

Professional standards in teacher education: tracing discourses of professionalism through the analysis of textbooks

Jonathan Tummons

School of Education, Leazes Road, Durham University, DH1 1TA

jonathan.tummons@durham.ac.uk

Abstract

This article explores aspects of the relationship between professional standards for teachers and the curriculum for teacher education in the lifelong learning sector in the UK. Drawing on an analysis of different editions of three core textbooks for teacher education in the lifelong learning sector, which are positioned as acting as proxies for the teacher education curriculum, the article explores the relationship between professional standards and the curriculum for teacher education in the sector. Starting from a standpoint that foregrounds the material nature of professional standards – that is, that the standards need to be conceptualised and made sense of as an embodied, physical textual artefact – the argument presented here is that in order to understand any impact that professional standards might have beyond the discursive, the ways in which the standards as a material text might be seen as interacting with other relevant texts that embody different aspects of the profession – such as textbooks – must be considered. The article concludes that whilst curriculum can and ought to be expected to change over time, the impact of professional standards on curriculum change would appear to be relatively minor.

Key words

Document analysis. Further education. Professional standards. Professionalism. Teacher education. Textbooks.

Introduction: reading a textbook

At the time of writing, a new set of professional standards for teachers and trainers in the lifelong learning sector has only recently been published by the Education and Training Foundation. This is the third set of standards for the sector to be published during the last fifteen years. But now that these standards have been written, what happens next? Curriculum documents may refer to them, textbooks may quote them and academic researchers may explore the discourses of professionalism that they inhabit. This is the *everyday problematic* (Smith, 2005) that informs the research that is reported here. The central question to be opened up in this article is: what do professional standards actually *do*?

Professional standards, FEnto, LLUK and the Education and Training Foundation: changing times

Professional standards can perform a number of inter-related roles (Eraut, 1994). They can make public expectations regarding the expected behaviours, knowledge and practices of those people who are suitably qualified to work in the profession in question. They can work as a source of information relating to these same behaviours, knowledge and practices for providers of education and training who offer, or seek to offer, relevant qualifications. They can be used as a mechanism for the endorsement and quality assurance of the curricular and assessment processes that these same qualifications rest on (Taylor, 1997). And it is important to remember that such a set of standards does not seek to define excellence, but threshold competence: what the practitioner needs to be able to know and do before they can go into practice, the assumption being that continuing learning in the workplace will afford the practitioner with further opportunities for development (Katz, 2000).

Within the sector that has been variously described as the further education (FE) sector, the post-compulsory education and training (PCET) sector, the post-14 sector and the Lifelong Learning Sector (LLS – the term employed here), the relationship between professional standards and the practitioners who work as teachers/trainers/lecturers (the terminology in use is variable – the term ‘teachers’ will be employed here) within the sector is complex. Professional qualifications for teachers in the LLS are by no means new, although they have for much of their history been voluntary, highly variable in terms of both curriculum and assessment, and differing in academic level (Lucas et al., 2012). Professional standards are a more recent arrival. The first set of professional standards for LLS teachers was published in 1999 after a consultation period of several years, followed two years later by statutory reform that made the acquisition of appropriate initial teaching qualifications based on the standards compulsory for new teachers in the sector (Nasta, 2007). The standards were published by the Further Education National Training Organisation (FEnto): one of a larger number of National Training Organisations (NTOs) introduced by the UK Conservative government of 1979-1997 to specify and implement relevant education and training programmes for the sector in question. The FEnto standards were criticised by some university-based researchers for being overly instrumental, technicist, and undervaluing wider professional development (Elliot, 2000). They were also criticised by Ofsted, who in 2003 published a report on *The Initial Training of Further Education Teachers* (HMI 1762: Ofsted, 2003). According to this report, teacher education in the sector was seen as being too variable and too inconsistent despite the introduction of new standards and new qualifications and as lacking subject-specialist pedagogy (Lucas, 2004).

In the following year, the then Department for Education and Skills published a new working paper, *Equipping Our Teachers for the Future*, which promised reform of LLS teacher education as part of a wider change in workforce education and training. NTOs were gradually replaced by new organisations – Sector Skills Councils (SSCs) – and FEnto was subsequently replaced by Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK), who published a new set of standards in 2006, after another period of consultation. These standards were accompanied by a further element: a new process of professional formation that required teachers in the LLS sector to achieve a new professional status – Qualified Teacher, Learning and Skills (QTLS) – following a compulsory period of continuing professional development (CPD). But criticism remained: from university researchers, who argued that the new standards were still mechanistic, overly prescriptive and narrowed the content of teacher education curricula (Lucas et al., 2012), and from policy makers who allowed the standards to ossify firstly by abolishing LLUK and secondly by removing financial support from the Institute for Learning (the professional body for LLS teachers that, amongst other things, was responsible for auditing

teachers' CPD and QTLS endorsement) and which at the time of writing has announced that it is ceasing operation, and thirdly by reintroducing voluntarism into LLS teacher education. And although the QTLS process of professional formation has survived, the management of the process has been passed from the IfL (ostensibly a member-led organisation) to the Education and Training Foundation (very much an employer-led organisation). So what now for professionalism and professionalisation in the lifelong learning sector?

Professional standards, professionalism and professionalisation

Professionalism is an ideology. As such, it can exist in different forms. Within the lifelong learning sector, debates around professionalism occupy one of two distinct discourses (Gee, 1996). One of these discourses resides within a neoliberal landscape, and is *reified* within policy texts, government reports and such like. This is a discourse of imposed, narrow professionalism, of *audit* and accountability (Shore and Wright, 2000). The second occupies a landscape that is constituted by academic journals and conference papers. This is a discourse of *autonomous*, emancipatory professionalism, authored and owned by autonomous practitioners (Gleeson et al., 2005). Within these discourses of professionalism as ideology, we locate the separate but related process of professionalisation, here defined as “a process by which an occupation seeks to advance its status and progress towards full recognition within that ideology” (Eraut, 1994: 100). Professional standards, therefore, are a mechanism – alongside other visible mechanisms such as formal qualifications or other forms of training, codes of ethics or disciplinary procedures – through which the process of professionalisation can be enacted.

In this context, it seems right to suggest that the ways in which a set of professional standards might be used can be understood in terms of the particular discourse of professionalism that is being served at any moment of analysis. The quality assurance processes by which initial teacher education qualifications are endorsed can be highlighted as one example. Between 1999 and 2002, 45 universities and five other awarding bodies (City and Guilds being the largest) had their LLS teacher education programmes endorsed by FEto: that is to say, all of these qualifications were agreed to have been constructed in such a way that upon completion (that is, successfully completing all of the required assessments) of any one of these programmes, the trainee would be deemed to have demonstrated the required level of competence and knowledge necessary for a new entrant to the LLS teaching profession. This can be seen as an example of professionalisation for *audit professionalism* at work. At the same time, the fact that so many practitioners in the LLS were involved in a lengthy consultation process prior to the publication of the FEto standards (which went through eight revisions in a process that involved over 200 further education colleges, 10 universities and 23 other interested agencies (Lucas, 2004)) can be seen as an example of professionalisation for *autonomous professionalism* at work. But this is not to say that both of these – or any other – processes surrounding the FEto or LLUK standards were entirely successful. The endorsement process referred to above did little to harmonise the LLS teacher education curriculum or standardise the experiences of either trainees or teacher educators (ibid.). And notwithstanding the consultation process that surrounded their creation, the FEto and LLUK standards are generally agreed to have failed to provide a discourse of developmental, expansive professional learning for LLS teachers, whose training continues to be seen as a ‘second thought’ by policy

makers (Lucas and Nasta, 2010). As yet, it is too early to comment on the new standards from the Education and Training Foundation in this context.

Problematising professional standards

As a third set of professional standards for LLS teachers and trainers is published, it seems apposite to ask questions what their predecessors, the LLUK and the FEto standards, managed to achieve. There are several possible directions that such an inquiry might take. For example, if we were to explore professionalisation from an *audit professionalism* perspective, we might position teaching standards as being part of the wider neoliberal project of education policy reform, rooted in managerialism and performativity cultures (Gleeson and James, 2007; Robson and Bailey, 2009). In this case, the shift by the coalition government to that form of selective localism that has led to – *inter alia* – the dissolution of LLUK and the reintroduction of voluntarism into LLS teacher education, has simply maintained the professionalisation of performativity that is enacted through inspection, league tables and other tools of the audit culture (Avis, 2011). If we were to explore professionalisation from an *autonomous professionalism* perspective, we might position teaching standards as a representation of what teachers know, do and believe – an articulation of the profession of teaching (Mulcahy, 2011). In this case, the demise of the Institute for Learning and a consideration of the teacher/trainer voice within the Education and Training Foundation (with a board constituted of senior managers from FE and related industry sectors), might suggest that autonomous professionalism is under (renewed) threat. But any such inquiry would have to make certain assumptions about the impact that professional standards might have in the first place. What do professional standards actually do? Did the neoliberal project of accountability, inspection and audit actually need the FEto and LLUK standards in order to be accomplished? If the FEto and LLUK standards were indeed as mechanistic and technician as they have been described, then to what extent would they have been capable of contributing to a discourse of autonomous professionalism?

A framework for inquiry

The argument and data presented in this paper forms the second part of a longer phenomenographical inquiry that seeks to explore the impact of and responses to the FEto and LLUK standards (Tummons, 2014). The starting point for this inquiry – based on a methodology that will be described below – is: what do the FEto/LLUK standards actually do? And this question in turn rests on the notion that for the standards to do anything at all, in the first place they have to be read by someone, before they can be acted upon (or not).

The framework for the conceptual analysis of the FEto/LLUK professional standards that I use here is derived from three related theoretical perspectives: material semiotics, and specifically actor-network theory (Fenwick and Edwards, 2010; Law 1994, 2004; Latour, 2005); social practice accounts of literacy (Barton, 1994; Barton and Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996); and social learning theories, specifically communities of practice theory (Hughes et al., 2007; Tummons, 2012; Wenger, 1998). These theories, all of which occupy a social epistemology and ontology, lead us to consider the professional standards as artefacts, as documents that are intended to convey particular meanings which are intended for the people to whom the documents are addressed once they have been authored: this is the first element of the framework. However, there are four overlapping caveats. The first is that no such textual document can carry a single, agreed, inherent

meaning or body of meaning. The act of reading always involves a process of negotiation of meaning, in which the reader brings her or his own understanding, attitudes, experiences, social and cultural milieu, and history to the text that is being read. The meaning that is made by any one reader is thus relational and capable of being more or less divergent to what was intended by the author(s). The second caveat is that it is important to remember that meaning-making is further problematised by distance: as any literacy artefact travels – across institutional, organisational or geographic boundaries – the work that it can do relies on how it is received when it arrives at its destination(s): assuming that the artefact is not lost, forgotten or destroyed *en route*, it then still needs to be read for the meaning-making process to be activated. The third caveat is that the reification of any such literacy artefact is always a problematic process: it is uncertain at best that any such document can satisfactorily capture and make concrete in written form, the themes, issues, concepts and ideas that it purports to so capture. The fourth and final caveat relates to the knowledge, competences and attitudes that these standards purport to represent. It is arguably the case that many of those elements that constitute the professional competence of teachers are incapable of being represented in propositional form, derived, as they are, from tacit rather than explicit knowledge. To summarise, the argument presented here positions the FEnto/LLUK standards as being inherently problematic. They are incapable of being endowed with a single, unproblematised meaning or body of meanings. Instead, they are by definition, as a consequence of their reification into a textual form, contingent, fluid and malleable.

With this in mind, the second element of the framework for inquiry can be established: the identification of moments or episodes where the standards are put to use, drawn on or otherwise activated. This requires a consideration of the purported uses of the standards. That is to say, if one of the reasons given to justify the use of standards is as a way of capturing the professional knowledge of LLS teachers, then moments need to be found where the standards are in some way employed or aligned to any instantiation of this professional knowledge. Such a moment or episode can be understood as being a *nexus of practice* (Scollon and Scollon, 2003), a concept drawn from social practice accounts of literacy. A nexus of practice is a social event or practice upon which a number of different identifiable strands conflate and from which multiple connections can be traced. Such a nexus of practice can be found in the authoring of textbooks.

Textbooks as a focus for inquiry

Textbooks have been used as a focus for inquiry for researchers in a number of different academic disciplines who have sought to ascertain the comparative coverage of key topics within textbooks, to account for changes in textbooks content over time, to explore the ways in which particular topics are represented by different textbooks, and to establish what might be considered the core cumulative knowledge of an academic discipline at specified levels of attainment, for example, at undergraduate level (Armbruster, 1986; Keith and Ender, 2004; Lewis and Humphrey, 2005; Peoples, 2012). In this inquiry, the focus is on a comparative content analysis of textbooks. Specifically, the focus is on the relationship between the content of textbooks that are commonly used on LLS teacher education courses, and the FEnto/LLUK professional standards (see appendix one). Social practice theories of literacy (as described above) draw on the concept of *intertextuality* to explore the relationships that texts have with other texts (Barton, 1994). The question to be addressed here, therefore, is: what are the relationships between teacher education textbooks, and the

FEnto/LLUK professional standards, and what do these tell us about the ways in which the professional standards are used or made to act?

Methodology

The data that is presented below is drawn from the *document analysis* of subsequent editions of textbooks that are commonly used on LLS teacher-training courses (Hodder, 2000; McCulloch, 2012; Rapley, 2007; Robinson, 2010). The analysis consisted of the following components: firstly, content analysis of chapter headings and sub-headings; secondly, comparative analysis between each edition of the textbook in question (Peräkylä, 2005). Thirdly, drawing on *curriculum alignment* methodology, the frequency of use of the professional standards was quantified and compared across editions (DeLuca and Bellara, 2013). Three textbooks were chosen as a *purposive sample* (Silverman, 2005). All three have been revised on a regular basis. Two were first published *before* the introduction of the FEnto standards; the third was first published after the introduction of the FEnto standards (see table 1). The three books are: *Teaching, Training and Learning: a practical guide*, by Ian Reece and Stephen Walker (hereafter referred to as Reece and Walker), first published in 1992; *Teaching in Further Education*, by Leslie Curzon (hereafter referred to as Curzon), first published in 1976; and *Teaching and Supporting Learning in Further Education*, later retitled *Teaching, Tutoring and Training in the Lifelong Learning Sector*, by Susan Wallace (hereafter referred to as Wallace), first published in 2001.

[Table 1 here]

These three textbooks constitute a purposive sample as they all possess distinct characteristics as texts that are meaningful to my research. In the case of Reece and Walker, the analysis was in part a retrospective process: the first three editions were published prior to the publication of the FEnto standards. It was also a comparative process: the 4th and 5th editions were mapped onto the FEnto standards; the 6th to the LLUK standards. That is to say, throughout the text, relevant standards are cited/quoted in relation to relevant chapter topics. In the case of Curzon this was an inductive process: none of the previously published editions of Curzon were mapped onto either the FEnto or LLUK professional standards: for Curzon, therefore, the mapping was done retrospectively as part of the content analysis process (for example, chapters on assessment were linked to FEnto area 'f': 'assessing the outcomes of learning and learners' achievements'. Because the 6th edition of Curzon was published prior to the publication of the LLUK standards, the focus of comparison was on the enactment of the FEnto standards across the different editions of these two textbooks. In the case of Wallace, the analysis comes in two parts: firstly, in analysing the first two editions which were mapped onto the FEnto standards; secondly in analysing the third and fourth editions which were mapped onto the LLUK standards.

In order to establish the frequency of use of the standards as a proxy for coverage of particular areas or bodies of knowledge, the occurrence of each within each edition was counted. To allow for comparison

across editions and textbooks, the number of occurrences as a proportion of the total occurrences within each individual textbook was calculated.

Data summary and discussion

[i] Reece and Walker

From the 1st edition (1992) of Reece and Walker to the 4th (2000 – the first to be mapped to the FEto standards), there are only minor changes to content. The changes to the 2nd edition, in comparison to the 1st edition, amount to only 2 ½ pages of new content relating to multiple choice questions and structuring questions, a new checklist for the evaluation of assessment methods, minor changes to wording, and new references. There are new subsections on transactional analysis and classroom control. Changes to the 3rd edition are minor. 5 pages related to portfolio building are added and there is a slight expansion of the discussion of andragogy. 8 pages of examples of multiple choice questions, true/false questions and so forth are included. There is a new 6-page section on classroom management. Terminology is updated (for example, replacing ‘common and core skills’ with ‘key skills’). The section previously titled ‘study skills’ is expanded and renamed ‘references, citation, bibliographies and the Harvard system’.

The 4th edition (2000) is mapped to the FEto standards, and also receives minor changes. The additions are a section on giving a presentation (one page of text) and a more systematic use of Harvard referencing throughout some chapters (particularly the chapter on curriculum). One major change is the deletion of a chapter found in previous editions, ‘the role of the teacher in context’, which covered topics such as administration, college management, the nature of post-16 provision and discussion of the wider context of further education and training. The 5th edition (2003) is almost identical to the 4th. Chapter structures are revised but content is similar. Changes are minor: bibliographies are sometimes updated, as is terminology: for example, references to further education funding council inspections are replaced by references to Ofsted inspections (the surrounding text stays the same). There is a 4-page section on ‘learning styles and strategies’, and a 2 page section on ‘teaching with technology’. The 6th edition (2006) is mapped onto the LLUK standards. Beyond minor changes to terminology and references, the only substantial changes in content relate to e-learning: there is a 11 page section on ‘the role of ILT in assessment’, a 8 page section on software packages that might be used in the classroom, and a more general 9 page discussion of ILT. The chapter on ‘evaluating and improving professional practice’ has a small amount of new content (2 pages) that discusses the LLUK standards and QTLS accreditation.

From this it can be seen that from the 1st edition to the 6th edition, the changes made to Reece and Walker, not including necessary updates to reflect (for example) the expansion of Ofsted’s remit to include the LLS sector, seldom involve new content areas. The changes in content that surround the mapping of the FEto standards in 2000 and the LLUK standards 6 years later, are few in number. The inclusion in the 6th edition of a greatly expanded discussion of e-learning and ILT use in teaching and learning simply reflects the changing technological context of the time, rather than a response to a new professional standard: indeed both the FEto and LLUK standards refer to ILT and e-learning. The loss of the chapter on ‘the role of the teacher in context’ is more interesting. Whilst the reasons can only be speculated upon at the present time, it might be the case that the lack of a straightforward way by which it could be mapped onto one or more of the

FEto standards contributed to its removal. (Ongoing research within this project will include interviews with both the authors and editors of subsequent editions of this and other textbooks).

[iii] Curzon

Changes to Curzon (the 1st edition was 218 pages; the 6th edition was 459 pages) are more substantial than that of Reece and Walker. Almost all of this expansion is due to the expansion of coverage of topics that have been included throughout the different editions, alongside greater use of secondary sources and more discussion of the relevance of the topics to the teacher. Coverage of theories of learning provides a good example. In the 1st edition, this topic took up 2 chapters totalling 17 pages. In the 6th edition, it took up 7 chapters totalling 90 pages. The latter is more detailed and contains more examples of how theory might be applied in the classroom or otherwise inform the work of the teacher, but the same major groups of theories – drawn from educational psychology – are discussed in both. Over time, new theorists are introduced (for example, Robert Gagné appears for the first time in the 2nd edition; the cognitivist school, exemplified by John Dewey, Jerome Bruner and David Ausubel, appears for the first time in the 3rd edition). Coverage of each of these theorists also expands over time: for example, in the 1st edition, the coverage of Burrhus Skinner takes a little over 3 pages with the sub-headings: Skinner – the background; the basis of behaviour; the learning process; (and) Skinner’s work and the teacher. In the 6th edition, the discussion covers 8 pages, with a new subsection: the shaping of behaviour. This pattern of topic expansion occurs throughout. For example, in the 1st edition, there is a 9 page chapter on ‘the lecture’. By the 6th edition, this has expanded to 2 chapters totalling 19 pages.

As the editions proceed, new topics are also introduced. In the 2nd edition (1980), there is a new chapter on class discipline; in the 3rd edition (1985), new chapters are included on student counselling and teaching the older student. In the 4th edition (1990) there are new chapters on motivation, and on teaching students how to study; in the 5th edition (1997), there is a new chapter on the concept of intelligence; and in the 6th edition (2004), new chapters on the evaluation of teaching performance and the nature-nurture debate are included. Across editions, changes are made to chapter structure (for example, a topic that once consisted of a single chapter might be expanded into 2 chapters), and to chapter titles (for example, ‘a view of the learning process’ changes to ‘a view of the teaching-learning process’ in the 3rd edition, and to ‘education, teaching and learning’ in the 4th edition. Also in the 4th edition, the topics covered in this chapter are expanded on to the extent that they require a new chapter, titled ‘the science and art of teaching’, which appears from the 4th edition onwards. As subsequent editions appear, references are updated, terminology is changed, and content that has become redundant is amended. As with Reece and Walker, the use of computers in education and training provides a clear example. The brief mention in the 1st edition of “the continuing advance in the technology of micro-miniaturisation which allows the contents of entire libraries to be recorded, stored in a very small space and retrieved instantaneously through the use of electronic devices” (Curzon, 1975: 151) has by the time of the 6th edition become a chapter that discussed choice of software and hardware, possible uses of computers for, for example, simulation or problem-based learning, and open learning.

[iii] Wallace

The analysis of the four editions of Wallace needs to be considered in the light of two key issues. The first issue to note is that professional standards (FEnto for the first two editions, LLUK for the next two) are positioned from the outset as drivers for the content of the book, in contrast to Reece and Walker, where standards are applied retrospectively to different editions without noticeably driving content.

The first two editions (2001 and 2005) are quite similar. Following an introductory chapter, both of these editions are structured so that each area of the FEnto standards is covered in a single chapter, with the exceptions of areas a (assessing learners' needs), and e (providing learners with support). Two chapters with a wider reach – one discussing reflective practice and the other discussing key skills – are mapped onto a large number of standards, explained by the author in the text in terms of the wider applicability and transferability of the topics being discussed. The chapter 'key skills and the teacher' in the first edition is renamed in the second edition as 'the minimum core and key skills', reflecting the introduction of the FEnto *Minimum Core of Teachers' Understanding of Language, Literacy And Numeracy*. A small amount of new content is included in the chapter and one paragraph of text is lost. In addition, a short (4 pages) chapter on theories of learning is also added to the second edition, mapped to several FEnto areas in a similar manner to the chapters already discussed here.

For the third edition (2007), mapped onto the LLUK standards, a significant expansion of the text was undertaken, and the fourth edition (2011) is in turn very similar to the third. As before, the content of the texts is explicitly linked to the (now LLUK) standards, and the significant expansion of the text between the second and third editions is explained as a response to the different requirements of the new standards. For the third edition, two new substantial areas of content are therefore added: a chapter on subject specialist pedagogy; and a chapter on continuing professional development (CPD). Coverage of quality and diversity issues is also significantly expanded. Other content areas that were present in previous editions are also presented in more detail and with updated references. Changes to the fourth edition are relatively minor. Some typographical errors are corrected, some factual content is updated (although some infelicities occur such as out of date references to legislation), two chapters in the third edition are merged into a single chapter in the fourth, and the chapter on 'managing behaviour and motivating learners' gains 3 pages of discussion. The final chapter is renamed 'achieving your teaching qualification' and gains a new 5-page discussion providing advice for the reader when preparing for being observed whilst teaching as well as offering more general study guidance.

FEnto, Reece and Walker, Curzon, and Wallace: a comparison of thematic coverage

A common feature of teacher education textbooks (including LLS textbooks) is the use of relevant professional standards as a feature of the text. It is common for specific chapters to be either prefaced or concluded by reference to, or quotation of, those professional standards that are relevant to the content of the chapter. Thus, all the chapters in the 4th and 5th editions of Reece and Walker are linked to relevant FEnto standards, and in the 6th edition, to the LLUK standards. I have already described the process by which coverage of the FEnto standards has been applied to Curzon for the purposes of this research (Curzon being one of the very few LLS teacher education textbooks that do not make use of professional

standards in this way). I have also already explained the focus on the coverage of the FE_{nto} standards, as distinct from the LLUK standards, due to the times of publication of the different textbooks being reviewed. The FE_{nto} standards consisted of a number of statements gathered together under eight main 'areas of activity', lettered 'a' through to 'h' (see appendix one). The proportional coverage of the FE_{nto} standards in the 4th and 5th editions of Reece and Walker are identical (see table 2):

[table 2 here]

Having already established that the changes made to the content of subsequent editions of Reece and Walker are relatively minor, and that no substantive new content was either introduced or removed with the exception of the chapter titled 'the role of the teacher in context', it can be assumed that if the FE_{nto} standards were retrospectively applied to the first three editions of the book, the frequency of coverage would remain unchanged. By contrast, the more substantial changes made over time to subsequent editions of Curzon lead to a rather different pattern of frequency of coverage of the FE_{nto} standards. The expansion of some sections and gradual addition of new content, as described above, leads to a shift in emphasis across editions. A comparison of the frequency of coverage between the 1st and 6th editions illustrates this quite clearly (see table 3):

[table 3 here]

The contrasts from the 1st to the 6th editions of Curzon requires some further comment. The substantial increase in the coverage of area 'c' (developing and using a range of teaching and learning techniques) is a consequence of the significant expansion of chapter on theories of learning and on methods of instruction. Other changes are relatively minor with the exception of the coverage of area 'g' (reflecting upon and evaluating one's own performance and planning future practice) and area 'h' (meeting professional requirements). It could be argued that the thorough study of the contents of the entire book (how students learn, methods of teaching and assessment, classroom management and so forth) constitute meeting professional requirements and thereby provide coverage of area 'h' that is more than adequate. But this only appears as a discrete topic of discussion (in a manner akin to the coverage of the FE_{nto} standards as an object of study in Reece and Walker) in the 1st edition of Curzon, specifically in the three chapters that provided coverage of the FE sector more generally, that were removed from subsequent editions (as discussed above). However, the relatively slight coverage of area 'g' is more problematic. Reflective practice has occupied a dominant position in LLS teacher education for some time and certainly since the publication of the FE_{nto} standards (Tummons, 2011). It is impossible to ascertain precisely the reasons why this subject area was marginalised after the 1st edition (in the 4th and 5th editions, frequency of coverage of area 'g' dropped to 2%) although it might be assumed that Curzon, as sole author, exercised his professional judgement in doing so.

The changes across the different editions of Wallace provide the most straightforward example of the impact of a professional standards framework on curriculum structure and content as represented in a textbook. The FEto and LLUK mapped editions are explicitly positioned as being constructed in response to the standards and the significant changes between the second and third editions represents the differences between the FEto and LLUK standards. Arguably the most significant of these is the introduction of content relating to *subject specialist pedagogy*, highlighted by Ofsted as a weakness in the FEto standards (HMI 1762: Ofsted 2003), and now included in the LLUK standards and accompanied by a new focus on mentoring (Fisher and Webb, 2007; Ingleby and Tummons, 2012). The focus on CPD is also significant, and is linked to the (now defunct) Institute for Learning regulations relating to professional formation and QTLS (qualified teacher, learning and skills) status. It is important to note that whilst CPD and professional formation is also included in the 6th edition of Reece and Walker, although subject specialist pedagogy is not.

At the same time it is important to recognise that the style or genre of writing differs markedly across these three textbooks, reflecting the different authorial styles, approaches and interests of the respective authors, and with consequent effects on the scope or nature of coverage of some topics. For example, coverage of ICT and e-learning is done in very practical terms in Reece and Walker, in a more detailed and theoretical context in Curzon, and in a brief and discursive manner in Wallace.

Conclusions: what do professional standards do?

Amongst discussions of emancipatory professionalism and performativity cultures, professional standards are positioned as embodying the knowledge, values and competences of a profession, and/or as tools for audit and accountability. What is often lost sight of in such discussions, however, is a consideration of how the standards as a text actually work. The *materiality* of professional standards is lost sight of amidst such conversations. By this, I mean to draw attention to the simple fact that for the standards to achieve anything – whatever discourses of professionalism they might inhabit or promulgate – then they have to be read, to be circulated, to be quoted, acted on or otherwise manipulated. The ways in which professional standards are used in textbooks may seem to be relatively minor, but such use constitutes a visible manifestation of *intertextuality* (as discussed above (Barton, 1994)), a moment when the standards can actually be seen to be travelling from one material location, the FEto standards as published by FEto and circulated in both print and pdf formats, to another, the opening sections of chapters in a textbook.

So what impact did the FEto standards have? What do they make happen? What can they be seen to have been accomplishing, as a text-based material artefact – in these moments of intertextuality? The data and analysis presented above, based on three core textbooks that can be seen as to some degree representing the core knowledge of the LLS curriculum, would seem to suggest that they do accomplish something, but perhaps not very much. The content of Reece and Walker remains almost unchanged across all six editions, with one exception: the imposition of the FEto standards might be seen to have informed the deletion of one chapter from Reece and Walker ('the role of the teacher in context'), a concrete example of the kind of narrowing of the curriculum that has often been posited as an effect of the standards (Lucas et al., 2012). At the same time, the ease with which the LLUK standards were substituted for the FEto standards between the 5th and 6th editions of Reece and Walker, with relatively little changes to the content of the curriculum,

might suggest that the LLS curriculum is in fact robust and well-defined, capable of absorbing subsequent sets of professional standards rather than being absorbed or distorted by them. The curriculum can be seen as being similarly robust in its embodiment through subsequent editions of Curzon. The expansion of the topics discussed in this book from 1976 to 2004 can be described as systematic, as being based on an increasingly broad depth of scholarship, expanding the text not only in terms of depth of coverage, but also in a manner that is mindful of the reader, offering her/him more examples of theory-in-use, more examples of particular teaching and assessment strategies, and so forth. This is an incremental process, each edition being a little longer, based on a little more scholarship, and adding a small amount of new relevant content. If the FEto standards did indeed contribute to a dominant discourse of LLS teacher education, then the curriculum that Curzon embodies would seem to show no trace of this. It should not come as a surprise to note that the content coverage in Curzon changes during the 28 years between the publication of the 1st edition and the 6th. Any curriculum is prone to changes over time due to the impact of changing societal attitudes, changes in technology, new innovations and new forms of knowledge (Kelly, 2009). As such, a gradual process of change across subsequent editions of Curzon is not surprising. And this process seems to continue between the 5th and 6th editions, which come either side of the publication of the FEto standards, but which do not appear to be shaped or informed by them in any observable manner. Indeed, it is perhaps more of a concern that the content of Reece and Walker would appear to remain relatively unchanged during a publishing period of fourteen years (an analysis which, if nothing else, would justify a library decision not to so readily discard older editions in favour of newer ones). And Wallace, notwithstanding its position as a text that is explicitly structured around professional standards, nonetheless mirrors the curriculum content that is represented in both Reece and Walker, and Curzon. The one significant shift in content in Reece and Walker and in Wallace is the focus on subject specialism, mentoring and CPD. In the new era of voluntarism following the demise of the IfL, it will be interesting to see if these content areas recede in future editions.

To conclude: the argument presented here is proposed as an attempt to shift the analysis and discussion of professional standards away from more abstract notions of discursive construction, of competition between differing ideologies of professionalism, and towards an analysis of professional standards that foregrounds the concrete by looking for material traces of the work done by professional standards. By focusing on the ways in which professional standards, as textual artefacts, are seen at work in other texts, it is possible for the researcher to begin to map their movements, to ascertain how they travel. How any literacy artefact might be understood and acted upon is far from straightforward. But a necessary first step is that the artefact in question, the one that the researcher is seeking to explore, is actually picked up, copied from page to page or quoted, perhaps as the beginning of a chapter in a textbook. Abstract or conceptual arguments around how professional standards inform competing models of professionalism can only make sense if we can first find ways of ascertaining how such standards travel, how they are written and rewritten and where, rather than how, they are read.

Notes on contributor

Jonathan Tummons is lecturer in education and pathway leader for the MSc in Educational Assessment at Durham University. In addition to ongoing research into learning, teaching and assessment in further and higher education, he is currently acting as co-investigator for 'Higher Education in a Digital Economy: An

Institutional Ethnography', a three-year research project based at Dalhousie University, Nova Scotia, and funded by the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

References

- Armbruster, B. 1986. "Schema theory and the design of content-area textbooks." *Educational Psychologist* 21(4) 253-267.
- Avis, J. 2011. "More of the same? New labour, the Coalition and education: markets, localism and social justice." *Educational Review* 63(4) 421-438.
- Barton, D. 1994. *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barton, D. and M. Hamilton. 1998. *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. London: Routledge.
- DeLuca, C. and A. Bellara. 2013. "The current state of assessment education: aligning policy, standards and teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 64(4) 356-372.
- Eraut, M. 1994. *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Fenwick, T. and R. Edwards. 2010. *Actor-Network Theory in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Fisher, R. and K. Webb. 2007. "Subject specialist pedagogy and initial teacher training for the learning and skills sector in England: the context, a response and some critical issues." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 30(4) 337-349.
- Gee, J. 1996. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. Second edition. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Gleeson, D., J. Davies and E. Wheeler. 2005. "On the making and taking of professionalism in the further education workplace." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 26(4) 445-460.
- Hodder, I. 2000. "The interpretation of documents and material culture." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd edition, edited by M. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, 703-716. London: Sage.
- Hughes, J., N. Jewson and L. Unwin, eds. 2007. *Communities of Practice: critical perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Ingleby, E. and J. Tummons. 2012. "Repositioning professionalism: trachers, mentors, policy and praxis." *Research in Post Compulsory Education* 17(2) 163-178.
- Katz, T. 2000. "University education for developing professional practice." In *New Directions in Professional Higher Education*, edited by T. Bourner, T. Katz and D. Watson, 19-32. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

- Keith, B. and M. Ender. 2004. "The sociological core: conceptual patterns and idiosyncracies in the structure and content of introductory sociology textbooks, 1940-2000." *Teaching Sociology* 32(1) 19-36.
- Kelly, A.V. 2009. *The Curriculum: theory and practice*. Sixth edition. London: Sage.
- Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: an introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Law, J. 1994. *Organising Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, J. 2004. *After Method: mess in social science research*. London: Routledge.
- Lewis, T. and C. Humphrey. 2005. "Sociology and the environment: an analysis of coverage in introductory sociology textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 33(2) 154-169.
- Lucas, N. 2004. "The 'FENTO Fandango': national standards, compulsory teaching qualifications and the growing regulation of FE teachers." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 28(1) 35-51.
- Lucas, N. and T. Nasta. 2010. "State regulation and the professionalisation of further education teachers: a comparison with schools and HE." *Journal of Vocational Education and Training* 62(4) 441-454.
- Lucas, N., T. Nasta, and L. Rogers. 2012. "From fragmentation to chaos? The regulation of initial teacher education in further education." *British Educational Research Journal* 38(4) 677-695.
- McCulloch, G. 2012. Documentary methods. In *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, edited by J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe, and L. Hedges, 210-217. London: Sage.
- Mulcahy, D. 2011. "Assembling the 'accomplished' teacher: the performativity and politics of professional teaching standards." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43 (sup. 1) 94-113.
- Nasta, T. 2007. "Translating national standards into practice for the initial training of further education (FE) teachers in England." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 12(1) 1-17.
- Ofsted. 2003. *The Initial Training of Further Education Teachers – a survey (HMI 1762)*. London: Ofsted.
- Peoples, C. 2012. "A comparative review of stratification texts and readers." *Teaching Sociology* 40(1) 60-69.
- Peräkylä, A. 2005. "Analysing talk and text." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, third edition, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, 869-886. London: Sage.
- Rapley, T. 2007. *Doing Conversation, Discourse and Document Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Robinson, W. 2010. Documentary research. In *Educational Research and Inquiry*, edited by D Hartas, 186-198. London: Continuum.
- Robson, J. and B. Bailey. 2009. "'Bowling from the heart': an investigation into discourses of professionalism and the work of caring for students in further education." *British Educational Research Journal* 35(1) 99-117.
- Scollon, R., and S.W. Scollon. 2003. *Discourse in Place: Language in the Material. World*. London and New York: Routledge.

Shore, C. and S. Wright. 2000. "Coercive accountability – the rise of audit culture in higher education". In *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, edited by M. Strathern, 57-89. London: Routledge.

Smith, D. 2005. *Institutional Ethnography: a sociology for people*. Lanham: Altamira Press.

Taylor, I. 1997. *Developing Learning in Professional Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Tummons, J. 2011. "'It sort of feels uncomfortable': problematising the assessment of reflective practice." *Studies in Higher Education* 45(3) 471-483.

Tummons, J. 2012. "Theoretical trajectories within communities of practice in higher education research." *Higher Education Research and Development* 31(3) 299-310.

Tummons, J. 2014. "The textual representation of professionalism: problematising professional standards for teachers in the UK lifelong learning sector." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 19(1) 33-44.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix One: FEnto and LLUK professional standards

The FEnto standards were divided into eight areas, denoted as 'major areas of activity' for teachers in the sector (which were in turn sub-divided into a number of different competency statements):

- a. assessing learners' needs
- b. planning and preparing teaching and learning programmes for groups and individuals
- c. developing and using a range of teaching and learning techniques
- d. managing the learning process
- e. providing learners with support
- f. assessing the outcomes of learning and learners' achievements
- g. reflecting upon and evaluating one's own performance and planning future practice

The LLUK standards were divided into six areas, denoted as 'domains' (which were in turn sub-divided into a number of different knowledge and competency statements):

- a. professional values and practice
- b. learning and teaching
- c. specialist learning and teaching
- d. planning for learning
- e. assessment for learning
- f. access and progression

Table 1: textbook editions, dates and length.

	1 st edn.	2 nd edn.	3 rd edn.	4 th edn.	5 th edn.	6 th edn.
Reece and Walker	1992	1994	1997	2000	2003	2006
	460pp.	510pp.	602pp.	562pp.	438pp.	466pp.
Curzon	1976	1980	1985	1990	1997	2004
	218pp.	245pp.	306pp.	388pp.	450pp.	459pp.
Wallace	2001	2005	2007	2011		
	154pp.	158pp.	228pp.	230pp.		

Table 2: frequency of FEnto standards coverage in Reece and Walker, 4th and 5th editions

FEnto area of activity	frequency of coverage (% of total occurrences)
A	9
B	16
C	16
D	19
E	9
F	12
G	7
H	12

Table 3: FEnto standards coverage applied to Curzon (as a % of frequency of total occurrences)

FEnto area	1 st edn.	6 th edn.
A	8	12
B	16	17
C	24	35
D	24	21
E	3	6
F	5	4
G	11	4
H	8	0