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Abstract

A critical reading of the Donaldson Report on teacher education in Scotland reveals what might be termed a ‘panacea approach’ to addressing perceived current problems in relation to the quality of teacher education. In particular, the essence of the Donaldson Report is that teachers need to embrace ‘twenty-first century professionalism’ through a partnership approach to teacher education. However, neither ‘professionalism’, nor ‘partnership’ are defined or justified explicitly. Through critical discourse analysis we offer possible interpretations of professionalism and partnership within the context of the Donaldson Report. These interpretations include accepting the use of such terms as simple unconscious and uncritical adherence to a dominant discourse, and the idea that the wholesale embracing of partnership is a much more insidious attempt by the state to promote network governance, thereby limiting potential dominance of any one particular stakeholder group. Through systematic consideration of the immediate textual context of phrases relating to professionalism and partnership, and through a more holistic analysis of the wider policy agenda, we offer a critical reading of the Report. We conclude with a plea that as the rush to attend to the more tangible, operational aspects of the proposed reform gather momentum, such a panacea approach to solving perceived problems needs to be critiqued openly.
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Introduction and context

In November 2009, the Scottish Government announced that Graham Donaldson, recently-retired Senior Chief Inspector of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education,
was to carry out a fundamental review of teacher education in Scotland. The report, *Teaching Scotland’s Future* (Donaldson 2011), hereafter referred to as ‘the Report’, was published in January 2011 and contained fifty recommendations addressing all stages of teacher education across the career life-course.

The very first paragraph of the Report proper presents the rationale for the need for such a review, and is quoted here in full:

> Over the last 50 years, school education has become one of the most important policy areas for governments across the world. Human capital in the form a highly educated population is now accepted as a key determinant of economic success. This has led countries to search for interventions which will lead to continuous improvement and to instigate major programmes of transformational change. Evidence of relative performance internationally has become a key driver of policy. That evidence suggests, perhaps unsurprisingly, that the foundations of successful education lie in the quality of teachers and their leadership. High quality people achieve high quality outcomes for children. (Donaldson 2011, 2).

This sets the scene clearly for the review, locating it within a globalised move to perform well internationally through measurements of attainment which might be considered to be indicative of human capital, in terms of the capacity of an educated population to enhance economic prosperity.

Responses to the Report have been overwhelmingly positive, with the Scottish Government accepting either in full, in principle or in part, each of the fifty recommendations in the Report (Scottish Government 2011). Other key stakeholder
organisations were also positive in their responses to the Report, with little dissent in relation to the overall direction being proposed. In particular, the education community in Scotland has welcomed the decision to affirm the role of higher education within structures of teacher education, and to promote the role of research and enquiry in lifelong teacher education.

In its response to the Report, the Scottish Government also outlined plans for a National Partnership Group (NPG) to operationalise the recommendations. Interestingly, the NPG is co-chaired by three people: representatives of Scottish Government, the Scottish Teacher Education Committee (higher education institutions (HEIs) with a teacher education role) and the Association of Directors of Education (senior local government officers responsible for education services) – possibly an attempt to model the partnership approach being advocated in the Report itself. The NPG is responsible for strategic leadership of the three sub-groups, which focus on the early phase (initial teacher education (ITE) and induction), career long professional learning, and leadership respectively. While the role of the NPG is to oversee and lead the response as a whole, the division of the detailed work into three distinct groups is indicative of the general way in which the Report is being received and acted upon by all stakeholders, That is, that stakeholders are looking at the parts of the system that they have responsibility for in a bid to make early progress. A danger with this approach is that each group or stakeholder is so bound up with developments in their own discrete area of teacher education that they do not have the space to consider the policy trajectory in a more holistic way.

The above overview portrays a picture of a report which has been broadly welcomed by all stakeholders involved in teacher education in Scotland, such that the plans for implementation are well on track with little serious or impactful objection or critique. However, we argue that it is the responsibility of the Academy to ensure that any
such potentially significant transformation in the ways in which teacher education works in Scotland is considered in relation to wider issues of politics, policy, power and control. Much of the capacity to engage critically with such projects of policy steering is located in contexts of teacher education. In this sense the implications and risks from politically mandated rapid change are very ‘close to home.’ This combination of pace and institutional caution has the potential to discourage a critical reading of the Report and the Scottish Government’s rapid and enthusiastic response. Thus, in this paper we present an analysis of the Report that supports an argument to the effect that what has been presented in the Report, and is now in the process of being implemented, adopts a policy panacea approach. It is suggested that Scotland is not alone in adopting such an approach, albeit not always categorised explicitly as a ‘panacea approach. For example, Loomis et al. (2008) argue that a global trend towards using ‘universal information’ rather than ‘particular information’ (p. 234) to inform teacher education policy is evident across the EU in particular. Below we discuss what we consider to constitute a policy panacea approach, after a brief outline of our approach to analysis. Thereafter we go on to exemplify the policy panacea approach through analysis of the concepts of professionalism and partnership which underpin much of the Report.

**Approach to analysis**

This article takes a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach; specifically aligning with a philosophical tradition of discourse rather than a linguistic tradition (MacLure 2003), the philosophical tradition having its origins in European philosophical and cultural theory, particularly poststructuralism. In the context of this paper, Graham & Luke’s (2011) definition of discourse as ‘institutionally and culturally structured patterns of meaning making’ (105) is helpful. Critical discourse analysis, then, is the explicit recognition of issues of power and inequality within discourse, it (CDA) ‘focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or
challenge relations of power and dominance in society’ (van Dijk 2001, 53, emphasis in original).

CDA is an approach rather than a method as such, and within CDA a range of different angles can be taken on the task of analysis. In this paper we adopt broadly what van Dijk (2001) refers to as a ‘socio-cognitive’ approach where interrogation of the text takes place at five different levels including:

1. the semantic macrostructures which reveal key propositions;
2. the local meaning applied to particular words or terms;
3. the relevance of subtle semantic structures employed, sometimes subconsciously, by the writer or speaker;
4. the political, historical and political local and global contexts; and
5. consideration of the mental models which the writer/speaker might have been drawing on when presenting a particular position.

Van Dijk (ibid.) also suggests that rather than subjecting a whole piece of text to analysis, that it makes sense to concentrate on analysing those factors which enable the writer or speaker to exercise power. In this article, therefore, we have chosen to focus on analysis of two examples of what we are referring to as ‘policy panaceas’.

Our analysis takes the form of a close textual analysis of the instances of ‘professionalism’ and ‘partnership’ within the Donaldson Report itself, examining the surrounding context and offering possible interpretations. However, in adopting a CDA approach it is not enough simply to examine the words themselves, it is also important to consider the wider context within which the Report has been produced, hence the contextual scene-setting earlier in the paper, which we draw on in our analysis. Our ultimate aim, in adopting such an approach, is to offer a range of interpretations of the ways in which professionalism and partnership are presented in
the Report, so that we might encourage deeper questioning about the purposes and potential impact of the Report in a more holistic way.

**Policy panaceas**

In this article we suggest that aspects of the Donaldson Report recommendations can be understood as attempting to provide policy panaceas. In coming to this position, it is important that we make explicit what we understand by a policy panacea and how this might differ from other forms of policy development. We understand policy panaceas to be policy solutions which are promoted, either explicitly or implicitly, as cure-all solutions to address a range of issues. Policy panaceas can be understood as administrative, organisational and managerial techniques and technologies, prescriptions and forms of action, that have become so established in the policy climate to the extent that their efficacy and appropriateness are self-evident and seem beyond question. Such prescriptions have become part of the institutional worldview and can be safely invoked in response to a myriad of problems and projects of government without the need to establish their legitimacy. Panaceas do not start from the identification of a particular, individual and definable problem and do not follow what might be seen as a traditional, technicist approach to policy development (Lasswell 1970). That is, they do not: identify the problem, consider a range of solutions, agree the ‘best’ solution within the contextual parameters and then outline how the success, or otherwise, of the policy proposal might be evaluated. We should be clear, at this point, that we are not necessarily advocating such a technicist approach, rather we are trying to draw distinctions between different policy development processes. Kennedy (2011) examines the use of policy panaceas in the US context, warning that they are ‘difficult to study because researchers themselves can become smitten by them and become advocates more than examiners of these new ideas’ (3). She goes on to suggest that it is much more likely that such a panacea approach to policy reform would be evaluated in relation to
its implementation, that is, how well it has been operationalised, rather than be interrogated in terms of its success in relation to any particular individual policy goal. The problem, as Kennedy (ibid.) sees it, is that panaceas by their very nature seek to cure-all by providing a wholesale solution to numerous problems.

Panaceas, by virtue of their 'cure-all' nature, have obvious instant appeal, yet that short-term appeal may well be at the expense of clear and sustainable policy outcomes. Identifying particular outcomes to evaluate is in itself a challenging task, where a policy is set up as being capable of addressing a multitude of issues. McConnell suggests that policies should be evaluated in three different realms: 'process, program and political dimensions' (2010, 346), arguing that it is too simplistic to conceive of 'policy success' as merely the process or the implementation of the specific programme. In particular, he suggests that 'some policy analysts prefer to keep politics at arms’ length, because it is seen as a distraction from a rational form of policy analysis’ (ibid. 50). The success or otherwise of the implementation of Donaldson’s recommendations would arguably benefit from being considered in relation to process, programme(s) and political dimensions, and the analysis in this paper will help to expose the challenge in adopting such an evaluative approach where the panacea approach makes the identification of specific processes and programmes somewhat opaque.

**Professionalism as a panacea?**

The Report promotes what Donaldson refers to as ‘twenty-first century professionalism’, advocating this as central to his vision of teacher education for the future. This phrase seemingly describes a way of behaving or acting as a teacher. Indeed, the word ‘professionalism’ could be swapped with the word ‘teaching’ and still make the same sense: ‘twenty-first century teaching’. So, why use the term ‘professionalism’ when the word ‘teaching’ would do? Indeed, what contribution does
'twenty first century' make to the meaning of the phrase: is it an appeal to modernity, a means of promoting a more contemporary vision of teaching? Presumably, the decision has been made, either consciously or sub-consciously, to draw on the semantic benefits afforded by the word ‘professionalism’, that is, the established associations and perceived esteem connected with the term. It is important, then, to make explicit what these semantic benefits might be by exploring possible interpretations of professionalism.

In its traditional form, the concept of professionalism was allied to occupational distinction, that is, that higher status occupations were accorded the status of profession and that professionalism was what distinguished the workers within these high status occupations from those in other, non-professional occupations. Thus began attempts to classify what constitutes a profession and therefore to identify components of professionalism. Commonly, such analyses of professions refer to specific criteria emanating from traditional professions such as medicine and law, making reference to having specialist knowledge, autonomy and responsibility (Hoyle and John 1995) and adherence to a code of ‘professional’ conduct. With the accordance of the status of profession comes increased status and reward. However, deeper exploration of the impact of such increased status and reward is interesting, revealing two quite different ideological paradigms. Adopting a functionalist perspective of professionalism, the key tenet is that the profession is trusted to carry out a service to society. This trust is evident through the deployment of professional self-regulation as a quality assurance mechanism. It is argued that the accompanying rewards to members of the professional group reflects society’s appreciation of the trust that it has in the profession to carry out the particular service (Barber 1963). The motivation for carrying out the professional service is essentially altruistic, and the accompanying rewards acknowledge that contribution. In contrast, a Weberian perspective would focus primarily on the rewards reaped by the professionals as
opposed to the service provided by them, and would contend that professional status serves to increase the exclusiveness of the occupational group, thereby increasing the associated rewards. The central focus here is on the acquisition and maintenance of power through exclusivity (Haralambos and Holborn, 2000), and the rewards that can be commanded by this exclusive status. These two perspectives reflect what might essentially be termed as either altruism or self-interest as the key motivators for seeking professional status.

Central to this debate is the ever-changing nature of occupational groups and their relationship with society. In this sense, perhaps the validity of the study of ‘professions’ itself is questionable, as professions themselves are only identifiable as occupational groups judged against the somewhat elusive concept of professionalism, a concept which Smyth et al. (2000) argue is principally an ideology linked to matters of control. It is therefore perhaps not possible to identify a workable definition of professionalism:

... to seek a fixed position is futile: professionalism has always been a changing concept rather than a generic one ... I see the concept and practice of professionalism as a site of struggle, especially as it relates to meaning. (Sachs 2003, 6)

This ‘site of struggle’ pertains to the ways in which the term, and the concept, of professionalism are used by different stakeholder groups. Smyth et al. (2000) argue that the concept has not only been used to exert control over teachers, but has also been used by them ‘as a weapon to maintain and/or regain some control over their work’ (45).
Contemporary debate on professionalism outlines two broad perspectives: managerial and democratic professionalism (Sachs 2001). These perspectives are helpful analytically, in terms of exploring the issues that Smyth et al. (ibid.) raise in relation to the locus of control evident through deployment of the concept of professionalism in any particular context. The managerial perspective values effectiveness, efficiency and compliance with policy, whereas the democratic perspective holds dear such values as social justice, fairness and equality and ‘seeks to demystify professional work and build alliances between teachers and excluded constituencies… on whose behalf decisions have traditionally been made either by professions or by the state’ (Sachs 2001, 152). While superficially, the democratic perspective might appear to be more politically motivated, Apple (1996) argues that ‘the institutionalization of efficiency as a dominant bureaucratic norm is not a neutral, technical matter. It is, profoundly, an instance of cultural power relations’ (54).

With these contrasting perspectives in mind, we now move to consider in detail the use of the term ‘professionalism’ within the Donaldson Report. ‘Twenty-first century professionalism’ is not the only term used: the body of the text makes twenty-eight specific mentions of the need to change current enactment(s) of professionalism, variously using terms such as:

- ‘extended professionalism’ (Donaldson 2011, 5, 15, 34, 52 & 79);
- ‘enhanced professionalism’ (ibid. 9, 10, 69 & 97);
- ‘reinvigoration of professionalism’ (ibid. 10);
- ‘redefined professionalism’ (ibid. 14);
- ‘wider concept of professionalism’ (ibid. 14);
- ‘reconceptualised model of professionalism’ (ibid. 68 & 97); and
What is not clear from the text is whether these various terms all refer to the same concept or whether they have subtly different meanings. There is almost an inference that readers will have a shared definition of what is meant because the term is not defined explicitly. What is evident at a first glance, though, is the deficit nature of the first six of these seven terms; that is, that professionalism needs to be extended, enhanced, reinvigorated, widened and reconceptualised, presumably suggesting that the current state of professionalism is simply not good enough. It is an implicit criticism of teachers’ current enactment of professionalism, and is somewhat in contradiction to the generic statements made in the Report about the high quality of teachers: ‘The established strength of the teaching profession in Scotland, together with the steps taken by successive governments to improve it further, have created a secure platform upon which to build.’ (Donaldson 2011, 2). Despite this positive endorsement, the clear message that teachers need to ‘increase’ their professionalism is arguably an example of external influence being exerted on the profession. Interestingly, teachers are not being asked here to account for their own professionalism in relation to the principles that they themselves hold dear, rather they are being measured against an externally agreed set of criteria, that is, international league tables of pupil/student attainment. This challenges the notion that a central aspect of professionalism is the ability to self-regulate and account for oneself and one’s profession and could be seen to exemplify a managerial perspective on professionalism.

This deficit positioning begs the question, what, precisely, is it that teachers are not doing well enough at the moment? It may be helpful, here, to locate Scotland’s performance in an international context by considering its performance in PISA 2009 (although it must be acknowledged that this is only one way of measuring
comparative success). Overall performance in 2009 was similar to that in 2006 in all three subjects (reading, maths and science), following a decline in previous years. Performance was above the OECD average in reading and science and similar to the OECD average in maths (Scottish Government, 2010).

Did Donaldson and his team have specific ideas about this or is it simply a diagnosis that acts to locate responsibility with teachers and stands in the place of other insights into the barriers that hold Scotland back from being a high performing system? Is the deficit positioning simply an adherence to OECD pronouncements about needing to make teachers ‘better’?

The term ‘extended professionalism’ is used throughout the Report and is attributed to Hoyle (1974), although Hoyle’s original work uses the term extended ‘professionality’, not professionalism. Interestingly, however, writing with Peter John some twenty years later, Hoyle described extended professionality as being:

‘largely acquired through participation in a wide range of professional development activities, including attendance at in-service courses, reading the professional literature, visiting other institutions, collaborating with colleagues in such activities as formulating policies and preparing action plans, undertaking small action research projects etc’

(Hoyle and John 1995, 123)

Hoyle and John (1995) went on to acknowledge that ‘over the past twenty years the professionality of most teachers has been extended’ and that ‘a culture of professional development has emerged in teaching’ (ibid. 123). So, it would appear
that Hoyle himself would not see his 1974 version of extended professionalism as something to be aspired to in the twenty-first century. Nonetheless, whatever the detail of Hoyle’s original conception of ‘extended professionalism’ the term is being used in the Report to suggest that the current level of professionalism is not adequate. For example, in recommendations relating to the early phase of teacher education (initial teacher education and induction) it is suggested that teachers need to ‘begin to develop extended professionalism’ (Donaldson, 2011, p. 34), thereby suggesting that it does not already exist. This is echoed later in the Report where Donaldson says ‘if we are to achieve the extended professionalism we seek…’ (p. 52), again implying that such professionalism is not currently in evidence.

For some readers, Donaldson’s use of academic literature in the Report was seen as a key strength, giving the text credibility as an informed piece of work which could be considered as a more objective piece of work than an ‘opinion piece’ might have been. Indeed, the review process leading up to the report has generally been received positively in comparison with other such reviews (Smith 2010). However, such credibility depends on accurate engagement with, and citation of, the primary sources and careful presentation of any subsequent analysis. It is unlikely that the many readers would consider going to the original literature review (Menter et al. 2010) to check whether it would withstand objective academic scrutiny, and equally unlikely that many readers would consider double-checking whether Donaldson’s interpretation of the literature review reflected accurately the position put forward in the literature review itself. However, Donaldson’s reference to Hoyle’s notion of extended professionalism provides an (arguably unintended) example of how the Report can serve to influence the reader. Such an example (and there are others) may lead one to question the extent to which the literature review has genuinely informed the Report as opposed to being used as a tool to validate the objective integrity of the text. The narrative privilege of the Report, however, is likely to lead to
its contents and pronouncements being taken at face value rather than being subject to critique, particularly when the majority of readers may well engage with the Report in a much more instrumental manner.

In addition to the substantive impact of drawing, accurately or otherwise, on research evidence, the perception of the review process is undoubtedly enhanced by the explicit reference to research findings in addition to evidence gathered through consultative approaches. However, Furlong et al. (2008) warn that this so-called ‘open’ feature of Third Way politics\(^1\), and its alignment with a ‘what works’ approach, while having some rhetorical appeal, can often mask a pre-defined idea of what the research evidence should show. The reference to ‘evidence’, research or otherwise, can be used as spin, and it is therefore vital that we consider the actual rigour, worth and selection of evidence that serves to support particular policy directions.

Focusing on Donaldson’s suggestion that we need to adopt a ‘wider concept of professionalism’ (14) leads to the question, wider than what? The statement suggests that we do indeed share a common understanding of what constitutes current professionalism, yet contemporary literature suggests that professionalism is, and can be, understood in a number of different ways. As discussed earlier, Sachs’ (2001) distinction between democratic and managerial perspectives provides a helpful analytical steer, as does Smyth et al.’s (2000) contention that the concept of professionalism is principally an ideology linked to matters of control. Going back to Donaldson’s plea for a ‘wider concept of professionalism’ to be adopted forces us to consider the starting position from which we seek to ‘widen’ the concept. It is unlikely that he is advocating a much more explicit subscription to a democratic perspective.

---

\(^1\) Third Way politics have commonly been associated with the governance of Tony Blair in the UK and Bill Clinton in the USA, and suggest a political ideology which supports wealth creation and entrepreneurship but also attends to issues of social justice; it is neither right-wing capitalism nor left-wing socialism, rather a half-way house or ‘third way’.
of professionalism as that would provide greater challenge to central control of, and over, teachers. We should also be mindful of the underpinning principle of the democratic perspective; its explicit aim to tackle inequality and to make education and schooling open to a much wider constituency of people. Such an aim for education is not explicit in the Report, either in its recommendations or in its discussion of the remit and purpose of the review itself. This project is perhaps, then, at odds with the explicit rationale for the review: to improve Scotland’s standing in international measures of attainment as a means of increasing human capital and ultimately securing a healthier economy. The contradictory political and ideological positions underpinning this argument suggest that the plea to ‘widen the concept of professionalism’ is perhaps more an appeal to teachers to ensure that they act in a professional way by complying with the emerging policy direction than it is to engage in critical thinking about the concept of professionalism and what that might mean for ‘professional’ behaviour.

The use of the term ‘professionalism’ in the Report is generally used to denote standards of teacher behaviour or engagement with their work. The Report does not, perhaps understandably, engage explicitly in discussion of the politics of professionalism, that is, the ways in which the concept can be used to mobilise or to control teacher behaviour. However, in appealing to particular standards of ‘professional’ behaviour, we contend that the concept of professionalism is being mobilised in the Report, intentionally or otherwise, as a form of subtle control over teachers and teacher education. We therefore propose that one reading might be that rather than being the answer or panacea, the focus on professionalism has more to do with the desire to influence teachers and teacher education than it does to engage with a particular ideological understanding or practical enactment of professionalism.
Partnership as a panacea?

Partnership is a strong theme within the Report, although as we will illustrate, the term is used to denote some quite different ideas. The overall effect, however, is that the reader cannot escape the idea that Donaldson wishes to promote more extensive partnership working in the career-long education of teachers in Scotland. Despite the overwhelming endorsement of such an approach, there is no explicit rationale in the Report for the adoption of a partnership approach. More detailed analysis reveals several implicit rationales, including equating teacher education with the approach underpinning the recent curriculum reform, CfE, which promotes greater coherence between early, primary and secondary education settings, that is, to see the various elements or stages of teacher education as a more coherent progression. Another possible rationale for partnership in the Report, although somewhat under-developed, is that such a mode of working might serve as ‘a practical expression of the theory/practice relationship’ (7). If this genuinely is one of the key reasons for promoting a partnership approach then it surely needs to be made much more explicit as it requires intentional behaviours on the part of the partners involved in the partnership. That is, the partnership would not be based simply on organisational matters but would be an intellectual partnership as well as a practical one. Another possible rationale in the Report is that partnership might serve as a means of ensuring more consistency in quality of student experience.

Before going on to explore these possible rationales in more detail, it is worth considering the wider context in which a partnership approach might exist, and we argue that the Report does not pay any explicit attention to the potential power issues that such an approach to teacher education might involve. The Report, and the literature review commissioned to support and inform it (Menter et al. 2010), in common with a lot of educational literature on partnership (see for example, Smith 2010; Smith et al. 2008; Furlong et al. 2000), considers the concept from a fairly
operational, transactional perspective. That is, it considers who might be responsible for what, and how they might negotiate the relationship, drawing on frameworks for analysis such as Furlong et al.’s (2000) which proposes four models of partnership: the HEI-based/integration model; the complementary (separatist) model; the HEI-led model; and the collaborative model. However, partnership, we argue, needs also to be considered from a political perspective. In their critique of the English National Partnership Project (NPP) in initial teacher ‘training’, Furlong et al. (2008) locate the development within Third Way politics, arguing that partnership represents a form of governance not only seen in education, but applied to social policy across the board. They identify two perspectives on partnership: one which is ‘essentially an epistemological and pedagogical concept’ (p. 309), where the key focus is on drawing on the different forms of knowledge that the partners bring to the experience of teacher education, that is, school-based, situated knowledge and HEI-based, research informed knowledge. The other they suggest is a neo-liberal concept, ‘designed to challenge the hold over initial teacher training by the “educational establishment”, in this case the universities’ (ibid.).

In returning to the detail of the Donaldson Report, while there is no explicitly articulated rationale for the promotion of a partnership approach, there are many examples of what might be considered to be partnership in action. Indeed, there are sixty explicit mentions of partnership within the main body of the text, the vast majority of these mentions relating to a concept of shared responsibility between schools, local authorities and universities. For example:

There is now a need to create a new kind of collaborative partnership within which all aspects of the student’s development are a shared responsibility and respective roles and responsibilities are clear (7)
A new concept of partnership among universities, local authorities, school, national agencies and other services.... (11)

Evidence from existing local authority and university partnerships of this nature indicate that the acceptance of a shared responsibility is central to success (46)

However, it seems that shared responsibility in itself does not extend to responsibility for the accountability of the partnership process: ‘Stronger quality assurance of the effectiveness of partnerships should be applied by GTCS [General Teaching Council for Scotland] through their accreditation procedures and HM [Her Majesty’s] inspectors in their inspections of teacher education and schools’ (44). The introduction of a strong inspection element to partnership is considered by Furlong et al. (2008) to be indicative of ‘political realism’ in the exercise of partnership as a form of neo-liberal governance. It indicates a form of control over the partnership which belies the appeal to democracy and autonomy that can be found in the rhetoric surrounding such a move.

Two other conceptions of partnership are promoted in the Report. The first is partnership as a reflection of the principle of cross- and integrated subject teaching contained within the recent curriculum policy reform, Curriculum for Excellence (see http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/understandingthecurriculum/). For example: ‘Some interesting and challenging developments involving cross-sectoral partnerships are taking place around the senior phase of Curriculum for excellence within secondary schools’ (46). A second conception of partnership evident is the notion of ‘working in partnership’ to indicate inter-professional working: for example, it is suggested that student teachers should be ‘beginning to develop extended professionalism, including preparation for distributive leadership roles and partnership working’ (34).
The vast majority of references to partnership concentrate on the notion of extending shared responsibility for teacher education. On the face of it, it would seem logical to promote such openness, transparency and collaboration, drawing on the various strengths of each party and attempting to make values explicit and shared. However, one of the key means to achieving this more enhanced form of partnership is the creation of ‘joint appointments’ between universities and schools, thereby potentially diluting and fragmenting individual professional identities and expertise (as teacher, teacher educator, or academic, for example) and creating a new breed of hybrid educator. The argument used to justify this suggestion is that teacher educators would be more ‘in touch’ with classroom practice and would be able to share their research in a more realistic way. While this might be desirable from a professional point of view in relation to teaching in schools, it may not necessarily fit comfortably with the direction of travel in the Higher Education sector in general. After all, research-focussed universities have their own sets of research priorities and goals for all staff, including teacher educators, and the legacy of the merger of former colleges of education into universities is still being felt keenly in relation to research expectations (see Menter 2011, for further discussion of the post-merger context in Scotland).

Perhaps more insidious, however, is the overall direction of travel towards a form of network governance in teacher education. Presented as ‘motherhood and apple pie’, a partnership approach to career-long teacher education has an obvious attraction, yet such an approach to shared responsibility arguably encourages a form of network governance which has the capacity to set up the various parties against each other and allows for the dispersal of ‘blame’ when the panacea does not manage to cure all ills. Offe (2009) describes network governance as ‘state-organized unburdening of the state’ (555) where explicit control moves from government to governance.
However, Börzel (2011) argues that ‘the literature has shown that network governance is likely to produce (more) adequate policy outcomes if political decisions can be hierarchically imposed’ (55). That is, that in order for network governance, or in this case ‘partnership’, to succeed then government needs to provide a ‘shadow of hierarchy’ (ibid. 56) which acts as incentive for the partners to work collaboratively.

While network governance may be seen to distribute responsibility, and in some senses can be viewed as a positive and trusting move, the power to distribute, that is, the governance of the network, remains firmly in the hands of the state (Ball 2009). So, while the partnership, in this case schools, local authorities and universities, has a shared responsibility for teacher education, it is mandated and ultimately controlled by government. It could be suggested, therefore, that in the absence of an explicitly articulated educational rationale for a partnership approach in the Donaldson Report, that the promotion of what could be termed ‘network governance’ is more to do with issues of control: ‘In an increasingly interdependent world, networks provide a solution to a whole variety of problems related to the setting and implementation of collectively binding norms and rules for the provision of public goods and services, that is, governance’ (Börzel 2011, 52). Drawing on the work of Rhodes (1986), Börzel describes networks as ‘power dependency relationships between government and interest groups, in which resources are exchanged’ (2011, 50). This definition fits well with what is suggested in the Donaldson Report, particularly the exchanging of resources, in this case principally human resource, but also, arguably, academic credit.

So, while Furlong et al. (2008) argue unequivocally that the partnership approach promoted through the NPP in England was ‘a concept of governance rather than to do with the form and content of professional learning’ (311) we are not suggesting the partnership approach being advocated in the Donaldson Report, and endorsed
wholly by the Scottish Government, is explicitly designed as a form of governance. What we are suggesting is that the dual purpose of a partnership approach, that is, partnership as a form of governance and as a form of professional learning, needs to be considered more explicitly within the Scottish context where education governance in general has been more subtle and consensual than it is in England.

**Conclusion**

We contend that the arguments put forth in this paper lend weight to the idea that the Donaldson Report in general, and the notions of professionalism and partnership in particular, are indicative of a panacea approach to policy making. Such an approach, and its attempts to ‘cure-all’ suggest that an ill-defined, or at least very broadly constituted, set of problems are to be addressed. At the root of this, in the context of teacher education in Scotland, is the sense in which the ‘problem’ with teachers has not really been defined nor evidenced. Rather, the global policy meta-narrative driving countries worldwide to implement reform in relation to teacher education has encouraged a reactive and largely uncritical response. We are not suggesting that the Report is wholly suggestive of a policy borrowing approach (Phillips and Ochs 2003), but that it is suggestive of adopting what Appadurai (1996) refers to as ‘vernacular globalisation’, that is, where structures and systems are shared and ‘enter distinctive national terrains with their own education politics that continue to affect the translation of those apparently shared forms and processes into indigenous practices’ (Ozga and Lingard 2007, 68). However, what is perhaps of more concern is the sense in which not only have elements of the proposed policy solution been ‘borrowed’, but perhaps more significantly, that the policy problem itself appears, to an extent, to have been borrowed.

While there appears, at least for the time being, to be broad support for the direction of the recommendations contained in the Donaldson Report, there is not as yet any
explicit strategy identified for the evaluation of the changes resulting from the recommendations. This, we suggest, will be made much more complex by the adoption of a policy panacea approach and the inherent difficulties in identifying precise outcomes for evaluation purposes. We draw, again, on McConnell’s (2010) work in suggesting that the evaluation of developments in this context should be considered in a three-fold way: the policy process, the resulting programmes and the political implications. The apparent desire to focus on the development of programmes, or systems, as a result of the Donaldson recommendations suggests that more explicit attention is needed in relation to the other two realms: process and political implications, and it is these two aspects that this paper seeks to draw particular attention to.

In drawing to a conclusion, we must also highlight again the need to consider partnership, and indeed the appeal to ‘professionalism’, as forms of governance and control, whilst at the same time acknowledging that ‘the ideological importance of State education, its role in developing human capital and the economic costs of paying for State education, all require the State to ensure that teachers function within ideological and economic parameters, however, loosely defined’ (Stevenson and Carter 2009, 324). We therefore urge deeper consideration of the potential implications of increasing network governance in teacher education: we should give full consideration to the epistemological and pedagogical arguments for adopting a more wholesale partnership approach, but must, at the same time, be willing to interrogate such a move in terms of the potential adoption of a neo-liberal agenda and all that that implies in relation to the control of teacher education. Finally, we would not wish, in the words of Hargreaves and Goodson (1996), to see the concept of professionalism, or indeed partnership, used as ‘a rhetorical ruse – a way to get teachers to misrecognize their own exploitation and to comply willingly with increased intensification of their labour in the workplace’ (20).
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