformed ‘so that it focuses on what is really important’ (p.23). What matters most are classroom skills - ‘new teachers report that they are not always confident about some key skills that they need as teachers’ (p.23) such as teaching reading (systematic synthetic phonics) (p.43) and behaviour management. The IoT reinforces the ‘practical turn’ in teacher education from the early 1990s (Furlong and Lawn, 2010). Teaching is not presented as a complex activity and the scholarship of teaching is absent. Gove has described teaching as ‘a craft because it is something you learn in a work-based environment,’ (Times Educational Supplement, 19th November 2010). The Case for Change draws on the findings of the Becoming a Teacher study (Hobson et al 2009) to assert that ‘university-based trainees see their training as too theoretical’ (p.9).

A review of Teachers’ Standards was announced in the IoT. The composition of the Review Group signals the marginalisation of university Schools of Education in England and a return to narrower forms of consultation and more selective use of evidence. This latest Standards Review, the consultation on which ran for just six weeks, appears to mark a return to more directive processes of policy formation. The fifteen-person Review Group is composed of selected ‘excellent’ school leaders, teachers and education consultants with strong representation from Academies (publicly-funded schools independent of local authority control). It does not contain any faculty members from mainstream university Schools of Education, but does include Anthony O’Hear (Buckingham University), former member of the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) and Teacher Training Agency (TTA) boards and author of the Social Affairs Unit pamphlet, Who Teaches the Teachers? (O’Hear, 1988), as well as Brett Wigdortz, the Chief Executive of the Teach First scheme, much praised in IoT and elsewhere. Evidence in support of the proposed reform of Standards was drawn from the mixed findings of the GTCE 10

10 Within days of taking office, the Schools Minister Nick Gibb allegedly told officials, “I would rather have a physics graduate from Oxbridge without a PGCE teaching in a school than a physics graduate from one of the rubbish universities with a PGCE.” (The Guardian, 16th May 2010). From this elitist stance connections are not explored between positive capacities and attributes (such as academic ‘calibre’ and personal dispositions), and equity issues associated with educational opportunity, access to higher education and diversity among the school workforce.

11 The Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education existed in England from 1984 until the creation of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) in 1994. The TTA was the forerunner of the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), which is the national agency responsible for the training and development of the school workforce in England.
commissioned 2010 Survey of Teachers (Poet et al, 2011). The first report of the Teachers’ Standards Review, published 14th July 2011 (Coates 2011), proposes a reduction from 33 to eight ‘baseline’ standards that must be met before trainee teachers are awarded Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). It is proposed that from 1 September 2012 the new Standards for QTS (initial teacher education) are combined with the Core Standards (for main scale teachers who have successfully completed induction). There are currently 41 Core Standards. The review report states that, ‘it is not the task of standards to prescribe in detail what “good” or “outstanding” teaching should look like; that decision is best made by ITT providers, teachers and headteachers themselves’ (p.7). The eight principles of the GTCE (2009) Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers are replaced by three standards for personal and professional conduct. There is no longer an expectation that teachers in England will ‘promote equality’ (GTCE 2009:6).

There is to be an increase in places through school-centred initial teaching training and the graduate teacher programme, where trainees ‘learn on the job’ (IoT, p.23) and ‘a national network of Teaching Schools to lead and develop sustainable approaches to teacher development across the country’ (IoT, p.23) to be quality assured by the National College (an executive agency of the Department for Education charged with the development of leadership capacity among schools, early years settings and children’s services). Innovation in teacher education is to progress on a selective basis in a mixed market: ‘In parallel, we will invite some of the best higher education providers of initial teacher training to open University Training Schools’ (IoT, p.23) and ‘giving outstanding schools a much greater role in teacher training in the same way that our best hospitals train new doctors and nurses’ (IoT, Foreword, p.3). Reference is made to ‘top graduates’ (p.9) and ‘top universities’ (p.6, p.19). The rationale draws not on successful domestic practice but from diverse geo-political and socio-cultural sources and lacks attention to context specificity. The Finnish model of Training Schools (situated in a national system of comprehensive education without streaming, national testing and inspection) appears in the same sentence as the development in the U.S. of professional development or ‘lab schools’ (pp.23-4).

Whilst the IoT is, at best, quiet on the role of higher education in educating teachers, third sector ‘civil society programmes’ receive a high degree of positive attention (Gove, 2009). Teach First (based on the US Teach for America model), Teaching Leaders (UK equivalent of the U.S. Leading Educators programme) and Future Leaders are helping to attract more of the best graduates and school leaders to working in disadvantaged schools’ (IoT, p.16). Corporate sponsors, independent schools and academy chains are among their partners. There are 12 references to Teach First in the main text, described as ‘fantastic’ by the Prime Minister and his Deputy (p.3). Evidence in support of the effectiveness of the

---

12 Survey responses from 4,392 teachers suggested that early career teachers and senior leaders held more positive attitudes towards the contribution of the Standards to practice improvement than long-serving teachers. Poet et al (2011:20) conclude that, ‘there is very much a mixed view on the professional standards framework’.

13 http://www.teachingleaders.org.uk

14 http://www.future-leaders.org.uk/
programme is drawn from a research-based evaluation conducted by Hutchings et al (2006) and a report by Ofsted (2008). Evidence of the attractiveness of the programme is drawn from a graduate poll for The Times newspaper and a US Atlantic Magazine article reporting the impact of its forerunner, Teach for America (Ripley, 2010). The IoT signals expansion in Teach First places per year (from 560 to 1,140) and the introduction of a modest Teach Next scheme for ‘highly talented career changers’ (IoT, p.21).

Whilst emphasising the importance of recruiting ‘the most able young people’ and ‘best graduates’ from ‘top universities’ into teaching, the White Paper also outlines the ‘Troops to Teachers’ programme – ‘a bespoke compressed undergraduate route’ for ex-service personnel without degree level qualifications (p.22) but presumably ample supplies of authority. This programme too has its origins in the U.S. programme of the same name initiated in 1994. In a Conservative Party policy brief on ‘Troops for Teachers’ Gove (2008:1) argues that, ‘Evidence shows that ex-servicemen are particularly effective in dealing with ‘hard to reach’ young people’ on the basis of undisclosed data supplied by the educational charity Skill Force, which employs ex-military personnel as instructors delivering a curriculum for 13-16 year olds based on the three themes of ‘character, community and contribution’ (and mapped against English and Scottish skill awards15). The further claim that Troops to Teachers in the U.S. has had ‘enormous success’ (Gove, 2008:2) is not repeated in official evaluations of the programme, which are more measured (United States Government Accountability Office, 2006). This selective use of evidence by the Education Secretary in England supports an overt stance on the function of schools in character development.

School-university partnerships appear only in the background. Collaboration is celebrated but is to be advanced through local school-led networks, federations or Academy chains, which are positioned as a key route for supporting improvement: ‘Schools working together leads to better results.’ (p.57). Funding is to be deployed to promote collaboration in a competitive market via, ‘a new collaboration incentive worth £35m each year…[to] reward schools which support weaker schools to demonstrably improve their performance while also improving their own’ (p.76). Academy school sponsors are to be encouraged to assume a greater role in producing system improvement. New providers are encouraged to enter the English schools’ market (such as the U.S. charter schools: the Knowledge Is Power Programme (KIPP), Green Dot and Uncommon Schools)16 (p.58). The Case for Change cites the U.S. charter school chains KIPP and Aspire and the

15 http://www.skillforce.org/skillforce-for-schools/skillforce-curriculum
16 Charter schools are publicly-funded schools that operate as non-profit corporations independent of local school district control. Charter status is authorised at state level and a range of stakeholders can submit a charter proposal for consideration – parents, teachers, community groups, business interests. Control is devolved through a ‘charter’ in return for greater accountability for performance. Further information on the network of 109 KIPP schools can be found at http://www.kipp.org/. For information on the Aspire chain in California, the Green Dot school model in Los Angeles and the Uncommon Schools movement in New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts see http://www.aspirepublicschools.org/, http://www.greendot.org/ & http://www.uncommonschools.org/our-approach. The evidence base on the impact of charter schools in comparison to traditional public schools is mixed (CREDO, 2009).
U.K. Academy chains Ark, Harris and the Christian charity, the United Learning Trust\(^\text{17}\) (p.13).

There is no mention of teachers-as-researchers or ‘teaching as a research and evidence-based profession’ in the IoT or the revised Standards. The reference made to ‘teaching research groups’ and other forms of systematic collaborative inquiry cited in *The Case for Change* (p.11) are omitted. Of the 18 references to ‘research’ in the IoT, only four appear in the main text; all others are endnotes. In the main text, ‘research’ is used (a) to undermine the value of contextual value added measures (p.68); (b) to promote the impact of the work of National Leaders in relation to Teaching Schools (p.75); (c) in support of the Finnish model of Training Schools (p.24); (d) as part of moves to extend information and available resources to support school-led improvement efforts (p.77). Inquiry through professional development is restricted to subject scholarship for the classteacher or MBA-influenced models of leadership development. Subject-based professional development is promoted through the introduction of ‘a competitive national scholarship scheme’ for further study (p.24) and through reference to the educational charity, the Prince’s Teaching Institute\(^\text{18}\) (rather than through local university Schools of Education or local authorities).

**Teaching Scotland’s Future (TSF)**

**Comprehensive principles**

Where IoT focuses on school autonomy and diversity of provision as a means of raising standards, TSF focuses on the professional capacity of the teacher workforce in community schools engaged in collaborative partnership with key stakeholders in the wider education community – principally universities, local authorities and the General Teaching Council for Scotland. *Teaching Scotland’s Future* approaches innovation within the context of popular support for a comprehensive system of state education. Parents in Scotland have shown little enthusiasm for removing community schools from local authority control from the late 1980s. Scotland’s two self-governing (grant maintained) schools were returned to local authority control in 1997\(^\text{19}\). The development of ‘trust schools’ proposed by East Lothian Council in 2010 was opposed. Fewer than 5% of pupils attend schools in the independent sector in Scotland. While the Donaldson report acknowledges contributions to the review from ‘colleagues in England, Wales and Northern Ireland’ (Donaldson, 2011iii), there is no reference to alternative practice or consultation with educationists in the devolved jurisdictions of the UK in IoT.

Scottish education was not subject to the same ‘discourses of derision’ and ‘distrust’ targeted at teachers, schools and teacher education south of the border (Ball, 2007). TSF commences with a bold affirmation of achievement. Developments

---

\(^{17}\) In October 2009 the Labour Government had barred the United Learning Trust from expanding its Academy chains following concern raised by Ofsted about the performance of its academies in Sheffield and Stockport. *Times Educational Supplement, 29th July 2011*


\(^{19}\) Dornoch Academy and St Mary’s Episcopal primary were returned to Highland and Stirling councils respectively.
in Scottish teacher education ‘place Scotland in a strong position when compared with other countries internationally…One main requirement, therefore, is to make the most of what we already have’ (p.2) and re-focus ‘to address the areas of greatest challenge for Scottish education’ (p.35). TSF offers a critically reflexive and ‘proactive view of teacher education’ (p.4). The report builds on earlier reports that have emphasised the role of partnership (Sutherland Report, 1997; Brisard et al, 2005) and leadership (Scottish Executive, 2003); and addresses areas of omission such as the lack of attention to the role of CPD in teacher education in the preceding review of ITE (Scottish Executive, 2005). Teaching Scotland’s Future gives greater weight to complexity, enquiry and professional agency.

The most successful education systems do more than seek to attain particular standards of competence and to achieve change through prescription. They invest in developing their teachers as reflective, accomplished and enquiring professionals who have the capacity to engage fully with the complexities of education and to be key actors in shaping and leading educational change. (TSF, p.4)

Where IoT centred on the promotion of negative liberty, TSF makes explicit linkage between the educational aims and values of a national education system founded on the promotion of positive freedom. TSF takes a broad understanding of the curriculum as the totality of educational experiences. From the outset there is a formal commitment to attempt to link curriculum development with professional education; and the education project with the social project. Here an emphasis is placed on collective responsibility rather than responsible self-government at an individual or institutional level. The form of ‘extended professionalism’ (Hoyle, 1974) represented here - whilst falling short of the kinds of ‘activist professionalism’ advocated by Sachs (2003) - is different from the narrow view of professional responsibility depicted in IoT. In this ‘wider concept of teacher professionalism’, teachers are repeatedly positioned as ‘co-creators of the curriculum’ (p.4) and ‘agents of change, not passive or reluctant receivers of externally-imposed prescription’ (p.19). Rather than a restricted version of professionalism centred on classroom skills and subject knowledge, TSF is explicit about extending the field of responsibility and participation for all teachers: ‘This concept of professionalism takes each individual teacher’s responsibility beyond the individual classroom outwards into the school, to teacher education and the profession as a whole’ (p.15). Whilst no system of public education is immune to the performative turn, the balance of professional to managerial forms of accountability varies within the UK.

Teacher quality and teacher development
Both documents focus on the issue of selection and share a concern with the calibre of new entrants. Different approaches are posed. First, TSF identifies

20 School ‘league tables’ based on exam results, produced by the news media, are available in England and Scotland. Scottish Schools Online publishes a wide range of information on schools for comparison purposes: inspection reports, examination results, staying on and attendance/absence rates, leaver destinations, school roll, and pupil intake in terms of free school meal entitlement.
a need to define what is meant by teacher quality: We need to be clear about the qualities and capacities which are associated with high quality teachers and develop procedures to select for those qualities’ (p.26). Second, TSF recommends action to ‘broaden the base of selection to involve local authorities and schools as more equal partners’ (p.5). Third, TSF advocates the diagnostic use of literacy and numeracy tests: ‘The threshold established for entry should allow for weaknesses to be addressed by the student during the course’ (p.26).

Where the Teachers’ Standards framework in England has contracted to focus on a smaller number of core skills, TSF affords greater attention to the full continuum of teacher education, particularly leadership development, and this is reflected in the structure of the report. In Scotland the intention is to refine and develop an integrated suite of Standards that are ‘explicit about the core knowledge, skills and competences that all teachers need to continually refresh and improve as they progress through their careers… with practical illustrations of the Standards’ (TSF, Recommendation 35, p.97). The Standards framework currently consists of the Standard for Initial Teacher Education, the Standard for Full Registration (probation), Standard for Chartered Teacher22 and Standard for Headship. TSF recommends the addition of a new Standard of Active Registration (Recommendation 36, p.97), linked to professional reaccreditation. In this, Scotland concurs with other countries that are developing refined (rather than reduced) standards that set out dimensions of teacher competence and accomplishment e.g. Hong Kong, New Zealand and Australia.

Teacher education should be seen as and should operate as a continuum, spanning a career and requiring much better alignment across and much closer working amongst schools, authorities, universities and national organisations. (TSF, p.28)

Attention to the full continuum is an acknowledgment that the demands of teaching have become ‘increasingly complex and demanding’ (p.12) and cannot be addressed through initial preparation programmes based on an apprenticeship model of work-based learning alone. The proposals in TSF are informed by a contention that ‘Any expectation that initial teacher education will cover all that a new teacher needs to know and do is clearly unrealistic’ (p.34), described elsewhere as the “quart-into-pint-pot” problem (p.89). Moreover, ‘Even the most capable new teacher is still at the beginning of the journey of professional development’ (p.54). Because teaching is becoming more complex, the length of preparation and the organisation, content and staffing of programmes need to change. Donaldson does not propose the hollowing out of ITE to emphasis craft skills in compressed courses, but the pursuit of greater intellectual challenge from the earliest stages

---

21 There are four substantive sections. The first addresses twenty-first century teachers and leaders. The next section focuses on admissions and the issues of recruitment and quality. The final two main substantive sections of the report focus on the early career phase and career long learning.

22 Recruitment to and progression through the Chartered Teacher programme was frozen on the 6th June 2011 (SNCT, 2011). The Chartered Teacher Programme was introduced in 2003 to recognise and reward experienced and accomplished teachers. Progression was through a part-time modular master’s programme, with salary increments for successful completion of modules.
of professional formation. It is suggested that this might include lengthening the period of ITE to two-year postgraduate or five-year undergraduate programmes\(^{23}\) (p.40), with the continuation of mentor support beyond ITE.

In marked contrast to the IoT, Donaldson asserts, ‘Scotland’s universities are central to building the kind of twenty-first century profession which this Report believes to be necessary’ (p.104). He maintains that, ‘There is considerable potential for university-based teacher educators to contribute more fully across the full continuum of teacher education in Scotland’ (p.57). However, this endorsement is not without a critical edge. A number of challenges are identified for Schools of Education. These include developing the pedagogical research capacity of teacher educators, taking full advantage of the university location of Schools of Education and moving towards collaborative partnership relationships that might support aspirations for ‘co-construction’. Reflecting on the outcomes of universitisation from the late 1990s, TSF observes,

> Mergers between the former colleges of education and universities were designed to help to raise the status of the profession and to allow future teachers to benefit from the wider academic and research culture of a university. Those aims have at best only been partially achieved and there remains considerable scope to improve the synergies between dedicated teacher education schools and the wider university. (p.6)

The degree of intellectual challenge extended in the traditional B.Ed degree for prospective primary school teachers attracts particular attention. It is suggested ‘its specificity of purpose can lead to an over-emphasis on technical and craft skills at the expense of broader and more academically challenging areas of study’ (p.39). Recommendation 11 (p.88) proposes the phasing out of the current B.Ed degree and the wider involvement of arts and science faculty in courses leading to teaching qualifications.

> In line with emerging developments across Scotland’s universities, the traditional BEd degree should be phased out and replaced with degrees which combine in-depth academic study in areas beyond education with professional studies and development. These new degrees should involve staff and departments beyond those in schools of education. (TSF, p.41)

Recent high levels of unemployment among new teachers have prompted greater attention to the wider employability of individuals with teaching qualifications\(^{24}\).

---

\(^{23}\) In addition it is suggested that greater use might be made of university time outwith school terms: ‘using traditional vacation periods, extending the PGDE beyond the current September to June (10-month) pattern, using the long break between the current two phases for further study’ (p.41).

\(^{24}\) Scotland currently has high levels of unemployment among early career teachers and so the problem of supply in general is one of over supply (with some shortage subjects) and lack of ethnic diversity. The ratio of applications to offers for ITE courses in 8:1. The proportion of new teachers not employed in teaching in Scotland in the October following induction rose from 5.3% to 27% between October 2005 and 2010 (GTCS, 2010). Intermittent employment of teachers from their second year (i.e. post probation) has also strengthened the focus on a need for improved coherence in the early career phase. This is to be achieved by continued mentor support and access to appropriate CPD pathways (p.55).
The development of concurrent degrees, the involvement of arts and science faculty and contributions from other human services, such as social work, are suggested as ways of rendering teaching qualifications more attractive to a wider range of employers in education-related and other areas of work (Recommendation 7, p.86).

Where IoT draws on teacher surveys to suggest popular support for the direction of policy, TSF argues that preference for apprentice models of work-based learning among beginning teachers are to be challenged rather than accepted: ‘The values and intellectual challenges which underpin academic study should extend their own scholarship and take them beyond any inclination, however understandable, to want narrow training of immediate and direct relevance to life in the classroom’ (p.6). Teacher educators ought not to collude with the demands of some students for a restricted diet of practical instruction (p.37). The university location of Schools of Education might be more fully exploited to reduce, ‘unhelpful philosophical and structural divides, [they] have led to sharp separations of function amongst teachers, teacher educators and researchers’ (p.5). Whilst highly valued, the practicum should be the site for experimentation in ‘well researched innovation’ by ‘research aware teachers’ (p.102). School experience ‘should do much more than provide practice in classroom skills, vital though these are. Experience in a school provides the opportunity to use practice to explore theory and examine relevant research evidence’ (p.90).

The ‘craft’ components of teaching must be based upon and informed by fresh insights into how best to meet the increasingly fast pace of change in the world which our children inhabit. Simply advocating more time in the classroom as a means of preparing teachers for their role is therefore not the answer to creating better teachers. The nature and quality of that practical experience must be carefully planned and evaluated and used to develop understanding of how learning can best be promoted in sometimes very complex and challenging circumstances. (pp.4-5)

TSF does not recommend that teaching in Scotland should become a master’s level profession on entry but does support the extension of opportunities for teachers to pursue master’s level qualifications from an early career stage. Recommendation 44 argues that ‘Masters level credits should be built into initial teacher education qualifications, induction year activities and CPD beyond the induction year, with each newly-qualified teacher having a ‘Masters account’ opened for them’ (p.99).

**Partnership and collaboration**

Partnership and collaboration in TSF are not about networked forms of private governance but a reflexive re-examination of professional jurisdiction across the career stages to achieve stronger synergy between partners in the public system of education (Recommendation 3, p.86). Rather than the erosion of partnership arrangements within the education community, TSF seeks an expansion and deepening of these relations (Recommendation 15, p.91). Donaldson notes some discrepancy between the rhetoric on partnership and current practice: ‘There appears to be no lack of goodwill towards improved partnership working but,
although cooperation has improved, effective collaboration remains relatively rare' (p.47). New models of joint staffing are suggested to promote knowledge exchange, moderation of standards and assessment of students by school-based mentors (Recommendation 24, p.93).

New and strengthened models of partnership among universities, local authorities, schools and individual teachers need to be developed. These partnerships should be based on jointly agreed principles and involve shared responsibility for key areas of teacher education. (p.48)

TSF recommends the identification of ‘hub teaching schools as a focal point for research, learning and teaching’ (p.91, pp.111-112). Here there is a tension between the identification of ‘centres of excellence’ and the will for systemic level change that draws on established partnership networks. In this regard, the comprehensive principles that underpin the Scottish national system and historic alliances within the policy community (e.g. between teachers unions and local authorities) might be seen as conservative or inhibiting innovation. The closer alignment of faculty activities with the concerns of school effectiveness might also create disquiet among opponents to any erosion of independent criticality in the ‘broad church’ of educational research.

The creation of a network of such ‘hub school’ partnerships across all authorities and also involving national agencies would enable much more direct engagement of university staff in school practice, with research as an integral part of this strengthened partnership rather than as something which sits apart. (p.8)

Within the Scottish system, local authorities continue to play a key role, especially in relation to new teacher induction. The Teacher Induction Scheme was introduced in 2002 and has provided a guaranteed salaried induction post (0.7 FTE) for all teachers qualifying to teach from Scottish universities. Experienced teachers who mentor probationer teachers in Scotland receive 0.1 FTE timetable remission for this role. Whilst generally held in high regard, variability in the quality of induction experiences across the system are noted; particularly the unintended merger of the assessment function and mentoring role in many schools: The ‘world-class’ entitlement to the induction year placement has not always been matched by world-class content within the programme’ (p.51). TSF recommends that all new teachers have access to both a mentor and a supporter and that mentoring support is available beyond induction (Recommendation 31, p.95). Where IoT is silent on mentoring, TSF argues that ‘If we are to achieve the extended professionalism we seek, all teachers need mentoring skills to develop each other and support and challenge improvements to practice’ (p.52). The report states ‘All teachers should see themselves as teacher educators’ (Recommendation 39, p.98). TSF draws attention to the need for skilled and trained school-based mentors as they assume a greater role within more collaborative partnerships. Universities currently have no formal involvement in induction. However, Recommendation 10 proposes that

25 See Recommendation 20 re. assessment role (p.92) and Recommendation 28 re. training of mentors (p.94).
'Initial teacher education and induction should be planned as one overall experience' (p.88). The involvement of university faculty may strengthen the rigour of ‘action-based research’ elements within local authority induction programmes and provide continuity in the early professional years.

Where IoT signals the abolition of the GTC England, TSF asserts that the: ‘GTCS is pivotal in supporting and assuring teacher quality. It is the guardian of twenty-first century professionalism’ (p.104). The independent Teaching Council acts as a powerful gatekeeper: setting entry standards for ITE; approving and evaluating accredited courses (pp.6-7); regulating entry of teachers to the Register, managing the Teacher Induction Scheme (TIS) and awarding Chartered Teacher status. The Professional Standards are owned by the profession; generated and reviewed by the GTCS. Alternative routes to promote diversity among the teacher workforce are not ruled out but only: ‘employment-based opportunities which have sufficient academic rigour are worthy of further investigation’ (p.6). The report notes that, ‘Teach First would need to work with a Scottish university to develop the academic component of the course to the same standard as other routes’ (p.26) (Recommendation 9, p.87). The potential for part-time, distance learning and career change routes is raised in order to provide greater access to teaching (p.25). The problem of teacher supply is framed by equity issues in the distribution of teachers: ‘The foundations of a successful education system lie in ensuring an appropriate supply of high-quality teachers covering geographical areas, education sectors and curriculum specialisms’ (p.20). This is not surprising in a context with a higher distribution of small, rural and remote schools. The TIS is described in positive terms as ‘geographically equitable across Scotland’ (p.33).

**Equity and accountability**

The GTCS, local authorities and school leaders are positioned as having key roles in assuring the quality of teacher education, together with HMIE (now Education Scotland, following the merger of HMIE with Learning and Teaching Scotland, LTS) (Recommendation 19, p.91). Leadership development in TSF concentrates on ‘leadership for learning and distributive forms of leadership’ (p.17), rather than the financial challenges of devolved funding. A commitment is shown to forms of professional accountability that are evidence-based and derived from robust forms of self-evaluation linked to outcomes. It is argued that, ‘Although measures of effectiveness are difficult to identify and disentangle from various other factors, high quality teacher education has to have a strong evidence base’ (p.56). TSF recommends a shift in focus from the quality of CPD provision to an assessment of impact and outcomes for learners (p.63, Recommendation 34, p.96). TSF argues, ‘Better research is needed but the key lies in teachers themselves looking for evidence of impact in their own work’ (p.70).

Social background remains a significant influence on educational achievement in Scotland. TSF cites the OECD (2007) report26, ‘In Scotland, who you are is far more important than what school you attend... the school system as a whole is not strong enough to make this not matter’ (p.17). Part of extended professionalism

---

26 Quality and Equity of Schooling in Scotland, OECD (2007)
is a commitment to tackle such ‘wicked, persistent issues’ (p.19). The Standard for Initial Teacher Education (SITE) contains explicit reference to teachers’ responsibility to address underachievement arising from social disadvantage. By the end of initial teacher education, beginning teachers will ‘Demonstrate that they value and promote fairness and justice and adopt anti-discriminatory practices in respect of gender, sexual orientation, race, disability, age, religion, culture and socio-economic background’ (Standard for Initial Teacher Education, GTCS, 2006:15). All teachers in Scotland are expected to ‘show in their day-to-day practice a commitment to social justice’ (Standard for Full Registration, GTCS 2006:14). Within the new curriculum, Health and Wellbeing (HWB) is the responsibility of all teachers in Scotland.

All new teachers in Scotland should be aware of the key challenges we collectively face, such as improving standards of literacy and numeracy and doing more to overcome to effects of disadvantage and deprivation on educational outcomes, and contribute personally to addressing these. (TSF, p.37)

Increased attention to HWB as a core concern stands in contrast to the review and place of Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) in the school curriculum in England. Following the White Paper an internal review of PSHE was announced on 21st July 2011. The review is to be conducted by the Department for Education in England with a view to ‘giving teachers the flexibility to use their judgement about how best to deliver PSHE education’ (IoT, p.46). PSHE in England is currently part of the basic curriculum, rather than the National Curriculum, and does not have a statutory basis. In advance of the review the Department has stated its intention to maintain the non-statutory basis of PSHE as a school subject. An intention to tighten accountability is signalled through current collaborative work with the Office for National Statistics to explore the possible development of a ‘child well-being indicator’ (Gibb, 2011:5).

CONCLUSION

There are some areas of commonality in the two documents. Both address similar topics: teacher quality, selection, accreditation routes and providers. Both emphasise the importance of leadership and propose schemes for ‘national leaders of education’. Both reports address concerns regarding the literacy and numeracy of entrants to the profession, although differ in terms of whether the purpose of testing is to restrict entry or to serve as a diagnosis. Both contain a focus on teachers’ subject knowledge. TSF draws attention to the need to develop subject specialisms among the teaching staff of primary schools (p.89). Both documents acknowledge the significance of cross-national comparison and the prioritisation of the economic function of education by governments in the context of globalisation (although, as pointed out above, IoT makes no reference to Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales). Both documents use evidence to support claims - sometimes the same sources – and use presentational devices to communicate key messages. Similar language is used to signal change in desired directions – flexibility, autonomy, accountability and responsibility. However, the rationality that informs policies on teaching and
teacher education in the two jurisdictions – clothed respectively in the rhetoric of ‘progressive conservatism’ and ‘progressive nationalism’ - and the meanings that readers can bring to them, differs.

This comparison also demonstrates some points of divergence in the development of national policy on teacher education in England and Scotland. There are several distinct lines of travel in the two documents. From a perspective north of the border, in relation to teaching and teacher education, the IoT:

- appears reductionist and underplays the complexity of teaching;
- emphasises the role of the teacher as subject scholar and disciplinarian above other aspects of the role;
- is underpinned by individualism and lacks an understanding of the social;
- has created forms of policy review that are indicative of ‘apparent’ rather than ‘substantive’ forms of dialogue, including circumscribed membership of key groups (notably the Teachers Standards Review).

Caution should be exercised in interpreting claims made on the basis of comparative analysis of a small sample of texts, so that differences between jurisdictions are not overstated or extrapolated more broadly (and within-country differences in attitudes and social policy outcomes are not ignored)\(^27\). As Fairclough (2003:16) notes ‘textual analysis is a valuable supplement to social research, not a replacement for other forms of social research and analysis.’ Mindful of this caveat, this review of two key policy documents suggests the following. First it does appear that very different conceptions of teachers, teaching and teacher education exist in these two contexts. Secondly, there are significant differences revealed in the overall social philosophy that is prevalent in each case. Thirdly, the comparison has revealed more evidence of very different approaches to policy development and policy making.

---

\(^27\) Whilst acknowledging ‘Scottish distinctiveness’, Mooney and Poole (2004) have argued that there were shared commitments to the New Labour project north and south of the border - a ‘Scottish Third Way’ (p.475). On the election of the first SNP minority government in May 2007, Mooney et al (2008:389) claimed, ‘there remains a strong commitment to an economic conservatism and to a ‘softer’ form of neo-liberalism’.
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