*Education reform in England: quality and equity in the performative school*

Dr Chris Wilkins, Reader in Education, University of Leicester

## Abstract

This paper argues that contradictory forces affect teachers' work in the neoliberal school system in England, with a diversity of governance models alongside increasingly dominant orthodoxies of what constitutes 'effective practice and leadership'. School reforms in England have focused on increasing overall attainment and on closing the achievement gap for pupils from 'disadvantaged communities'; whilst there is evidence that reforms have delivered on the former, evidence is inconclusive on the latter, with some critics arguing that some reforms have increased social inequality.

The future for teachers' professional identity and practices in this landscape is uncertain. Whilst this paper broadly concurs with many studies of teacher identity which argue that the ever-extending reach of performative mechanisms has restricted teachers' opportunities to develop as activist professionals with 'a moral purpose', it also argues that the diversified landscape may provide the opportunity for new autonomous spaces. It goes on to suggest that further research is needed into the forms of locally-determined values and practices emerging in 'quasi-privatised' academies and free schools in England, to explore whether these professional communities will be entirely managerialist/entrepreneurial in character, or whether models of practice underpinned by a concern with social equity and social justice issues may emerge.

## Introduction

Recent decades have seen a global preoccupation with the effectiveness of education systems, reflecting the dominance of neoliberalism in economic and social policy arenas, and an orthodoxy focused almost entirely on seeing improving educational outcomes in terms of competition in the 'global knowledge economy' (OECD 2005; Rasmussen et al. 2009). This global neoliberal project has been extensively analysed and conceptualised during this time, with particular attention paid to the impact of the performative frameworks that characterize it on the values and the practices of schools and of teachers.

Another important area of study has been the relationship between the demands of competing on a knowledge economy and issues of equity. Some argue that neo-liberal reforms can deliver greater efficiency and competitiveness in parallel with a socially progressive, even egalitarian agenda; Giddens argues that this 'European Social Model' is at the heart of the

European Union's Lisbon Treaty (Giddens 2007). However, this is countered by those who argue that the demands of performative systems preclude practice that is driven by values and principles of social justice and equity (Ball 2000; 8).

This debate has run alongside one about the impact of performative systems on the work of teachers and on teachers' professional identity. For some, neo-liberal managerialism has for many years been seen as 'de-professionalising' teachers, reducing them to (Barton et al. 1994; Robertson 2000), whilst others argue that it has created opportunities for 'professional empowerment' in schools where distributive leadership models allow for a more collegial environment (Gronn 2003; Coles & Southworth 2005).

This article explores the phenomenon of performative reforms in education with a particular focus on the impact these may have on social justice and equity issues. It does so by examining recent and current policy trends in England, which has long been seen as being in the 'vanguard' of the neo-liberal reform agenda (although the article also draws on international perspectives, particularly school reforms in the USA). Different models of education reform have emerged in different systems, with specific policy approaches developing as a consequence of local political contexts, but of the national reforms taking place over the past two decades, the English context provides the most striking evidence of the neoliberal project at work (Furlong 2013). Nowhere else has the marketisation and diversification of educational delivery been so extensive; nowhere else has the performative regulatory framework become so intensive (AUTHOR et al. 2012). An exploration of the impact on performative reforms on educational equity in England, therefore, may provide useful insights into the potential consequences for the many national systems across the world who appear to be, a varying speeds and degrees of enthusiasm, following 'the English way'.

The article discusses of the way in which the structures and governance of schooling in England have been diversified over recent years, in particular, the way the increasing autonomy of schools to self-govern in a 'third space' between the public and private. This diversification came initially through devolvement of financial and staffing responsibilities to all state schools, then by the growth of academies and 'free schools', with even greater autonomy, and entirely independent of local government influence. In particular, it explores the potential consequences for teachers' professional values, identity and practices, and

considers the possible impact of what are effectively quasi-privatized state schools on teachers' engagement with equity issues.

**Neoliberalism and educational reform**

During recent decades, much of the focus of education reform across the world has been on the teacher workforce, with a number of influential studies arguing that teacher quality is perhaps the most important determinant of improving outcomes (OECD 2005; Barber & Mourshed 2007; UNESCO 2011). This in turn has led to a policy focus on every aspect of maximising teacher quality; attracting the best, training them in the most effective way, and examining how best to support their continuing professional development (OCED 2011).

The neoliberal reform discourse (Ball 2003; Apple 2005) has been characterized by the increasing use of datasets such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Progress in International Reading and Literacy Study (PIRLS), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) to compare transnational performance, and so shape policy responses (Grek and Ozga 2010). PISA has become particularly influential in shaping political and public discourse within the European Union, where macro-level education policy has been driven by the aspiration for the EU to be a global 'knowledge-based' economic superpower (Ertl 2006; Dale & Robertson 2009).

Evidence certainly suggests systems seen as 'high performers' (such as Shanghai, Singapore Finland) share a crucial common characteristic; their ability to recruit the highest quality of entrant into teaching and to build on this through highly effective professional development (Barber & Mourshed 2007, 16). With the ever-increasing reach of neoliberal policies across the globe, there have been many attempts to replicate the key features of high-performing systems; certainly the political profile of teacher education policy has never been as high as it has in the past two decades (Furlong 2013).

Perhaps the defining characteristic of recent education (and particularly teacher education) reforms across the globe has been the attempts to 'capture the essence' of what enables school systems to 'come out on top' (Barber & Mourshed 2007). The solutions adopted are overwhelmingly neoliberal ones; *marketization*, assumed to bring fiscal efficiency, *diversification of provision* to facilitate 'consumer choice', and somewhat contradictory

*performative deregulation*, in which the state's role is apparently reduced to that of oversight of the market whilst actually exerting immense power through data driven performance management at every level; on individual teachers, schools, local/metropolitan authorities and national systems (Ball 2000; Robertson 2000). The neoliberal reform project, across all public services, not just education, has been effectively 'normalized' through its ubiquity in international political discourse; the World Bank and the OECD, the EU's Lisbon Treaty 2009 and national governments across the globe have promoted neoliberal policies as being not only the most *effective* way of bringing about economic and social development, but *the only way* (Lynch 2006; Rizvi and Lingard 2010).

**Neoliberal education reform in England: New Labour and beyond**

Despite the focus on teacher quality, the relationship between school improvement and the effectiveness with which schools address social equity issues has received comparatively little attention. This is particularly noteworthy in the English context, given that Tony Blair, prior to being elected as Prime Minister in 1997, stated that his policy priorities were "Education, education, education" (Blair 1996), whilst Peter Mandelson, one of Blair's key political allies, was noting that a key measure of the success of 'New Labour', as Blair had rebranded the Labour Party, would be whether Britain would be 'a more equal society' in ten years' time (cited in Hills *et al*. 2009). In 1999, Blair used the symbolically significant annual Beveridge Lecture on Social Justice (commemorating the 'architect of the Welfare State') to set out his government's historic aim to be "…the first generation to end child poverty" (Blair 1999). New Labour education policy, therefore, set out to place social justice and equity issues at the heart of its education policy in its period in office between 1997 and 2010.

This attempt to align social justice with a neoliberal agenda typified the Blairite 'Third Way', in which the neoliberal economic growth imperative was explicitly underpinned by a socially progressive agenda in which closing the 'achievement gap' (between rich and poor, black and white, male and female) was seen as being as important as improving overall educational outcomes (Hills et al. 2009). Education policy, therefore, shifted in the New Labour era from being simply a social policy to being social and economic at the same time (Furlong 2013). According to Anthony Giddens, Third Way politics aimed to reshape social democratic

principles in response to the revolutionary imperatives of globalisation and the knowledge economy (Giddens 2000).

**System-level education reform in England**

Attempts to address the social justice strand within 'Third Way' education policy have been wide-ranging, and included both structural reforms and fiscal ones designed to target funding at 'disadvantaged' groups. The introduction of the academy school model was intended to liberate school leaders and increase funding to facilitate the transformation of 'underperforming' schools (which were overwhelmingly serving socially and economically disadvantaged communities). The *Sure Start* programme, designed to provide integrated early education, childcare, health and family support in these communities pursues the same 'global, knowledge-based economy' goals as similar programmes in other countries, such as *Head Start* in the USA and the Early Child Care and Education (ECCE) Scheme in Ireland. Infrastructure was also prioritised and an ambitious schools building programme, part-funded by the archetypal neoliberal 'Private Finance Initiative', was introduced in 2003. As with the academies programme, *Building Schools for the Future (BSF)* was primarily targeted at schools in disadvantaged communities.

Following the election of a Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government in 2010, the neoliberal macro-level reforms were accelerated. Although BSF was abandoned, the academy model was widened and further diversification was encouraged via the introduction of free schools. Free schools are essentially a 'hybrid' model of state-funded independent schools with even greater autonomy than academies over matters such as the curriculum, teacher pay and conditions, and even teacher qualifications. The introduction of free schools, together with the expansion of the academies programme, has been presented as a means of closing the achievement gap for disadvantaged pupils, demonstrating that the aspiration to create social mobility through educational attainment has been embedded across the political spectrum. Similarly, whilst Sure Start funding has been reduced, the Coalition government introduced a Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) for pupils from low-income families, presenting this as a challenge to the "…soft bigotry of low expectations" (DfE 2010) propagated by an educational establishment derided by Secretary of State Michael Gove as complacent and patronizing towards disadvantaged communities. Gove himself (improbably for an ideological neoconservative) cited Gramsci as a key influence on his thinking when arguing in favour of 'working class intellectualism' as opposed to more naturalistic, informal

learning, stating that "The accumulation of cultural capital – the acquisition of knowledge – is the key to social mobility" (Gove 2013).

Evidence regarding the impact of these structural and funding reforms on educational equity is inconclusive. *Sure Start*, despite its positive impact in terms of early years health issues, has produced less convincing evidence of impact on educational outcomes (Clarke 2006). Whilst it is too early to measure the impact on attainment of PPG, evidence suggests that it is primarily being used to protect existing services by compensating for cuts in core funding (Carpenter et al. 2013). Similarly, evidence about the impact of the expansion of academy schools is fiercely contested; some studies argue they have improved attainment (Machin and Vernoit 2012), others have claimed that this improvement 'disappears' when the pupil and staffing mobility that occurs when schools convert to academy status is taken into account (Machin and Wilson 2009; Wrigley 2011; Allen 2013). A recent parliamentary Select Committee Report came to the conclusion that there was no conclusive evidence regarding the impact of academisation on overall attainment (House of Commons Education Committee, 2015), also noting the variability in impact of academy conversion on 'closing the gap' for socioeconomically disadvantaged students (Francis *et al.* 2014).

One notable feature of education reforms in England has been the undoubted success on the London Challenge, a conglomeration of initiatives that led to a significant improvement in student outcomes in London from 2000 to 2010; this improvement cut across boundaries of social class, ethnicity and type of school governance (Baars *et al.* 2014). Further research will be needed to unpick the complex factors that have led to the success of London Challenge (in both overall attainment terms and in terms of equity; the extent to which it has contributed to closing the attainment gap). However, the fact that improvements were seen across academies and community schools, across the wide range of ethnic communities in London and across a range of local authority districts where very different models of governance were favoured, suggests there will be no straightforward answers.

Debate around the impact of neoliberal school reforms on overall academic attainment, and on the consequences for social equity outcomes, are not confined to England. Separate OCED reports on the marketization of school systems found that the introduction of 'quasi-market' incentives brought, at best, modest gains (Hatcher 2011, 490), and the debates around system reforms in the USA have been particularly heated, where the charter school and contract school initiatives parallel the academies and free school developments in

England. Proponents of US school reforms argue that liberalizing school governance has made at least some contribution to delivering the egalitarian goals of *No Child Left Behind* (Dillon 2005), but many other studies have pointed to the opposite outcome, that the array of neoliberal reforms (of governance, curriculum and assessment) have had a disproportionate negative impact on equity (Fuller *et al*. 2007; Lipman and Hursh 2007).

Despite the relatively modest evidence of a positive impact of these structural manifestations of neoliberal reforms, set against a significant amount of evidence of their adverse impact on equity in educational outcomes, it seems unquestionable that global education policy will continue to be characterised by a multilayered, multileveled marketisation, and in some respects privatisation, measures (Ball 2009).

**Constructing the neoliberal schools workforce**

The structural and funding reforms of the New Labour era were accompanied, from the very beginning, by a succession of reforms aimed at 'modernising' schools and the teaching profession. Central to this was the notion that teachers must commit themselves to modernisation by aligning themselves with system-wide objectives (Furlong 2013, 33). As Blair himself said "The teaching profession is critical to our mission" (DfE 1998). The project to open up the 'secret garden' and make the profession accountable had been started by a previous Labour Prime Minister, James Callaghan, in 1976, and Blair used the 20th anniversary to give this 'Great Debate' fresh impetus, calling for a relentless focus on standards in literacy and numeracy, and for teachers "…to be held accountable for their performance and….to work in partnerships with parents, business and the community" (Blair 1996). Blair emphasised that his mission was 'practical' and intended to "…put behind us the political and ideological debates that have dominated the last thirty years" (ibid). This characterisation of neoliberal policy solutions as being 'common-sense' and 'above or beyond politics' echoes the prevailing conceptualisation of globalisation within political discourse; Rizvi and Lingard argue that neoliberalism has become the 'social imaginary' of globalisation, giving it sense and legitimacy (Rizvi and Lingard 2005, 51). The persuasiveness of this normalising discourse is apparent in the extent to which the neoliberal 'accountability and standards' agenda has come to dominate global education policy, with professional dissent offset by wider public acceptance of the 'common-sense necessity' of reform (Torres 2011).

Blair's 'Ruskin 20 years on' speech went beyond the reach of Callaghan's by targeting not just the restructuring of schools and the curriculum, but by setting out a mission to reframe teacher professionalism, overturning the traditional notion of individual professionalism in favour of a collective endeavour in which professionalism entailed multiple accountabilities; to parents, colleagues, school leaders and government. Under New Labour, teacher professionalism required teachers to take personal and collective responsibility for their professional development and to be 'open to change' based on evidence of 'what works'. This vision of new teacher professionalism was set against a portrayal of 'traditional' professionalism in which "…isolated, unaccountable professions made curriculum and pedagogical decisions alone without reference to the outside world" (DfEE 1998). In summary, teachers needed to accept an externally managed vision of their own professional expertise (Furlong 2013, 34).

**The self-improving teacher in the self-improving school**

New Labour's modernisation of the profession in order to improve the school system is characteristic of neoliberal reforms of systems across the globe, given credence by studies arguing for a focus on 'recruiting the best, providing the best training and retaining the best' (OECD 2005; Barber and Mourshed 2007; UNESCO 2011). It produced a decade or more of initiatives in England addressing these three related aims (the 2010 Coalition government, although abandoning many specific New Labour initiatives, continued on the same course, whilst arguably accelerating the pace of reform). The emphasis of professional development, therefore, has shifted from the individual teacher towards developing a culture which places professional learning at its heart and is intended to turn the profession into a 'self-improving' one founded on 'collaborative capital' (Hargreaves 2011). For Hargreaves, this 'modernization' of professional development has necessitated a shift from a *knowledge model*, emphasizing academic knowledge predominately acquired in higher education settings, towards a *practice model* in which improvement comes through the "progressive development of best professional practice…*learning by doing*" (2011, 10).

Hargreaves' view of the value of 'academic knowledge' for teachers reflects the wider scepticism of successive UK governments about the role of universities in the education and training of teachers, with sustained efforts to increase the involvement of schools in both initial teacher education and continuing professional development. This has culminated in

the Coalition government's ambition to create a 'school-led system' for Initial Teacher Education (ITE) (DfE 2010, 2011; MacBeath 2011; Taylor 2013). Further confirmation of the determination to shift the centre of gravity away from universities and their presumed focus on 'academic knowledge' comes from proposals to undermine the requirement for teachers to hold formal postgraduate teaching qualifications (Furlong 2013). For some, the promotion of a school-led system represents a concerted political assault on universities (Browne and Reid 2012), although it is perhaps more accurately a consequence of the neoliberal 'imagining' of a diversified, marketised delivery as not so much the most effective approach, but simply 'common-sense'; the *only* approach. As Blair might have put it, it is a *practical not ideological* imperative; this perhaps reflects the 'normalising' of neoliberalism, to the extent where the widespread privatisation of state education (Ball 2009) is largely unremarked upon in public and political discourse.

**Initial teacher education and the neoliberal project**

As already noted, ITE is a key strand of neoliberal education reforms, and recent UK governments have aspired to match the success of 'PISA high performance' systems in recruiting the best quality entrants into teaching (OECD 2005; Barber and Mourshed, 2007, Ball and Forzani, 2009). However, there has also been an acknowledgement that is many systems, matching the entry levels of South Korea and Singapore, for instance, is not a realistic aspiration for countries such as England and the US (Freedman et al. 2008, 25).

One high profile attempt to address this 'quality gap' has been the growth of the *Teach for All* model, in which 'elite' graduates interns are brought into teaching through an employment-based training programme. *Teach for All* (*Teach First* in England) is now a global franchise, operating in 33 countries, and notable because of its explicit mission of social equity alongside that of teacher quality, placing teachers in schools that consistently struggle to recruit high quality teachers. This linkage between teacher quality and equity is a significant one, given the evidence that in systems where teacher status (and so entry quality to the profession) is low, schools serving the most socio-economically disadvantaged communities have the greatest difficulty attracting and retaining high-quality teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Ammermüller & Lauer, 2009; Little, 2010). This means, therefore, that given the evidence of the adverse impact of socio-economic disadvantage on educational attainment

any policy that aims to close 'the achievement gap' must address the issue of teacher recruitment quality.

However, evidence for the actual impact of such initiatives on social equity (or on the broader issues of teacher quality and school improvement) is inconclusive. Although some studies support the notion that getting 'elite' individuals into the classroom through *Teach for All* and the 'Fellows Programs' in a number of US state school systems can impact positively on school performance, (Kane et al. 2008; Muijs et al. 2010; Xu et al. 2011), others have noted the high costs of such initiatives (McConney et al. 2012). Others have suggested the *Teach for All* 'internship' model, whatever the economic cost-benefit ratio, is fundamentally flawed. Whilst *Teach for All* claims to address the "global problem of educational inequality" (*Teach for All* 2014), this aspiration is underpinned by a rhetoric suggesting that 'problem' of teacher quality can be solved by dispatching 'elite cadres' to 'problem schools in problem communities'. Critics, however, argue that this simply reproduces 'middle-class privilege' through the "…production of discourses obscuring middle-class privilege and power" (Smart et al. 2009, 51).

Notwithstanding the particular sensitivities surrounding schemes that promote 'elite' graduates whilst problematizing disadvantaged communities, others argue that entry quality is less significant in determining teacher effectiveness than the quality of their teacher education/induction programmes (Darling-Hammond *et al.* 2005: Darling-Hammond 2009). Ultimately, tracing a causal link from teacher recruitment all the way through to educational outcomes for pupils is such a complex matter that it perhaps qualifies as an 'un-researchable' question'.

**Teacher identity in performative systems**

The neoliberal model of 'modernized' teacher professionalism, with its emphasis on personal and professional responsibility for improving one's own practice and that of schools, has been the subject of many studies into its impact on teachers' identity. A common theme in this research has been the notion that teacher identity emerges from the interplay between professional and personal identities (Wenger 1998; Day et al. 2007), and which responds in a dynamic way to internal and external factors (Sachs 2005; Beauchamp and Thomas 2009). This process creates the potential for conflict in 'becoming' and 'being' a teacher as

individuals try to reconcile personal values with those of the professional community; these in turn need to be balanced against the institutional priorities of the schools in which they work (Pillen *et al.* 2013).

This conflict between the idealistic sense of 'social purpose' that motivates so many individuals to become teachers (Lortie 1975; Kyriacou et al. 2003), and the local and system-level values, practices and priorities, is a recurrent theme in literature conceptualising teacher identity construction (Maclure 1993; Flores and Day 2006). Many studies of teachers' work in recent years have attempted to explain the ways in which teachers engage with this complex 'negotiation of power' between the personal, institutional and wider policy contexts (Lasky 2005; Avis 2005; AUTHOR *et al.* 2012).

The prevalence of performative policy and practice in recent decades has been widely seen as presenting a significant challenge to the normative values of the profession, enacted through the deployment of ever more visible and 'intrusive' external accountability instruments (Day et al. 2005; Troman et al. 2007; Cherubini, 2009, AUTHOR et al. 2012). However, whilst these performative instruments have been widely viewed as constraining and undermining 'traditional' professionalism although it could be argued that many critics of neoliberal policies present an overly positive, even nostalgic, view of 'traditional professionalism'. This needs to be taken into account when discussing the potential impact on social equity outcomes of neoliberal reforms.

Whilst the imagined 'golden age' of teacher professionalism (usually considered to be the 1960s and 1970s) did see genuinely progressive reforms in England, particularly in respect of the curriculum and pedagogy, it would be hard to argue that the profession was exemplary in championing the rights to equity in education for ethnic minority, female and working class pupils, let alone the pupils with special educational needs ghettoised into schools for the 'educationally subnormal and/or handicapped'. It is risky, of course, to apply contemporary judgements in such matters, but a close examination of the reality of schools in the pre-performative era is a necessary corrective to the lazy assumption that if the teaching profession could be liberated from performative constraints, a radical progressive social justice agenda would naturally emerge.

For many, this has led to the notion that teachers have been deprofessionalised (Ozga 1995), through a process by which their work has been reshaped as being a set of *post-professional* activities (Hargreaves 2000; Ball 2003; Apple 2005). Performative mechanisms have been characterised by the ways in which they undermine professional values based on critical reflection and practice, and imposing external, frequently data-driven, priorities that consequently devalue or suppress more creative, interpretive aspects of teachers' work (Galton and MacBeath 2008).  Ultimately, it is argued, this leads to an 'inauthenticity' of practice that has "potentially profound consequences […] for the inner-life of the teacher" (Ball 2003 226). Evans argues that the framework of professional standards, first introduced in 1998 in England and currently in their fourth iteration, have shaped teacher professionalism in complex ways, but predominately as a 'demanded or required' professionalism that is relatively narrowly defined by teachers' behaviour rather than their attitudes or intellectuality (Evans 2011 868).

Others have argued, however, that there is potential for resistance to this post-professional teacher identity, despite the dominant entrepreneurial, managerialist discourse.  For Sachs (2003) this resistance is dependent on the maintenance of a robust collegiality that values and promotes an 'inquiry-oriented' approach.  Where this collegial professional culture prevails, in which teachers feel a strong affiliation to their professional community, Sachs argues that teachers are able to uphold a more 'values-driven' notion of the professional as 'an active agent pursuing a moral purpose' (ibid 2003).

Hargreaves (2009) and Sachs argue that dissent is crucial to professional innovation through 'system adaption', and that it allows for the growth of a transformative professionalism driven by internally-generated professional values rather than externally-imposed models of 'good practice' (Avis 2005). The notion of collegiality and collaboration as being central to the maintenance of 'traditional' professionalism is a common one, and some studies of school leadership have drawn attention to this, noting that professional identities are more likely to remain stable in schools where school leaders promote a culture of *collaborative* professionalism rather that individual 'self-improvement' (Hord 1997; Katzenmeyer and Moller, 2009). This has led in turn to the notion that the most effective school leaders are those that are committed to fostering a 'professional learning culture' (Stoll and Louis 2007; Day and Gu 2010).

Sachs' notion of the activist professional is obviously an appealing one for educators with a strong commitment to a social equity agenda, and one that at first sight resonates with the notion of teachers as 'productive pedagogues' (Lingard and Mills 2007) who locate their practice in a wider context of social justice and the purpose of education, rather than the 'reproductive pedagogues' who simply enact (and therefore legitimise) extant inequalities (ibid. 234), However, this optimistic view of the potential for pursuing egalitarian goals within neoliberal policy arenas is a questionable one for a number of reasons.  As Sachs makes clear, values-driven practice can only flourish in a collegial professional culture, and there is a significant body of evidence suggesting that genuine collegiality is difficult to maintain in schools where tendency of performative frameworks to create an environment in which authoritarian principals are lauded as 'transformational leaders' (Courtney and Gunter 2015).  In such unpromising environments, the teaching profession is re-fashioned through a new generation of teachers more accepting of the discourse of performativity (Goodson 2014).  For many of this new generation of teachers, compliance with performative practices is normalised (AUTHOR 2011).

**Neoliberal school leadership**

The "knowledge claims and production processes for school leadership" (Gunter and Forester 2008) have been central to recent education policy in England (under both Labour and Coalition UK governments).  At the outset of the New Labour era, the notion that head teachers are "the key to a school's success" (DfEE 1998) took hold, along with the idea that whilst schools still required a single, 'transformational' leader at the top, sustainable modernisation could only occur with a more 'distributive' model of leadership in which responsibility for school improvement was devolved to increasingly complex tiers of 'senior and middle leaders' (Gunter & Forrester 2008, 150).  Distributive, or 'dispersed' leadership rapidly became the standard model for school leadership during the New Labour era; it was "an idea whose time has come" (Gronn 2000, 333). The multiple rebranding of the executive agency responsible for overseeing initial and in-service teacher education during this period neatly encapsulates the shifting orthodoxies of school improvement; known in the pre-1997 era as the *Teacher Training Agency*, it first became in 2005 as the *Training and Development Agency for Schools*, and then in 2012, the *National College for Teaching and Leadership*, reinforcing the view that leadership is central to securing school and system level improvement.

Distributive leadership has always, however, been characterised by contradiction, and its distributive features do not necessarily equate with democratically distributed *power*. David Hargreaves argued at the outset that learning communities depend for their effectiveness on leaders' ability to 'set the agenda' and provide a framework for trying out innovative ideas, and moreover, that leaders should be able to 'get rid of' staff whose dissent that presented a challenge to the 'right to manage' (Hargreaves 1999, p60).

This view clearly reveals the paradox of where power lies in the performative school and has led to criticism that the notion of the school as a learning community is a misleading one, and that the 'modernisation' of school leadership has been merely an exercise in ensuring compliance (Thrupp and Willmott 2003). Courtney and Gunter (2015) argue that the form of 'transformational leadership' promoted in neoliberal school systems are characterised by authoritarian, and even totalitarian, exercising of power, to the extent of 'purging' the workforce of those teachers whose dissent restricts their 'right to manage' (Courtney and Gunter 2015, 17).

This 'transformational' school leadership has been persistently portrayed as being inspirational yet distributive, and as ideal of the 'self-improving school' in which collaborative collegiality underpins a vibrant professional learning community (Hargreaves 2011). However, critics argue that distributive leadership actually simply enables the spread of a 'discourse of power' (Ball 2000) dominated by leadership practices rationalised through a culture of 'risk minimisation' (McWilliam and Perry 2006). Distributive leadership, therefore, rather than foster values-drive professionalism, legitimizes self-surveillance and a colonization of professional life and values in what Ball calls 'a new subjectivity' (Ball 2000, 4). This colonization allows central government to present a mirage of increased professional autonomy, with ministers regularly claiming the "greater freedom for schools", whilst creating a self-policing profession within an all-encompassing regulatory framework (Mahony and Hextall 2001; Hatcher 2005). In the performative system, this policing, mindful of the panoptic gaze of government, creates a culture of 'coercive instrumentalism' (AUTHOR 2009, 243; Courtney 2014). In this system, the middle leader is a crucial actor, facilitating a 'mobilization of bias' that enhances the legitimacy of particular actions, and so encourages the compliance of all members of the professional community (Busher et al. 2007, 417).

**Spaces for equity in the performative profession**

Opportunities for maintaining and enhancing teachers' professional autonomy certainly exist in the performative school system in England, where professional learning is seen as crucial to increasing system quality, and the notion of the self-improving teacher in control of their own destiny has become embedded in the professional psyche. However, the self-improving teacher is a fundamentally individualistic concept in which teachers are required to commit to 'modernisation' (which in practice means shifting values and practices to align with current policy orthodoxies, as determined by the government of the day). Because the government ministers are in a position to determine, at a micro-level, the criteria by which teacher competence is assessed, becoming a 'successful' teacher is largely determined by the willingness and capacity to perform at an increasingly high level (as assessed either by internal managers or an external inspectorate) against nationally-prescribed standards of 'functional competency'. As already noted, the teacher standards model adopted in England is a largely instrumental one focusing on narrowly-defined teacher behaviours (Evans 2012). Given the well-established links between teacher performance and self-efficacy (Bandura 1982; Day et al. 2005; Troman et al. 2007), therefore, it is clear that performative regulatory instruments may have a profound, and constraining, impact on teachers' sense of values-led professionalism. This is even more apparent given the phenomenon by which the neoliberal school governance enables leaders to use performance pretexts to remodel their workforce by 'getting the wrong people off the bus' (Courtney and Gunter 2015, 3). In this conception of the performative school, compliance is not only embedded into the fabric of the institution, it is continually 're-normalised' as policy goalposts shift (Courtney 2014: 10).

The individualising effect of neoliberal policy solutions can also be detected in the ways in which social equity issues have been conceptualised in the reform agenda in England, as pursued by both the New Labour and Coalition UK governments since 1997. Whilst the notion of 'inclusion' has been central to a wide range of reforms, this is largely framed through a discourse of individualism, about how best 'at risk' individuals can be enabled to succeed against the odds and so close the attainment gap (Alexiadou 2002). Pupils from 'disadvantaged' communities (generally a synonym for working class, poor and/or black) are conceptualised as being at risk of failure, a notion that suggests blame can be apportioned for any lack of success in schooling. In the neoliberal political sphere, this blame is sometimes directed at the individual for making poor choices, sometimes to their families and communities for failing to instil positive attitudes to learning and frequently to teachers and schools for having low expectations and providing insufficient challenge.

The notion of 'risk of failure' is a key one in the neoliberal education system; both individuals and schools are judged by the degree to which they are at risk of failure to meet performative thresholds (Stromquist 2002; Singh and Taylor 2007). The successful 'performing school', therefore, is one which is best able to 'close the achievement gap'. Whilst this is apparently a socially progressive agenda, one which aims to allow at-risk pupils to succeed, its underlying purpose is to create competitors in the knowledge economy. This interpretation of social inclusion is a fundamentally individualistic one, in which under-achievement is a 'market failure' reflecting "…a Hayekian ideal of social justice" (Alexiadou 2002, 76) in which education is merely the vehicle for individuals to 'compete and succeed'. The contradictions of this aspiration are well-documented; the education market is actually highly stratified (Ozga 1999), and differential access (mediated by inequality of educational outcome) is a necessary condition of the global neoliberal labour market rather than an unfortunate by-product (Brown 2000).

The neoliberal project, as applied to the education system in England, does appear to be a highly contradictory one. Although Hargreaves, Sachs and many others have highlighted the potential for embedding socially progressive ideals through collaborative professionalism, it is clear that these opportunities are greatest where there is scope for innovation and risk-taking. In the English school, however, autonomous professional space has to be either 'earned' through performative success or granted through ideological positioning. 'Earned autonomy' comes to schools whose level of performance satisfies the inspectorate, and so are subject to inspections that are not only to less frequent, but less intrusive (Waldegrave and Simons 2014). Individual teachers in the performative school can also earn the right to operate in 'micro-autonomous spaces' within their classroom; they earn this, of course, by meeting appropriate benchmarks, both in respect of managers' assessment of their teaching performance, and the attainment outcomes of their pupils (AUTHOR 2011).

In addition to this earned autonomy, autonomy is bestowed on schools whose governance models are ideologically in tune with the government of the day. Independent fee-paying schools have long been free from many of the constraints imposed on state schools, whilst over the past ten years many of these constraints have been lifted from publically-funded schools. Academisation brings freedom from local democratic control and from some aspects of legislation regarding workforce arrangements and the curriculum (Woods et al. 2007) whilst the Coalition government's free school initiative represents the most overt signal yet of

the desire to privatise state education (Hatcher 2011). Free schools are at liberty to determine their own curriculum and staffing arrangements (to the extent of being free of the need to employ any qualified teachers apart from a Special Needs Coordinator), and were explicitly set up to provide a competitive market for school places. Successive governments have claimed that the market-driven diversity of academies and free schools, and the 'freeing up of professionals' inherent in this, addresses the fundamental challenge for the school system in England, that of raising attainment overall whilst reducing inequality (Hatcher 2011, 500); put simply, this presents a progressive appearance of neoliberal reforms as being ones in which *quality* and *equity* are equally important and not incompatible. This would appear to have some resonance with those, such as Hargreaves and Sachs, who have long argued that autonomous professionals working in collaborative 'learning communities' provide fertile ground for values-led practices in which social equity issues are as important as academic development. Many would argue that the ideological underpinning of the 'semi-privatised' state school (be they academies/free schools in England or Charter Schools in the USA) is one of entrepreneurialism and managerialism, and that this will determine the prevailing ethos of the school. However, it also the case that they are also sites of democratic *potential*. This will, of course, be dependent on the extent to which leaders are willing and able to foster the high levels of professional trust necessary for teachers to learn and innovate together, but where these conditions do occur, it is plausible to argue that the relative freedom from the conservative 'blame culture' of the highly performative school (Avis 2005) could create the conditions for teachers to pursue a genuinely progressive social equity agenda.

Critics of the neoliberal diversification of school governance models, however, argue that the liberation of academies from the constraints in force over 'traditional' community schools has failed to deliver significant improvements in attainment (Machin and Wilson 2009; Wrigley 2011; Allen 2013), let alone any closing of the achievement gap. Meanwhile, the evidence from the USA on Charter Schools suggests that whilst there is ambiguity about the impact on overall attainment (Dillon 2005; NCEE 2010), in some studies have been shown to have a disproportionately adverse impact on outcomes for minorities (Bifulco and Ladd 2007). Ultimately this is likely to remain a contested issue for some time; the rapid expansion of academies and the demographic variability between schools makes it difficult to produce clear evidence either way. Similarly, whilst ministers insist marketising school choice enhances social mobility, critics argue that it increases social inequality because middle-class

parents will always be better placed to 'game the system' and ensure their children 'win' places at the most successful, and desirable schools (Hatcher 2011).

**Conclusions**

As yet, despite the huge amount of research into teacher identity over recent decades, much of which has been exercised by the question of how this is re-shaped and re-formed in performative systems, the particular impact on teacher identity of working under archetypal neoliberal governance models in academies and free schools remains a mystery. By virtue of the liberalised, diversified system constructed in England over the past two decades, researching this topic and trying to identify the distinctive features of teachers' work in such a complex and volatile landscape would present obvious challenges. However, whilst free schools are still at a small 'experimental' scale, academies are now a 'mainstream' governance model; introduced in England in 2002, expansion accelerated from 203 in 2010 to over 3,000 (15% of all schools) in 2014 (DfE 2014). Although it is right to be concerned about the growth of academies and free schools in respect of the impact on social equity, the question of how teacher identity in these 'quasi-privatised' state schools might be evolving deserves much greater attention. It may be that the individualised model of 'colonised' professional learning (Ball 2000), with its overriding culture of coercive instrumentalism (AUTHOR 2009) will continue to encourage compliance with external models of innovative practice, and exacerbate the sidelining of equity issues.

It may be, however, that these schools provide a greater degree of autonomy for teachers, whether it is solely 'granted' through ideological partiality or 'earned' through success in meeting performative targets, and that this could provide space for diversity and values-driven professional practice. Although cross-national comparisons are fraught with danger, there are some indications from the US that the Charter School movement, whilst frequently subjected to intense criticism for de-professionalising teachers, narrowing the curriculum and increasing the attainment gap (Lipman and Hursh 2007, 167), there is some evidence that this is not inevitable, and as the movement has matured there are examples of more 'progressive' practices emerging (Carpenter 2008, Blitz 2011). Lipman describes how the first wave of Charter Schools of Chicago, although predominately 'corporate' in organisation and ethos, included schools where the relative pedagogic freedom Charter status entails opened spaces for progressive agency, and attracted 'social justice oriented' teachers to work in them (Lipman 2008, 76-77).

What is clear is that further research is needed to see whether this can create the conditions not just for *transformational leadership*, but *for transformational teaching and learning*. At present we have little evidence to call upon, and those studies that have investigated the cultures developing in the early (2002-2010 era) 'sponsored' academies suggest that they do create an enhanced entrepreneurial domain (Woods et al. 2007, 353). However, although the authors of this study argued that this created the *potential* for cultural progressivism, in practice the school cultures they found were predominately constructed as sites of enhanced private entrepreneurialism, and so private influence (ibid., 254). If the evidence is inconclusive for these 'first wave' academies, then this is even truer of the post-2010 'converter academies'.

It is clear that the neoliberal governance model for state schools in England, whether in traditional 'community schools', academies or free schools, is not conducive to the values-driven professionalism envisaged by Sachs (2003); however, even where this teacher-initiated culture does exist, it will only lead to a meaningful engagement with social equity issues where these are central to the teachers' values. *Genuine* collaborative leadership is essential for productive pedagogies (Lingard and Mills 2007) that connect schools' curricula and practices to the pursuit of a social justice agenda, but it is not enough on its own. We need teachers committed to this agenda, and whilst teachers entering the profession still overwhelmingly do so for 'altruistic' reasons (AUTHOR 2011), altruism does not necessarily lead to activism. Evidence of the past decade suggests that teacher values are mostly supressed in the face of the coercive compliance imposed by performative managerialism.

The potential consequences of recent education reforms in England, therefore, are in almost every respect discouraging for social justice advocates. Paradoxically, however, as the performative grip tightens across the 'traditional' community school sector, it may be that the most promising arena for teachers to 'pursue a moral purpose' and a social justice agenda could be within the ultimate symbol of the neoliberal reform project; the privatised state school.

**References**

Alexiadou, N. 2002. Social inclusion and social exclusion in England: tensions in education policy, *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(1): 71-86

Allen, R. 2013. Measuring foundation school effectiveness using English administrative data, survey data and a regression discontinuity design, *Education Economics*, 21(5): 431-446

Ammermüller, A. & Lauer, C. 2009. School quality and educational outcomes in Europe, in: Baars, S., Bernardes,E., Elwick, A., Malortie, A., McAleavy, T., McInerney, L., Menzies, L & Riggall, A. 2014. *Lessons from London Schools: Investigating the Success*, London: CfBT. Dolton, P., R. Asplund, & E. Barth (Eds) *Education and inequality across Europe*. London: Elgar.

Apple, M.W. 2005. Education, markets, and an audit culture, *Critical Quarterly,* 47(1/2), 11-29.

Avis, J. 2005. Beyond performativity: reflections on activist professionalism and the labour process in further education, *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(2), 2029-222

Ball, D.L., & Forzani, F.M. 2009 The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497-511

Ball, S. 2000. Performativities and Fabrications in the Education Economy: Towards the Performative Society*, Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 1-23.

Ball, S.J. 2003. The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity, *Journal of Education Policy,* 18(2), 215-228.

Ball, S.J. 2009. Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: network governance and the 'competition state', *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(1), 83-99

Bandura, A. 1982. Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, (37), 122–147.

Barber, M. & Mourshed, M. 2007. *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top*, McKinsey and Company.

Barton, L., Barrett, E., Whitty, G., Miles, S. & Furlong, J. 1994. Teacher Education and Teacher Professionalism in England: Some Emerging Issues, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15(4), 529-543.

Beauchamp, C. & Thomas, L. 2009. Understanding teacher identity: an overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education, *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 39(2), 175–189.

Bifulco, R. & Ladd, H. 2007. School choice, racial segregation, and test-score gaps: Evidence from North Carolina's charter school program*, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26: 31–56.

Blair, T. 1996. *Speech to Labour Party Conference*, Brighton, September 1996

Blair, T. 1999. Beveridge revisited: a welfare state for the 21st century in R. Walker (eds), *Ending Child Poverty: Popular Welfare for the 21st Century*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Blitz, M. 2011. Market-based and Authorizer-based Accountability Demands and the Implications for Charter School Leadership, *Journal of School Choice: International Research and Reform,* 5(4): 357-396.

Brown, P. 2000. The globalisation of positional competition? *Sociology*, 34(4), 633-653

Browne, L. & Reid, J. 2012 Changing localities for teacher training: the potential impact on professional formation and the university sector response, *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, 38(4), 497-508.

Busher, H., Hammersley-Fletcher, L. & Turner, C. 2007. Making sense of middle leadership: community, practice and power, *School Leadership and Management*, 27(5): 405-422

Carpenter, D. 2008. The Coincidence of Reform: Charter School Diversity in a Standards-Based World, *Journal of School Choice: International Research and Reform*, 2(2); 93-114.

Carpenter, H., Papps, I., Bragg, J., Dyson, A., Harris, D., Kerr, K., Todd, L. & Laing, K. 2013.
*Evaluation of Pupil Premium Research Report*. London: DfE

Cherubini, L. 2009. Reconciling the tensions of new teachers' socialisation into school culture: a review of the research, *Issues in Educational Research*, 19(2), 83-99.

Clarke, K. 2006. Childhood, parenting and early intervention: A critical examination of the Sure Start national programme *Critical Social Policy*, 26(4): 699-721

Coles, M.J. and Southworth, G., 2005. *Developing leadership: creating the schools of tomorrow,* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Costigan, A. 2005. Choosing to stay, choosing to leave: NYC teaching fellows after two years, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 125-142.

Courtney, S. 2014. Post-panopticism and school inspection in England, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, published online 24/10/2014.

Dale, R., & Robertson, S. 2009. *Globalisation and Europeanisation in education*, London: Symposium.

Darling-Hammond, L; D.Holtzman, S.Gatlin; J.Vasquez. 2005. Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about Teacher Certification, Teach for America, and Teacher Effectiveness, *Education Policy Analysis Archives,* 13, 1-48.

Darling-Hammond, L. 2009. *Educational Opportunity and Alternative Certification: New Evidence and New Questions*, Stanford: SCOPE.

Day, C, B.Eliott, & A.Kington. 2005. Reforms, standards and teacher identity: challenges of sustaining commitment, *Teachers and Teacher Education,* 21(5), 563-577.

Day, C., P.Sammons, G.Stobart, A.Kington, & Q.Gu. 2007. *Teachers Matter: Connecting Lives, Work and Effectiveness*, Maidenhead: OUP.

Day, C. & Gu, Q. 2010. *The New Lives of Teachers*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Department for Education and Employment. 1998. *Teachers: Meeting the challenge of change (green paper)*, London: DfEE.

DfE. 2010. *The importance of teaching: the schools white paper*

DfE. 2011. *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers*

Dillon, S. 2005 Education law gets first test in U.S. schools, *New York Times*, downloaded at www.nytimes.com/2005/10/20/national/20exam.html

Ertl, H. 2006. European Union policies in education and training: the Lisbon agenda as a turning point? *Comparative Education*, 42(1), 5-27.

Evans, L. 2011. The 'shape' of teacher professionalism in England: professional standards, performance management, professional development and the changes proposed in the 2010 White Paper, *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5): 851-870

Francis, B., Hutchings, M. & De Vries, R. 2014. *Chain Effects: The impact of academy chains on low income students*, Sutton Trust, downloaded at http://www.suttontrust.com/researcharchive/chain-effects/

Flores, M. & Day, C. 2006. Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study, *Teachers and Teacher Education*, 22(2), 219-232.

Freedman, S., B. Lipson, D. Hargreaves. 2008. *More Good Teachers.* London: Policy Exchange.

Fuller, B., Wright, J., Gesicki, K. & Kang, E. 2007. Gauging Growth: How to Judge No Child Left Behind? *Educational Researcher*, 36(5):268-278.

Furlong, J. 2005. New Labour and teacher education: the end of an era, *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(1), 119–134.

Furlong, J. 2013 Globalisation, Neoliberalism and the Reform of Teacher Education in England, *The Educational Forum*, 77, 28-50.

Galton, M. & MacBeath, J. 2008. *Teachers Under Pressure* London: Sage.

Giddens, A. 2000. *The third way and its critics,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gove, M. 2013. Social Market Foundation Speech

Grek, S. & Ozga, J. 2010. Governing Education through data: Scotland, England and the European education policy space, *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(6), 937-952

Gronn, P. 2003. *The new work of educational leaders*, London: Paul Chapman

Gunter, H. & Forrester, G. 2008. New Labour and School Leadership, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56(2): 144-162

Hargreaves, A. 2000. Four ages of professionalism and professional learning, *Teachers and Teaching: history and practice,* 6(2), 151-182.

Hargreaves, A. 2011. *Leading a self-improving school system*, Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Hatcher, R. 2005. The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 26(2), 253–67.

Hatcher. R. 2011. The Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition government's "free schools" in England, *Educational Review*, 63:4, 485-503

Hills, J. & Stewart, K. 2005. A more equal society? New Labour, poverty, inequality and exclusion. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Hord, S.M. 1997. *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*, Austin,SEDL

Hursh, D. & Lipman, P. 2007. Renaissance 2010: the reassertion of ruling-class power through neoliberal policies in Chicago, *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2): 160-178.

Kane, T.J, J. Rockoff & D. Staiger. 2008. What Does Certification Tell Us About Teacher Effectiveness? *Economics of Education Review*, 27(6), 615-631.

Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. 2009. *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kyriacou, C., R. Kunc., P. Stephens, & A. Hultgren. 2003. Student teachers' expectations of teaching as a career, *Educational Review*, 55(3), 255-263.

Lasky, S. 2005. A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 899-916.

Lingard, B. & Mills, M. 2007. Pedagogies making a difference: issues of social justice and inclusion, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(3), 233-244.

Lipman, P. 2008. 'Paradoxes of teaching in neo-liberal times' in Gerwitz, S., Mahony, P., Hextall, I & Cribb, A. (Eds) *Changing Teacher Professionalism: International trends, challenges and ways forward*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Little, J. 2010. The Teacher Workforce and Educational Equity, *Review of Research in Education*, 34(1), 285-328.

Lortie, R. 1975. *Schoolteacher.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lynch, K. 2006. Neo-liberalism and Marketisation: the implications for higher education, *European Educational Research Journal*, 5 (1) 1-17.

MacBeath, D. 2011. Education of teachers: the English experience, *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, 37(4), 377-386

Maclure, M. 1993. Arguing for yourself: Identity as an organising principle in teachers' jobs and lives, *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(4), 311–322.

Machin, S. & Wilson, J. 2009. Academies and pupil performance, *CentrePiece*, 14(1), 6-8.

Machin, S. & Vernoit, J. 2012. *Changing School Autonomy: Academy Schools and Their Introduction to England's Education*, London School of Economics: Centre for Economic Performance.

Manuel J., & Hughes, J. 2006. 'It has always been my dream': exploring pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing to teach, *Teacher Development*, 10(1), 5-24.

McConney, A., Price, A., & Woods-McConney, A. 2012. *Fast track teacher education: A review of the research literature on Teach For All schemes*. Perth: Murdoch University, Centre for Learning, Change and Development

McWilliam, E. & Perry, L-A. 2006. On being more accountable: The push and pull of risk in school leadership, *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 9(2), 97-109

Muijs, D, C.Chapman, A.Collins, & P.Armstrong. 2010. *Maximum Impact Evaluation: The impact of Teach First teachers in schools* Manchester: University of Manchester.

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

OECD. 2005. *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. 2011. *Building a High-Quality Teaching Profession: Lessons from around the World* Paris: OECD.

Ozga, J. 1995. Deskilling a profession: professionalism, de-professionalisation and the new managerialism, in: Busher, H. & Saran, R. (Eds) *Managing teachers as professionals in schools*. London: Kogan Page.

Pillen, M. D. Beijaard. & P. Brok, P. 2013. Professional identity tensions of beginning teachers, *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 19(6), 660-678.

Rasmussen, P., Lynch, K., Brine, J., Boyadjieva, P., Peters, M. & Sünker, H. 2009. Education, Equality and the European Social Model, in R. Dale & S. Robertson (Eds) *Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. 2010. *Globalizing Education Policy,* London & New York: Routledge.

Robertson, S. 2000. *A class act: changing teachers' work, the state and globalization.* London: Falmer.

Sachs, J. 2003. *The Activist Professional*. Buckingham: OUP.

Singh, P. & Taylor, S. 2007. A new equity deal for schools: a case study of policy-making in Queensland, Australia, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(3), 301-315.

Smart, S., Hutchings, M., Maylor, U., Mendick, H. & Menter, I. 2009. Processes of middle-class reproduction in a graduate employment scheme, *Journal of Education and Work*, 22:1, 35-53

Stoll, L, & Louis, K. 2007. *Professional Learning Communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas*. Maidenhead:OUP.

Taylor, C. 2013. "Towards a School-led Education System."
www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/speeches/a00220299/charlie-taylor-keynote-speech

Torres, C. 2011. Public universities and the neoliberal common sense: seven iconoclastic theses, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 21(3), 177-197

Troman, G, B.Jeffrey & A.Raggi. 2007. Creativity and Performativity Policies in Primary School Cultures, *Journal of Education Policy,* 22(5), 549- 572.

UNESCO. 2011. *Global Education Digest.* Quebec: UNESCO.

Waldegrave, H. & Simons, J. 2014. *Watching the Watchmen: The future of school inspections in England,* London: Policy Exchange.

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

Wilkins, C. 2005. Teaching for equality and diversity: putting values into practice, in Osler, A. (Ed). *Teachers, human rights and diversity*, Stoke-on-Trent, Trentham.

Wilkins, C. 2011. Professionalism and the post-performative teacher: new teachers reflect on autonomy and accountability in the English school system, *Professional Development in Education*, 37(3), 389-409

Wilkins, C. 2014. Inspecting the Inspectors: race equality and quality in initial teacher education, *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 17(3), 445-470.

Wilkins, C., Busher, H., Kakos, M., Mohamed, C. & Smith, J. 2012. Crossing borders: new teachers co-constructing professional identity in performative times, *Professional Development in Education*, 38(1)*,* 65-78.

Wilkins, C. & Wood, P. 2009. ITE in the Panopticon, *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, 35(3), 283-297

Woods, P., Woods, G. & Gunter, H. 2007. Academy schools and entrepreneurialism in education, *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(2), 237-259.

Wrigley, T. 2011. 'Rapidly improving results: Penetrating the hype of policy-based evidence', In. Gunter, H. (Ed). *The state and education policy: The academies programme*, London: Continuum.

Xu, Z., Hannaway, J. & Taylor, C. 2011. Making a difference? The effects of Teach For America in high school, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(3), 447-469