Edinburgh Research Explorer

Perceptions of the educational elite on the purpose of a national framework of continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers in Scotland[1]

Perceptions of the educational elite on the purpose of a national framework of continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers in Scotland[1]

Aileen Purdon, University of Strathclyde

ABSTRACT

Scotland, in common with many other countries, has seen a growing focus on teachers' CPD over the past few years, resulting in the development of a national framework. This paper explores the perceptions of key stakeholders as to the fundamental purpose of the national CPD framework, through analysis of interviews with elite figures in Scottish education. The paper works from the premise that while there has been general agreement from stakeholders that the framework is a positive development, there has been no one agreed articulation of its purpose.

The paper concludes by raising questions about the lack of clarity amongst key stakeholders as to the fundamental purpose of the CPD framework and the resulting implications in terms of reviewing its success or otherwise. These implications are considered within the context of the power dynamics, both national and international, influencing the development of CPD policy in Scotland.

1   INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the perceptions of elite figures involved in Scottish education of the purpose of the emerging framework of continuing professional development for teachers. It considers some of the tensions between political and professional imperatives in terms of this particular education policy development and seeks to explore the dynamic power relationships that perpetuate these tensions. It should be noted, however, that while the term 'CPD framework' has become increasingly commonly used in Scottish education, there is dubiety over whether or not the framework was actually planned in any strategic way.

The paper emanates from a wider study into the purposes and expected outcomes of the CPD framework in Scotland. The wider study will examine the roles and relationships of significant organisations and elite figures in Scottish education as well as the perceptions of teachers. This paper presents an initial analysis of elite figures' perceptions of:

- The fundamental purpose of the CPD framework; and
- The indicators of successful implementation of the framework.

It is argued that the apparent lack of an agreed position in these two areas might lead to difficulties in the future where stakeholders feel that their own expectations have not been met through the framework.

2   BACKGROUND

In 1999 the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) announced that a framework for CPD for teachers in Scotland was to be developed. This was to be taken forward by the Ministerial Strategy Committee (MSC) for CPD, which met for the first time in October

2000. The MSC was to be responsible for 'developing and implementing a national strategy for CPD' (SEED press release, SE2623/2000, 4 October 2000).

The 'CPD framework' as it has come to be called, is commonly understood to comprise three standards, namely: the Standard for Full Registration; the Standard for Chartered Teacher; and the Standard for Headship. Alongside these three standards are various degrees of guidance as to how the standards might be met. In addition to the standards there is guidance (which has been consulted on but not yet published) for teachers interested in pursuing a leadership and management pathway, as well as guidelines for ongoing professional review and development.

By the time the MSC was convened, however, several components of the framework were already well underway, each having their own particular provenance. The Sutherland Report (Sutherland, 1997) had recommended a national framework be developed, and the Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (SOEID) had subsequently carried out a national consultation exercise (SOEID, 1998), but the most significant and visible impetus for the CPD framework came from the McCrone Agreement (SEED, 2001) which outlined changes to teachers' pay and conditions and included a new contractual commitment to undertake CPD. It also introduced the new grade of 'chartered teacher', based on a professional master's degree qualification and commanding a salary increase of up to £6000. As the individual component parts of the framework have developed there have been signs of increasing coherence, in terms of language and structure. The argument for coherence, while on the surface appearing to be a sensible justification, has in reality served to limit diversity and quell the need for teachers to think about and articulate their own conceptions of teaching (Purdon, 2003).

The complexities of these developments, their origins and their individual purposes, make any commentary on 'the framework' as one homogeneous development, somewhat difficult – a factor evident in the elite interview data discussed in this paper.

3   METHODOLOGY

This paper relies principally on data gathered from a series of ten interviews with elite figures in Scottish education – all of whom have had some involvement with the development of the CPD framework. The sample includes representatives of the Chartered Teacher Project Team, the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS), Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE), Local Authority Education Departments, the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED), Teacher Associations, Universities and high profile head teachers.

Elite interviewing allows social scientists to explore such issues as: why particular policy developments have been focused on; who will benefit most from them; who has been responsible for their development and what the intended outcomes are. While one of the criticisms of this particular methodology is the issue of ascertaining the 'truth' of the elite interviewees' statements, it could be argued that the fundamental purpose of such interviews is not to get at the factual truth, but to explore issues of perception, interaction and individual influence by virtue of position. In order to analyse these issues systematically Cookson (1994) identifies four elements of the 'power discourse': 'the ideological field, the institutional setting, the individual actor, and syntactical style' (p.121). These four elements form a useful framework for the consideration of the data discussed in this paper.

The interviews were all semi-structured in nature, allowing the flexibility necessary to elicit information from a unique group of interviewees. However, in having a schedule, albeit detailing topics for discussion rather than specific questions, a degree of control is maintained over the interview process. This is crucial when interviewing elite figures, as by virtue of their positions, they are generally skilled at controlling interviews and at regulating the release of information (Gilham, 2000).

For the purpose of this paper, and the wider study from which it emanates, it was decided to make use of computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), namely, NVivo. One of the particular strengths of NVivo over other CAQDAS programmes is its capacity for supporting an exploratory approach to data analysis; it supports not only the attribution of text units to particular categories, but also supports an incremental and experimental approach to both the organisation and the analysis of data.

Individual transcripts were analysed for key themes under two general categories: subject content and contextual meaning. The categories, or 'nodes' as they are referred to in NVivo were built up from the data itself, developing a freestanding and dynamic framework, therefore supporting an inductive analysis approach (Patton, 2002). Three nodes from the emerging framework proved central to the focus of this study - the three nodes relating directly to the three questions outlined later in this paper.

After some discussion of the context, the findings under each of the three questions will be presented in turn, thereafter the significance of their inter-relationship, both between and within individual transcripts, will be considered in terms of their possible implications. These

implications, deriving from this initial analysis of data, will form the basis of future exploration within the wider study.

4   THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

In exploring the possible rationale for, and expectations of, a national CPD framework in Scotland, it is important to be mindful of the international context and its potential influence.

Scotland, it seems, is not alone in viewing a structured framework of CPD as being an important step forward for the teaching profession. Many other western nations, for example England, Wales and parts of the USA and Australia, are also in the process of developing more systematised approaches to the continuing professional development of their teachers, particularly in the area of early professional development. For example, developments in Wales sound strangely familiar to Scottish educators - a statutory induction year being introduced from September 2003, which includes new induction standards, a framework for early professional development and well-established professional development programmes for senior management. In addition, there are currently plans to develop a framework of professional standards for classroom teachers. The official discourse evident in the 2003 CPD consultation paper (DfTE, 2003a) is firmly located in a performance culture where it is suggested that 'skills' should be 'transmitted' by more experienced teachers and accounted for through 'performance management'. The purpose of these developments is made quite explicit in the consultation paper:

> CPD is at the heart of the Assembly Government's strategy to raise professional
>
> standards and thereby to raise the level of pupil achievement…… no
>
> professional can afford to stand still and continuing development is essential if

standards area to be maintained and improved. (Department for Training and

Education, 2003a, p.1)

In the summary of responses to the consultation exercise (DfTE, 2003b) there appeared

to be general agreement that CPD should be firmly rooted within performance

management arrangements. The Welsh approach, then, is quite clearly standards-based

and focussing on improving standards of pupil achievement through the increased

competence of teachers. What is missing from this paper is any articulation of the

overall purpose of raising standards – there is no mention of potential economic or

social benefits to be gained from this.

Bullough et al (2003), writing about the impact of standardisation on teacher education in the

USA, are much more explicit about the potential influence of market assumptions on teacher

education and the way that this influence appears to go unrecognised or unquestioned,

despite the fact that the focus of accreditation in teacher education has shifted from

encouraging appropriate focus and distribution of resources to clear-cut accountability. They

claim that growing public dissatisfaction with public education, stirred by politicians, has led

to increased demands for teacher accountability to be demonstrated through 'the

implementation of set and measurable standards of performance that enable comparison…'

(Bullough et al., 2003, p.36). This, claim Bullough et al., will satisfy as 'proof of the value of

investment in schooling in the form of clear social and economic dividends' (p.36).

It is claimed, however, (Bates, 2002) that the influence of such developments in the USA are

felt well beyond its national boundaries. Indeed, Bates suggests that the advocacy of

professional standards as a means of quality assurance in various Australian states is

principally influenced by developments in the USA. He detects a growing perception of the irrelevance of the university–based element of teacher education and an increasing interest in a move towards greater school-based teacher preparation, as is happening in England. This supports a view of teachers as technocrats, consequently limiting the notion of teachers as agents of social change.

Teachers' CPD as a means of accountability is clearly an international issue, and indeed educators in many countries would recognise the sentiments of Kelly (2002) when he warns that:

> We must be careful to help educators think of professional development as a mechanism for long-term capacity building, rather than a quick fix to raise test scores in the next accountability cycle. (p.423)

Accountability, therefore, seems to be central to the growing international trend in systematising teachers' CPD. What is not so clear-cut is the underlying purpose of that accountability.

5   WHAT IS BEING DEVELOPED IN CPD?

So, what is continuing professional development? By its very name it implies continuation, and presumably enhancement, of professional action. Therefore, in attempting to come to a common understanding about what is meant by CPD it is necessary to identify what the professional action is that is being developed, i.e. the teaching. It would be naïve to assume that there is a shared and common understanding of the purpose of teaching; in seeking to

understand stakeholders' perspectives on the purpose of CPD, it is therefore crucial to consider their particular conception(s) of teaching.

It would seem reasonable to suppose that there ought to be a causal relationship between models of CPD and their impact on professional action. In other words, a particular conception of the purpose of teaching would suggest a particular model of CPD, which should result in a particular effect on professional action. However, the fact that there is no one agreed conception of teaching underpinning the Scottish CPD framework makes it unlikely that the emerging framework will facilitate enhancement of the full range of conceptions of teaching. By exploring a range of theoretical conceptions of teaching, an analysis of the responses of the elite interviewees can be considered in terms of what they say about the interviewees' notions of the purpose of teaching.

6   Conceptions of teaching

A number of frameworks exist which might usefully be employed in exploring the particular conception of teaching dominant in contemporary Scottish teacher education. Such frameworks originate principally from analyses of initial teacher education (ITE). For example, Zeichner (1993) outlines four traditions of teaching evident in his analysis of a number of initial teacher education programmes in the US: (1) the academic tradition which emphasises teachers' own subject knowledge and general education; (2) the social efficiency tradition which relies on 'scientific' evidence about the nature of teaching, and sits comfortably with a standards-based approach; (3) the developmentalist tradition, based on a constructivist approach to both teacher and pupil learning; and (4) the social reconstructionist tradition which embraces social and political dimensions of teaching and focuses on

preparing pupils to be critically aware participants in a democratic society, with the ultimate aim of promoting greater social justice.

These traditions, while deriving from an analysis of initial teacher education programmes, serve as a useful framework for considering the underlying philosophies behind approaches to ongoing teacher education. In considering initial teacher education in Scotland within the context of this framework, one of its key features is the highly regulated nature of its structure and content, providing little room for diversity in the system. While the approach to ITE in Scotland clearly does not fall entirely within any one of Zeichner's traditions, it is located principally within the academic and social efficiency traditions. In fact, the existence of the General Teaching Council for Scotland accreditation and review procedures and the annual publication of the <u>Memorandum of Entry Requirements to Courses of Teacher Education in Scotland</u> (published annually by SEED), highlights a clear alignment with the academic tradition in which a teacher's own academic achievement is a fundamental prerequisite for entry to the teaching profession in Scotland. While the origins of the academic tradition can be traced back many years in Scottish teacher education, the social efficiency tradition, with its emphasis on accountability through competence and standards-based systems, is a much more recent, but nonetheless influential one. This is evident through the recent emergence of a number of standards for teachers at various stages of their careers.

Analysing ITE using Zeichner's traditions serves to highlight the uniformity of provision in teacher education across Scotland, but it could be claimed that continuing teacher education, as encompassed by the CPD framework, allows for more diversity. However, as long as teachers align to a particular philosophy of teaching promulgated through ITE, the power of this diversity will be limited. This is particularly the case where new teachers are subject to

the views of more experienced members of staff in the school setting, where dominant staffroom voices have the power to shape the school's culture (Nias, 1989). And indeed, arrangements for the new induction year whereby each new teacher has a dedicated 'supporter' might be seen in some cases to have the power to reinforce the status quo through what will be a fairly intense relationship between the new teacher and an experienced teacher.

Another useful conceptualisation of differing orientations in teaching comes from Bottery and Wright (2000) who argue that recent government policy in England has encouraged a technical-rationalist approach to teaching at the expense of public and ecological orientations. The 'public' orientation of a teacher's role, argue Bottery and Wright, relates to the responsibility inherent in public service, with a particular emphasis in this case on the development of a participative democracy in schools, while the 'ecological' orientation concerns itself with teachers' awareness of the global position in which the nation state is situated and the concomitant pressures that flow from this (p.482).

Analysis of conceptions of teaching is aided by the use of frameworks such as those of Zeichner and Bottery and Wright, but should not be constrained by them, as they too could be charged with promoting particular conceptual views on the relevance of certain aspects of teaching. For example, while Zeichner's framework derives from an analysis of the structure and focus of ITE programmes, Bottery and Wright attempt to categorise the forces which influence the design of such structures. The two frameworks do not merely use different categories to describe the same aspects; they indicate different ways of conceptualising and prioritising aspects of teaching. Indeed, Bottery and Wright's public and ecological orientations could both be seen to fit within Zeichner's social recontructionist tradition, yet Bottery and Wright make clear distinctions between them. Their technical-rationalist

orientation would fall broadly within Zeichner's social efficiency tradition, but is only a small part of what that tradition implies. There is, however, no direct match between the various categories, and both frameworks can therefore usefully be deployed in assisting the analysis of conceptions of teaching.

7   National understandings and global influences

It could be argued that ITE, perhaps more than CPD, sets the parameters of the accepted conception(s) of teaching in any nation. Indeed, ITE in Scotland is governed by standards and rules laid down not only by the professional body (the GTCS), but also in primary legislation. For example, the First Minister's approval is required for any university to offer a recognisable teaching qualification; a necessary prerequisite for teaching in a state-funded school in Scotland. This, together with the rigorous requirements of the annual <u>Memorandum of Entry Requirements to Courses of Teacher Education in Scotland</u> (SEED) is commonly viewed as contributing to the enhancement of teaching standards in Scotland, but could also be seen to limit diversity through increasing central control of education. The ITE experience of any teacher qualifying in Scotland will therefore have been highly regulated and located primarily within one dominant conception of teaching, one which is currently focussed around performance measurement against a series of standards and places emphasis on the teachers' own academic achievements.

The increasing importance placed on standards in the regulation of teacher education can in part be attributed to the influence of globalisation (Apple, 2001; Hartley, 2002), whereby the need for nation states to produce suitably skilled workers to allow them to compete in a global market place has had a significant influence on the focus of schooling. In contrast to the widely-held assumption that standardisation and central quality assurance will help to

achieve this aim, Hartley (2002) argues that to service this new knowledge economy, it is not necessarily the short-term effects of standardisation that are required, but rather long-term investment in education which ultimately will help citizens to work creatively and collaboratively and to be self-managing. So while the social efficiency tradition might appear to be a panacea, the real focus ought to be on implementing a social reconstructionist approach.

In Scotland, as elsewhere in the UK and beyond, the dominant approach to teacher education is becoming increasingly standards-based. Initially confined to ITE, this approach has now become firmly embedded in CPD with the development of standards for full registration, chartered teacher and headship. Indeed a CPD guidance booklet published by SEED in November 2002 confirmed that 'the CPD framework will be based around three Standards' (SEED, 2002, p.9), thereby acknowledging the central importance of the standards, and implicitly, the measurement of individuals against these standards. This implies that what is encapsulated in these three standards is what teaching ought to be about, therefore limiting the potential for other conceptions.

Standardisation, by its very nature, limits diversity of both action and thought. Fullan (1993) cautions against a move in this direction in that it does not allow educators to drive, or indeed cope with, change. So, while the rationale for a standards-based approach to teacher education is that it is a useful tool for raising attainment, the attainment that is raised will not necessarily allow future citizens to succeed in an ever-changing society. Rather its focus is on technical competence and compliance.

Standards-based and competence-based approaches to teacher education suggest the pursuit of a scientific solution to the replication of good teaching, which will result in increased pupil learning. It is, however, devoid of attention to the social, cultural, political and philosophical aspects of schools and schooling. As has already been suggested, Scotland is not alone in following this pathway. Beyer (2002), writing about the manifestation of the standards movement in the US, suggests that 'teaching and the preparation of teachers is again being positioned as something like a science' (p.240). If this is indeed a growing and global phenomenon, then we must explore why this is so. It has been suggested that the principal reason is economic benefit (see for example Bottery & Wright, 2000; Apple, 2001; Hartley, 2002), and therefore it could be argued that in adopting a standards-based approach to the development of the Scottish CPD framework the raison d'être is to fulfil economic ideals.

Hartley (2002) argues that the increasing emphasis on standards-based approaches is driven by an economic imperative, but instead of focusing on nation states' ability to compete in the global market-place, he suggests that increasing regulation and standardisation is an economy-drive, i.e. cheaper and therefore better value for the public purse (pp.252 & 253). He goes on to caution that while it might be financially attractive in the short term it leads to less motivated teachers and to a dearth of 'social capital'.

The assumption implicit in the promotion of a standards-based approach to teacher education is that defining and meeting 'standards' in teaching has a direct impact on pupil learning, yet there is a paucity of research to back this up. Fenstermacher (cited in Beyer, 2002) attacks this assumption with the contention that '[While] there is a very tight connection between teaching and learning,… it is not the kind of connection that supports the claim that there can be no teaching without learning' (p.243). In other words, while there is a good chance that

14

good teaching will lead to pupil learning, good teaching alone is not the cause of all pupil learning. Beyer (2002) asserts that it is misguided to assume that teaching is the most crucial part of successful learning, and argues that 'for many children the more equitable distribution of resources and opportunities may well be the most important element of successful learning' (p.243). This notion is in direct conflict with the principle of standardisation, aligning itself more naturally with Bottery and Wright's (2000) public orientation and Zeichner's (1993) social reconstructionist tradition.

That such a pervading approach to teacher education can be allowed to flourish without being founded on a firm evidential basis, suggests that teacher education programmes, whether at the initial or continuing stages, are often based on assumptions and beliefs rather than evidence (Delandshere and Arens, 2001). This therefore nullifies the principle on which the standards movement relies; that it is based on 'scientific' evidence of what constitutes good teaching. Delandshere and Arens (2001) query the evidential grounds on which standardisation and uniformity in teacher education is based, pointing to the fact that there is little, if any, evidence that uniformity improves learning, education or society. They go on to suggest that in the cases they analysed 'in many instances foundational stances appear absent from teaching standards'. An analysis of the origins and development of the current standards in the Scottish CPD framework also fails to reveal an evidence-based foundation (Purdon, 2003). Indeed, it could be argued that this lack of evidence-based development points more clearly to political or ideological influences being central to the development of the CPD framework.

8   PURPOSE OF THE CPD FRAMEWORK IN SCOTLAND: PERCEPTIONS OF

        THE EDUCATIONAL ELITE

For the purpose of this paper the interview data from ten interviews were analysed under three specific categories:

1. What were interviewees' perceptions of the reasons for the development of a CPD framework in the first place?
2. What was their understanding of the purposes of such a framework?
3. What would they deem to be indicators of successful implementation of the framework?

The remainder of the paper reports the major findings under each of these headings and then goes on to discuss implications arising.

9   Reasons for the development of the CPD framework

Some of the more common understandings of why the framework was being developed in the first place included: an attempt to make the teaching profession comparable with other professions already engaging in systematic CPD; to provide an enhanced career structure; to address current inequalities in access to professional development opportunities; and to support teachers in being able to adapt to change. However, it is clear that even within these general categories there is considerable variation in interpretation. For example, in considering CPD as a means of supporting teachers in adapting to change, this could be read as empowering teachers to drive change (Fullan, 1993), yet in interview with one of the civil servants, this point was illustrated as being a means through which teachers could cope with the changes foisted upon them: 'there are priorities and we are throwing things at you left, right and centre'. Clearly there is a fundamental difference between teachers being able to cope with centrally imposed change and teachers embracing and driving change.

One of the interviewees, a senior university figure, talked at great length about the significance of the Sutherland Report (Sutherland, 1997), which suggested that considerable improvements needed to be made in the area of teachers' CPD and also suggested that a framework be developed. However, he was the only interviewee to mention this. Interestingly, this particular interviewee recounted a conversation that he had had with Lord Sutherland in which comparisons had been made with the situation in England. This is a claim that is often made about Scottish education policy – that many initiatives are influenced by what is happening in England. If this is indeed the case in terms of CPD, then the Sutherland Report, being a small part of a UK–wide report might well have been responsible in part for sowing the seeds of the development.

Various interviewees spoke about an acknowledgement of the need to systematise CPD, highlighting that many teachers throughout the country were already engaging in high quality, relevant CPD activity. While some interviewees claimed that the development of the CPD framework was about enhancing the professional status of teachers, another suggested that these teachers were looking for a system to 'cash in their CPD' in terms of formal credit towards a university postgraduate award. This could be interpreted as an attempt to enhance the university role in teachers' CPD, but might also be viewed as an attempt to exert more central control over the types of CPD teachers engage in. This view is supported by a civil servant who suggested that one of the principal reasons for the development of the framework was to improve the quality of current CPD, implying that much of it was considered to be poor or inappropriate. However, if that is indeed one of the principal reasons then it suggests that the framework has been developed principally for the purpose of imposing greater

quality assurance on CPD providers, and in turn suggests that CPD is something which should be provided rather than teacher-led. This point will be developed later in the paper.

Most of the interviewees, by virtue of their high-profile roles, gave responses which reflected their own particular perception of the 'bigger picture' of Scottish education. In contrast to this, one of the headteachers interviewed, a member of the Ministerial Strategy Committee for CPD, gave a response which was either surprisingly limited in its view, or an attempt to justify the approach taken by the Committee. He suggested that the framework was a 'natural development' built on the benchmarks which had been developed for initial teacher education programmes:

> And then of course you had the McCrone-type probationer approach, which I
> think is wonderful, so you get the Standard for Full Registration – I don't see a
> problem with that. That's really a development, if you like, from ITE. It
> therefore became very natural that you had a standard for chartered teacher.
> (Headteacher on MSC)

This response does not really indicate a view on why the framework was seen as being worthy of development in the first place, rather it seems to take that for granted, and accepts implicitly the 'coherence' argument (Purdon, 2003) as being a worthy rationale for the development of a standards-based framework of CPD.

A high profile local authority director of education interviewed as part of the sample raised an issue not about the reason for the development of the framework, but rather about the relative importance attached to its development. He suggested that the development of the

CPD framework was perhaps being overshadowed by the significant changes being brought about to pay and conditions through the McCrone Agreement (SEED, 2001), suggesting that the CPD aspect of the agreement was being dominated by the pay and conditions aspect. This view suggests that he believes the primary source of CPD developments to have been the McCrone Agreement. This is a view supported by a senior teacher association official who claims that outcomes attributed to CPD will be used by the Government as a measure of value for money in terms of its investment in teachers' pay and conditions through the McCrone Agreement. In this case he is referring specifically to outcomes relating to increases in pupil attainment.

While a significant number of interviewee comments could be interpreted in such a way as to provide an indication of that particular person's perception, one in particular provided mainly rhetoric in this area, suggesting that the real reason for the development of the framework was 'to create a culture of professional entitlement' – laudable sentiments perhaps, but in need of substantial unpacking as it is highly unlikely that there would be general agreement as to what this 'entitlement' should be.

Despite the range of views as to the original reason for the development of the CPD framework, not one of the interviewees questioned the need for it, unanimously viewing it as a positive step.

10   Purposes of the new CPD framework

While there is acknowledged to be general agreement among stakeholders that the development of the CPD framework is a positive step, nowhere is there written down any clear definition of the intended purpose of the framework. In each of the interviews this issue

was raised, sometimes by the interviewees themselves, but if not, certainly by the interviewer. It will come as no surprise to discover that across the ten interviews analysed in this paper a broad range of possible purposes was identified.

Many of the interviewees stated quite firmly that the purpose of the framework was to ensure a better education for children, for example:

> If this works properly teachers will be better prepared to do what they do and I suspect that they will be more satisfied in doing their job, so the kids have most to gain from all of that. (Senior teacher association official)

While this general view was expressed in a range of ways by the interviewees, what was not expressed explicitly by the above, or any by any of the other interviewees, was any notion of what a better education entails. This suggests an assumption that we share an understanding of what education is about and that it is not a contested area, supporting Delandshere & Arens' (2001) claim that the more we standardise our teacher education the less we are required to articulate our own conceptions. The assumption that greater adherence to the framework will necessarily result in better teaching or learning subscribes to the theory underpinning Zeichner's social efficiency tradition which suggests that there is a right way to teach whereby the better an individual teacher can perform this prescribed 'good teaching' the more learning will take place in their classroom. This view fails to give due cognisance to issues of environment and society, and the inequalities inherent in them.

While some interviewees suggested a range of possible purposes for the framework, a senior HMIE figure was much clearer about the purpose, claiming that Government ministers had

already defined the purpose, which was about raising attainment. He goes on to explain his understanding of 'raising attainment' in more detail:

> They [Government ministers] are wanting to improve the range and quality of skills that young people have when they leave school because that improves their chances of getting advanced education, or getting a better job, or improving their lifestyle, and that has implications for society and the economy.
> (Senior HMIE figure)

This explicit adherence to Government imperatives is continued in his claim that CPD should 'feed very directly into Government targets like inclusion', thereby acknowledging the CPD framework as a means of delivering Government priorities as opposed to something which the profession itself should own. Continuing the link between CPD and raising pupil attainment, but displaying a slightly different perspective on it, comes comment from a senior teacher association official, who believes that raising attainment is the 'pay-back' demanded by Government for funding the pay and conditions package outlined in the McCrone Agreement:

> … if it is the private sector then there are measures about profitability and shareholder value and so on that can be used to ascertain where their investment has come good. So they [the Government] need to devise a proxy in the public sector and basically the proxy that is being used is to do with pupil attainment; it's the targets, it's the exam results and these kind of quantifiable measures that the Treasury expects to see back for the money that they have made available.
> (Senior teacher association official)

This view supports Hartley's (2000) claims that standardisation and accountability is also about the prudent use of public funds.

A common theme in several of the interviews is the acknowledgement that there appears to be no formally agreed or written down purpose for the development of the CPD framework – perhaps somewhat surprising considering the resources that have been invested in its development. This acknowledgement comes from a range of sources including figures from the GTCS and universities as well as from civil servants directly involved in the development of aspects of the framework. Indeed one civil servant expresses the view that even members of the Ministerial Strategy Committee for CPD, whose remit it is to give strategic direction to the development of the framework, would be unlikely to share a common view of the purpose. However, that view is not echoed by one of the headteachers on the MSC who states quite unequivocally that he believes all members of the Committee subscribe to the same view of the fundamental purpose of the framework. Despite holding this particular view, he fails to articulate exactly what that fundamental purpose is. The apparent lack of any clear purpose of the framework adds complexity to the question of evaluating its success – a theme explored in the next section of this paper.

Only one of the interviewees, a senior university figure, raised explicitly the issue of the transformative potential of the CPD framework, claiming that 'it really comes down to whether public schools are there to reproduce or transform'. He implies that the CPD framework could support Zeichner's social reconstructionist view of teacher education, although other comments in this interview tend to suggest that he views this as more of a

theoretical potential than an actual one – a view supported by the HMIE figure's comments discussed above.

One of the local authority directors of education, however, also talks about the reculturalisation of teaching through the CPD framework, claiming that 'we are engaged in an enterprise here to change culture, you know, to raise the esteem and professional confidence of teachers'. He goes on to explain that 'I only want teachers to be effective teachers but they need some professional curiosity about the context within which they are operating... to succeed in that'. He appears to be suggesting that his notion of 'effective teaching' is not necessarily to conform to performance indicators or attainment targets imposed by central government, but rather to be autonomous professionals, aligning with Bottery and Wright's (2000) public and ecological orientations of teaching. So, while interviewees use common language – for example, 'effective teachers' – clearly their understanding of what that implies is not necessarily shared. This adds complexity to the analysis of messages emanating from elite education figures, as it demonstrates that it is not enough merely to consider what they are saying, but as Cookson (1994) suggests, that the ideological field in which the individual acts is fundamental to the interpretation of their comments.

Another interesting issue arising from the interviews is the respective status attributed by individual interviewees to the various components of the CPD framework. In particular, there was a tendency by many to respond to questions about 'the CPD framework' purely from the perspective of developments in the chartered teacher programme. While there is a range of explanations as to why chartered teacher might currently be seen to be of higher status/priority than other aspects, this nonetheless has to borne in mind in interpreting the

23

responses. Indeed, perhaps it was unreasonable to expect interviewees to come up with a succinct rationale for the purpose of a framework which comprises discrete components, each with their own origins and purposes. Whatever the reasons for variations in perceived importance of the respective components, it is nonetheless obvious that chartered teacher is seen by many to be the central focus of the CPD framework. A senior teacher association official suggests, rightly or wrongly, that this is because the rest of the framework will not be substantially different to current practice:

> Of the CPD issues it [the chartered teacher project] has been by far and away
>
> the biggest, and it has been the most significant because it is the one where it is
>
> new, it is open for grabs. (Senior teacher association official)

Another possible purpose of the framework mentioned by several interviewees relates to the status of teachers and the way the profession is perceived both internally and externally. However, closer examination of these comments indicates different discourses in play. For example, the senior HMIE figure states that the framework is in part about 'enhancing professional integrity' and while it could be argued that a standards-based framework designed principally to enable Government imperatives to be fulfilled is not the best way of enhancing professional integrity, it is obvious that the HMIE figure interviewed understands the importance of using rhetoric which will keep teachers on-side.

One of the senior civil servants, on the other hand, suggests that the framework is about 'trying to re-engage teachers with their professionalism, it's giving them that opportunity to recognise that they've got a responsibility to think about their professionalism'. Here the

implication is quite clearly that this is a top-down approach where teachers will need to have things 'done' to them in order to remedy the deficit implicit in this statement.

While detailed discourse analysis of such comments might reveal subtle differences in the choice of language and the meaning implicit, it does not necessarily indicate factual truth. Rather what it might indicate is the level of experience of the respective interviewees in terms of their awareness of their own public presentation – perhaps signifying that Cookson's (1994) notion of the four elements of the power discourse are not discrete aspects, but are interlinking categories that have a direct bearing on each other. For example, the 'syntactical style' is perhaps less polished and deliberate in the less experienced public figure – the 'individual actor'. Nevertheless, it must be assumed that not everybody listening to these elite education figures will have the time or the inclination to carry out detailed discourse analysis, and therefore the message that is conveyed, whether it be attributable to syntactical style, the individual actor, or a combination of both, is highly significant.

11   Indicators of success

It may have been reasonable to assume that the perceptions articulated under this theme would relate closely to the issues highlighted under the previous theme. After all, if the framework were established to serve certain purposes then the indicators of its successful implementation would surely be linked to these purposes. However, this is not what transpires from the interview data. Indeed, in the majority of interview transcripts there is no clear match between these two areas. There is, however, fairly broad agreement that there currently exist no agreed plans for the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the framework. One of the civil servants goes further in suggesting that:

until we… have a slightly firmer idea of what the framework is going to be I

think we would be unwise to start throwing out too many unfocussed success

factors. (Civil servant)

This comment acknowledges that there are in fact no overall strategic objectives for the CPD

framework.

Several of the interviewees suggest uptake of courses as an indicator of successful

implementation, for example, 'are teachers getting and going on CPD?' (Senior HMIE

figure). Whether or not these interviewees are actually suggesting that they would advocate

adopting this indicator, or whether they are merely expressing what they anticipate will be

used, is not always clear. However, it does suggest that when it comes to measurement, some

of the more qualitative aspects mentioned under the previous section, such as improvement in

teacher morale and more confident, happy pupils, tend to assume a lower profile.

As well as course uptake it was proposed that course availability and the extent to which local

authorities provide opportunities for teachers to meet their CPD needs would also be

indicators of success. These types of indicators imply a view of CPD as being something that

is 'provided' for teachers – this is arguably in direct contrast to the notion of enhanced

professional status and responsibility highlighted by interviewees elsewhere. In foisting the

responsibility for successful implementation on employers and providers, the elite figures

interviewed in this study are in effect limiting the extent to which they view teachers as

having ownership of CPD.

Most of the interviewees do acknowledge that some of what they perceive to be the more desirable outcomes of a successful CPD framework will be quite difficult to measure. They also highlight the difficulty in distinguishing between improvements made as a result of a good CPD framework and improvements made as a result of other initiatives. Nonetheless, this is surely not an issue that relates purely to CPD policy – it must have implications for the evaluation of all education initiatives and polices, none of which stand in isolation.

A senior GTCS official suggested that there might well prove to be tensions between what teachers and what other stakeholders would view as desirable outcomes of the framework. It was suggested that the other stakeholders would be looking for more 'concrete' indicators of success. Indeed, the interviewee went on to suggest that much of the benefit of successful implementation would not really be visible for perhaps another twenty years when the pupils on whom it is hoped this will have an impact begin to make more visible contributions to society.

Interviewees holding posts in SEED, a university and HMIE itself all suggested that future school inspections should consider the extent to which the CPD framework is being implemented successfully. A senior HMIE figure also suggested that they would wish to mount an aspect task at some point, an aspect task being a country-wide review of one particular aspect, taking into account the views and practices of relevant institutions such as the universities, local authorities and schools. However, there would have to be some initial agreement about the kinds of features that were deemed to be desirable in terms of successful implementation.

Interestingly, one of the teacher association officials suggested that 'issues around retention will become one of the indirect things that people will measure', yet not one of the interviewees suggested that improved retention would be one of the key purposes of the CPD framework. This could mean that the interviewee assumes that indicators of success will be those things most easily measured, or that retention is a key purpose but not one that stakeholders want to highlight.

The possibility that the indicators that are most easy to measure will be the ones that are used is supported by two interviewees in particular. One of the teacher association officials, as raised earlier, considers that Government will want to see payback for its investment in teachers' salaries in terms of raised pupil attainment through targets and exam results. This is supported by one of the civil servants who also suggests that measuring the achievement of pupil attainment targets will be useful:

> it will be interesting to compare targets in five or ten years time with the targets
> now, and whether you can distil the impact of the chartered teacher programme
> on the improvement you will see. (Senior civil servant)

Despite the majority of suggested indicators of success being fairly quantitative in nature it would be unfair to present this as the whole picture presented by the interviewees. For example:

> one indicator of success would be that there was significant enhancement in the
> quality of education provided by schools…[and] a richer quality of discussion
> about educational issues (Senior university figure [1])

better communication amongst teachers… [and] an ability of professionals in schools to make more explicit to the public what they were achieving. (Senior university figure [2])

It is interesting to note that the more extensive and explicit comments relating to qualitative indicators come from the two senior university figures interviewed. While the interview transcripts of these two interviewees display some contrasting views on the purpose of CPD for teachers, they are the only two within this sample to be quite so explicit in qualitative terms and to acknowledge that while qualitative indicators are perhaps more difficult to measure, they are nonetheless important. This could be for a number of reasons – firstly, it could be argued that it is not the university sector that has invested the money in the development of the framework and it will therefore not be held accountable for the success or otherwise. Secondly, it might well be that these particular interviewees subscribe to a conception of teaching which views these more holistic indicators as important. However, it could be that these particular interviewees hold a more positive view of the potential and rigour of qualitative social science research, and therefore do not shy away from suggesting such indicators of success.

12   IMPLICATIONS

The interview data analysed in this paper reveals competing discourses which can be grouped into four broad themes, namely: standards and accountability; employment rights; enhancement of professional status; and teaching as a moral and political endeavour. Within these four broad themes, that of standards and accountability appears to dominant.

Again the relevance of Cookson's (1994) four elements of the power discourse is evident, and in particular the significance of the ideological field. Clearly, the notion of standards and accountability as a primary factor in developing a CPD framework is acceptable to the majority of interviewees. Indeed, this is evident through tacit approval rather than any clear expression of support, thus demonstrating the power of the 'assumptive world' (Young, 1977) within which the education elite operate.

The competing discourses in the CPD debate are fuelled by the conflicting philosophies of two of the current major influences on education policy: globalisation and social justice. From the data analysed in this paper it appears that while much of the rhetoric espouses social justice-type aims, the reality reflects more accurately the impact of globalisation.

Despite conflicting views from some of the interviewees, there was widespread evidence of support for the development of a CPD framework for teachers in Scotland, yet interestingly, no agreement as to the precise reasons for this. Indeed, there appears to be no consideration of this lack of agreement as a potential difficulty in the future. However, it is suggested in this paper that the discrepancy between and among elite education figures as to the purpose of the CPD framework could well lead to dispute further down the line if it becomes evident that the vast array of agendas potentially being satisfied cannot all feasibly be met.

This lack of an articulated purpose for the framework, and the diverse range of views about its potential purpose, could potentially allow Government to exert greater control. While it is not suggested in this paper that this is a deliberate action on behalf of the Government, the default position might well act in its favour. Indeed control of the CPD framework, by design or by default, would serve as a very effective means of ensuring Government priorities could

be met, while at the same time appearing to be giving the profession something to which it feels entitled.

What is clear from the interview data is that there is still a dominant view of CPD as something that is provider-led, or at least provided for teachers. This supports the assertion that the dominant model of initial teacher education in Scotland does influence CPD. While there were one or two suggestions of purposes of the CPD framework which might be seen to subscribe to a social reconstructionist view of teacher education, these were the minority. The dominant view is one of employer/provider-led CPD, which will facilitate accountability, thereby supporting a social efficiency view of teaching. However, the rhetoric surrounding the development of the CPD framework espouses enhanced status for teachers, professional entitlement and a growing culture of professional trust. There is perhaps a contradiction here which is worthy of further exploration - that the attempt to open up teacher professionalism is being entrusted to organisations which themselves are constrained for a variety of cultural and legislative reasons, and are therefore less likely to be able to promote a wider, reconstructionist view of CPD.

If, as is suggested in this paper, there is an issue relating to the status in which qualitative sociological research is held then there are clear implications not only for CPD policy, but for education policy in general. It is imperative that perceptions about the relative worth of research methodology do not serve to inform the development and implementation of policy, in other words the policy objectives should drive the evaluation methodology, not the other way round.

While the data from the ten elite interviews discussed in this paper have revealed some interesting issues, it is not suggested that the resulting observations are necessarily generalisable to the organisations that the interviewees are employed by, or to the Scottish education system as a whole. What it does illustrate, however, is the significance of the influence of 'individual actors' on organisational identities. The extent to which the individual elite figure shapes their organisation, or vice-versa, is an important issue worthy of further exploration.

The evidence presented in this paper seems to suggest that key stakeholders in education are not engaging in debate about the fundamental nature and purpose of CPD, and therefore are not considering the fundamental purpose and nature of teaching. There is an implicit assumption in much if the interview data that teaching should be capable of being packaged into an easily definable statement and that good teaching will result in effective learning: this assumption needs to be challenged. Finally, it seems that the complexities of the CPD debate may well be symptomatic of a much bigger issue about the purpose of teaching and how we articulate and share our understandings of this.

13   NOTE

[1] An earlier version of this article was presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, 17 – 20 September 2003, Hamburg, Germany.

14   REFERENCES

APPLE, M. (2001) **Educating the "right" way: markets, standards, God and inequality** (New York, Routledge Falmer).

BATES, R. (2002) Australian Teacher Education: some background observations, **Journal of Education for Teaching**, 28 (3), pp. 217–220.

BEYER, L. (2002) The Value of critical Perspectives in Teacher Education, **Journal of Education for Teaching,** 52 (2), pp. 151-63.

BOTTERY, M. & WRIGHT, N. (2000) **Teachers and the State: Towards a directed profession** (London, Routledge).

BULLOUGH, R. V., CLARK, D. C. and PATTERSON, R. S. (2003) Getting in Step: accountability, accreditation and the standardization of teacher education in the United States, **Journal of Education for Teaching**, 29 (1), pp. 35–51.

COOKSON, P. (1994) The power discourse: elite narratives and educational policy formation, in: G. WALFORD (Ed.) **Researching the Powerful in Education** (London, UCL Press).

DELANDSHERE, G. and ARENS, S. A. (2001) Representations of teaching and standards-based reform: are we closing the debate about teacher education? **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 17 (5), pp. 547-566.

DEPARTMENT FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION (2003a) **Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for Teachers: the way forward** (The Welsh Assembly Government).

 DEPARTMENT FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION (2003b) **Summary of Consultation Responses for Continuing Professional Development for Teachers: the way forward (**The Welsh Assembly Government).

FITZ, J and HALPIN, D. (1994) Ministers and mandarins; educational research in elite settings, in: G. WALFORD (Ed) **Researching the Powerful in Education (**London, UCL Press).

FULLAN, M. (1993) **Change Forces: probing the depths of educational reform** (London, Falmer Press).

GILHAM, B. (2000) **The Research Interview** (London, Continuum).

HARTLEY, D. (2002) Global Influences on Teacher Education in Scotland, **Journal of Education for Teaching**, 28 (3), pp. 251-255.

KELLY, P. (2002) Decentralisation of Professional development: teachers' decisions and dilemmas, **Journal of In-Service Education**, 28 (3), pp. 409–425.

NIAS, J. (1989) **Primary Teachers Talking: a study of teaching as work** (London, Routledge).

PATTON, M. Q. (2002) **Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods: 3rd Edition** (Thousand Oaks, Sage).

PURDON, A. (2003) A national framework of CPD: continuing professional development or continuing policy dominance? **Journal of Education Policy**, 18 (4), pp. 423-437.

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (2001) **A Profession for the 21st Century: Agreement reached following the McCrone report** (Edinburgh, SEED).

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (2002) **Continuing Professional Development** (Edinburgh, SEED).

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY DEPARTMENT (1998) **Proposals for Developing a Framework for the Continuing Professional Development for the Teaching Profession in Scotland** (Edinburgh, SOEID).

SUTHERLAND, SIR STEWART (1997) Report 10 - Teacher education and training: a study, in: National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education **Higher Education in the Learning Society**, (the Sutherland Report) (Norwich, HMSO).

WALFORD, G. (1994) **Researching the Powerful in Education** (UCL Press, London).

YOUNG, K. (1977) "Values" in the policy making process, **Policy and Politics**, 5 (3), pp.1-22.

ZEICHNER, K. (1993) Traditions of practice in U.S. preservice teacher education programmes, **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 9 (1), pp. 1-13.