ABSTRACT
Teacher professionalism and development are central to the study of education across the globe, and in particular, are central to concepts of educational reform and change. This article explores the centrality of teacher professionalism and development to the three substantive networks of the Applied Educational Research Scheme (AERS) in Scotland, examining how they feature within discussions about: school management and governance; schools and social capital; and teachers as learners. The article explores each of these contexts in turn concluding with consideration of how the work of the three AERS networks might help to understand and inform an agenda for change.

REFORMING TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM AND DEVELOPMENT IN SCOTLAND
It is apparent that across the world the major upheavals in the management and delivery of public services have had an enormous impact on teachers and their work. ‘Restructuring’ of teaching is a familiar theme in North America, Australasia, and Europe as well as in many parts of the ‘developing world’ (Ball, 2006; Mahony and Hextall, 2000). Ball (2006) argues that within programmes of reform:

there are embedded and required new identities, new forms of interaction and new values. What it means to teach and what it means to be a teacher (a researcher, an academic) are subtly but decisively changed in the process of reform. (p.145)

Continuing professional development (CPD) is central to this process of change and the reformation of teacher identity, both of the individual and as a professional group. Yet the context in which teachers form and reform their professional identity is increasingly complex, governed by, for example, tensions between co-existing features of both modernity and postmodernity, where the desire to change, to look forward, to step into the unknown can be at odds with the monolithic culture of the school and its existing organisation and structure:

…it is in the struggle between and within modernity and postmodernity that the challenge of change for teachers and their leaders is to be found. It is through these conflicts that the realization of educational restructuring as an opportunity for positive change or a mechanism of retraction and restraint will be realized. It is here that the battle for teacher professionalism, as the exercise of wise discretionary judgement in situations that teachers understand best, will be won or lost. Hargreaves (1994:4).

In this article we explore the ‘battle for teacher professionalism’ in the changing context of teaching in Scotland. In subsequent sections of the paper, we look at the light being cast on teacher professionalism and development by each of the three networks in turn. The conclusion offers an assessment of the significance of these insights and sets out a continuing research agenda, focusing on the notion of teacher professionalism and development as a conduit for proactive change, as opposed to merely a tool for implementing externally-imposed change. In the remainder of this section we consider the background to these enquiries, in particular considering the
extent to which the policy context for teacher professionalism and development in Scotland is a distinctive one.

In the run up to the (re)establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, there were many expressions of hope surrounding the potential changes which might transpire under this new level of governance: the existing education system having been viewed as being ‘insufficiently radical’ (Allan, 2003:291). The new Scottish Parliament was therefore charged with the task of advancing a distinctively Scottish education tradition which promotes and values egalitarianism (McCrone, 2003), espousing values of social justice and state welfare to be central.

Paterson, et al. (2001) note that education had figured as one of the highest priorities with voters in the 1999 Scottish parliamentary elections. They suggest that the prominence given to education within the political debate at that time should not be surprising, as historically, education has been a central focus for nationalist movements elsewhere, and is tied up with the notion of Scottish culture and identity, where education is viewed ‘as a publicly-funded resource for the community, commanding public respect and including incomers into the community’ (ibid.: 159). Indeed, the influence of this historical view is reported by Menter, et al. (2004) in a contemporary comparative study of two particular aspects of CPD policy development in England and Scotland, where they conclude that ‘the differences in the policies reflect both the different cultural positioning of education – including fundamentally different educational ideologies – and more particularly different forms of governance’ (p.211).

So how have teachers figured in this distinctive policy and cultural context? Among the factors that have distinguished the Scottish teaching profession, at least from other parts of the UK, have been the predominance of a single teachers’ union, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), and the longevity and influence of the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS), established by an Act of Parliament in 1965. Teaching has been a wholly graduate profession in Scotland since the early 1980s, and by the end of 2001 all of the former colleges of education had amalgamated with universities.

Whilst this move to university-based initial teacher education (ITE) provision was taking place in Scotland during the 1990s there was growing discontent among teachers over their pay and conditions. Threat of industrial action in the late 1990s led to the establishment of a Committee of Inquiry under Professor Gavin McCrone. This contrasted very strongly with the response to similar unrest south of the border, where the government sought to impose a pay settlement, and then under a Labour government, to move towards a very different approach to the ‘modernisation’ of teaching (see Menter, et al., 2004, for further discussion). Bennett, et al. (2002) also make this home-nation comparison in their review of the impact of devolution on local government services, claiming that ‘the local authority role [in education] was not challenged nor has it been weakened, as has happened elsewhere in the UK’ (2002:35). So there exists in Scottish education a complex web of governance involving a parliament devolved from the UK, strong local governance and a significant level of professional governance.

Despite the existence and strength of these three different levels of governance, there was general support for the McCrone Committee Report (SEED, 2000) and subsequent Agreement (SEED, 2001), which contained a set of proposals that would not only give teachers a very significant pay rise (23%) to be phased in over three years, but also led to one of the best resourced teacher-induction schemes anywhere in the world. It also led to the creation of the Chartered Teacher programme as a means to support classroom teachers who wished to continue to develop their professional practice and be rewarded for it, rather than being effectively forced into a management role if they sought promotion. In addition, all teachers became contractually obliged to undertake 35 hours of CPD per year, to engage
in a structured professional review and development process, and to maintain a professional portfolio.

Most of the policies included in the McCrone Agreement are now fully or almost fully implemented. This makes it a very interesting time to be researching teachers in Scotland and to be exploring their professional identity and how it may have changed. It is no surprise, therefore, that all three AERS networks are looking at various aspects of these issues. However, other relevant contemporary studies have been undertaken recently that should also be taken into consideration. A report by Audit Scotland (2006) acknowledged some of the benefits of the McCrone Agreement, but raised questions about how the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) could possibly know whether the policies had been effective, given that very few measurable targets had been associated with the implementation plan. The Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT), set up under the McCrone Agreement, commissioned a study focusing on teachers’ working time in the post-McCrone era (Menter, et al., 2006) which concluded that while the Agreement had brought about some important changes, most teachers were still working significantly more than the 35 hour week agreed. In early 2007 Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) published a report on the progress made in implementing the McCrone Agreement, acknowledging the existence of ‘a more constructive atmosphere of partnership between teachers, their employers and the Scottish Executive’ (HMIE, 2007:30), highlighting some areas where further work is required, and concluding that in terms of the identification of any impact on children’s learning, evidence is currently ‘very limited’.

Despite the emergence of evidence of progress in specific aspects of the implementation of the McCrone Agreement, it must be acknowledged that each of the above-mentioned reports has been carried out, or commissioned by, particular stakeholders seeking answers to specific questions, demonstrating the current popularity of the ‘evidence-based policy development’ approach. There is a need, therefore, to consider issues of bias, validity, audience and dissemination in such research, which generally focuses on evaluation of current initiatives rather than more fundamental critique of the system at large. In this respect, the relationship between policy-makers and researchers is critical. Trowler (2003) argues that such links are poor, claiming that not only do researchers often speak an inaccessible language, but that they also fail to take responsibility for disseminating their results to policy-makers. These observations should be set against the quest for ‘evidence-based policy development’ which is apparent in contemporary educational discourse in Scotland and beyond. However, much of the ‘evidence’ demanded by policy-makers is either ‘factual’ or is restricted to pre-defined ‘problems’. Both of these evidence requirements fall quite clearly within Trowler’s (2003) definition of the engineering model of research, leaving little requirement on the behalf of policy-makers for the kind of research which would be produced by an enlightenment model, which eschews the notion of ‘truth’ and challenges the origins of pre-defined educational ‘problems’. The unique place of AERS allows space in which a more enlightened approach to research might usefully be adopted in contrast to the more common engineering model where funding for policy research is usually controlled, distributed and clearly defined by government and other policy-makers; a situation which places academics in a difficult partnership where ‘ownership is negotiated’ with funders and independence is therefore potentially compromised (Nisbet, cited in Humes and Bryce, 2001:331).

This paper therefore seeks to explore the potential contribution to debate on teacher professionalism and development afforded by AERS, where each of the three networks brings a particular angle to the study of post-McCrone teachers which is not likely to emerge as a strong feature of any of the above-mentioned studies. The School Management and Governance (SMG) Network is focusing on the relationship
between school management and teacher collegiality, the Learners, Learning and Teaching (LLT) Network is looking at professional development and professional learning, and the Schools and Social Capital (SSC) Network has been exploring the extent to which social capital among teachers is a feature — or not — and its potential for enhancing inter-professional practice. The way(s) in which teacher professionalism and development features in each of these networks is explored in the following sections.

THE SMG NETWORK

The SMG Network consists of three problem-led projects, namely: How do Schools Measure their own Performance?; Citizenship and Democracy; and School Management after McCrone. These projects aim to develop theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of school management and governance. The strands are parallel and complementary rather than sequential and it is the third of these, School Management after McCrone, which draws most directly on concepts of teacher professionalism and development.

The School Management after McCrone project seeks to explore how the McCrone Agreement has affected school management practices, considering issues of both structural and cultural change. The approach of the project group is two-fold. First, it is undertaking a review of policy development in this area through documentary analysis of texts issued by key stakeholders at national and local level (for example, HMIE, GTCS, EIS, SEED, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) etc), corroborated by follow-up interviews with key players. Simultaneously, case-studies are being undertaken within various local authorities to explore the ways in which management practices have evolved since the implementation of the McCrone Agreement. These involve semi-structured qualitative interviews with teachers, teaching assistants, school managers and local authority officials. These studies are on-going and it is not the remit of this article to relate, nor to predict, the outcomes of these enquiries but rather to explore the inter-relationship of the group’s focus on school management with notions of teacher professionalism.

Inevitably, School Management after McCrone is a study, not only of the effects of the Agreement, but of the broader landscape of school management in the context of post-devolution Scotland, a context of changing structures and competing discourses. (Indeed, at time of writing, there is talk of the group being renamed to reflect the fact that the social world under investigation is that of school management post-devolution, rather than simply post-McCrone.) The study takes place in the context of what is arguably a re-definition of teacher professionalism, where notions of managerialism, efficiency and accountability are struggling for dominance against notions of democracy, collegiality and political agency (see Sachs, 2003). The McCrone Agreement brought with it a restructuring of school hierarchies, therefore creating ‘space’ for potential new, and context-appropriate understandings of teacher identity, and for new configurations of professional relationships. But the McCrone Agreement is potentially a vehicle not only for structural change, but also for the negotiation of cultural change; changes to the ways in which teachers construct their professional identity and are constructed by others. Indeed, the text of the McCrone Agreement is heavy with the rhetoric of professional restoration for teachers, particularly through its recommendation of collegiate working practices. The structural changes, therefore, open up new possibilities for the re-positioning of classroom teaching itself, and thus for a reformation of teacher culture and a re-imagining of teacher professionalism.

However, alongside the positive rhetoric of the McCrone Agreement comes a host of other developments and influences which also impact both on school management and on teacher professionalism. These include: the implementation of the standards-based framework of CPD; a renewed emphasis on management and ‘leadership’ in
schools, and on CPD; and a greater reliance on CPD as a means of ‘ensuring’ teacher professionalism. A deeper engagement with issues of democracy, social justice and inclusion on the part of policy makers in Scotland may also affect the educational climate, emphasising the need for researchers, policy makers and practitioners to understand the modernisation of the teaching workforce as ‘a political rather than a technical process’ (Ozga, 2005:217), in which the concept of professionalism is principally an ideology linked to matters of control (Smyth, et al., 2000). It seems, then, that professionalism can be understood as both an opportunity for teachers to exercise autonomy in a climate of trust, and as a political tool used to control teachers and the education system in an attempt to promote particular agendas.

In exploring these tensions the group is seeking to identify dominant discourses evident in policy documents, giving consideration to the circumstances of their production and to whose interests they might serve. In particular, the language of professionalism is being examined: are discourses surrounding professionalism those of autonomy and teacher-agency, as encompassed by Sachs’ notion of ‘democratic professionalism’; or are they those of control and conformity, as represented in the notion of ‘managerial professionalism’ (Sachs, 2003)? Also worthy of exploration is where the policy documents are positioned in relation to the idea of professional development as an individual or a collaborative endeavour, and the extent to which the position in the policy documents mirrors that presented by interviewees.

Texts are similarly being scrutinised for implicit and explicit references to collegiality and leadership, concepts bound up in the management-professionalism relationship. For example, from initial observations it is clear that at the heart of key policy objectives for Scotland are discourses of engagement, collaboration, participation and collegiality, yet the practical exercise of such aspirations remains subject to issues of power and control. Hargreaves (1994) talks about ‘contrived collegiality’ in which teachers’ collaborative working relationships are: administratively regulated, as opposed to spontaneous; compulsory as opposed to voluntary; implementation-orientated as opposed to development-orientated; fixed in time and place as opposed to flexible; and predictable. Essentially, contrived collegiality is a top-down administratively controlled process whereas genuine collegiality is spontaneous, flexible, and above all, teacher driven.

In case-study interviews, by asking questions about changing work practices, changing roles and changing professional relationships, the group is seeking to discover what constructions are emerging about teacher professionalism ‘on the ground’ in order that ‘policy as text’ can be compared with ‘policy as discourse’ (Ball, 2006:44). In analysing interview transcripts particular attention is being given to evidence relating to the changing processes of decision making, through which conclusions might be drawn about where teacher professionalism in a changing Scottish context might be placed in relation to Sachs’ (2003) notions of democratic and managerial professionalism, and fundamentally, what implications this has for school management and leadership.

THE SSC NETWORK

The work of the SMG Network (discussed above) urges us to consider different forms of professionalism and their relationship to, and with, school management. A particular consideration in this respect is the external influence on education of social policy at a more general level. This is identified by the SSC Network as being manifested through, for example, a focus on social inclusion and new community schools; integrated children’s services; a more explicit community education role for schools; and other professions and agencies working increasingly in partnership with schools (Riddell and Tett, 2001; Tett, et al., 2003).

This growing focus on social inclusion and community-building in education is at the centre of the SSC Network’s focus on social capital, and relates to both the
concept of collegiality central to the work of the SMG Network and the emphasis on collaborative learning in the work of the LLT Network. Within the SSC Network, a literature review group has been working on the theme: ‘Redesigning professionalism and enabling professionals to use, recognise and develop social capital’. The group understands social capital to be a resource that may help in bonding fragmented social life, or as Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) define it:

Social capital is the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition (p.119).

It might also support the bridging of communities to their external environments, and the linking of people to formal structures and agencies. It was deemed important to distinguish between these different forms of social capital, and to appreciate that social capital may open or limit opportunities.

The literature review on ‘redesigning professionalism’ aimed to identify key characteristics of teacher professionalism that might be mobilised to support the recognition and development of social capital or to inhibit such development. A matrix using key words in social capital theory — ‘networks’, ‘norms’, ‘trust’ and ‘forms of reciprocity’ (see Putnam, 1993, 2000) — was used to examine the literature for evidence of how types of social capital operate.

Two key texts on professionalism (Hoyle and John, 1995; Sachs, 2003) were reviewed by all members of the group using the social capital analytic framework described above. The reviews suggested that attention needed to be paid to ways in which teachers and other professional groups understand and operate professional codes and norms. This reading led participants to the sense of a disjuncture between the background of the theory, policy and formal processes of teacher formation, and current changes that relate to how teachers operate in practice. There seemed to be a mismatch between previous criterion-based definitions of professionalism (Hoyle and John) and what should constitute teacher professionalism in the current context of children’s services integration, where potentially productive developments in school-based, inter-professional and inter-agency teamwork are often not experienced as such, but are seen as fragmented initiatives (for example, Sachs).

The current policy context for Scottish teachers, including the development of inter-professional and inter-agency practice, pointed to the need to give serious consideration to social ties and connections. As a result of this preliminary stage, the literature review group found value in pursuing three distinct strands to examine diverse aspects of professionalism, namely: Scottish teachers’ lives and work; inter-professional working relations; and resources and constraints.

The conceptual framework offered by social capital seemed to offer a way of articulating and unifying these three strands of the review. The next stage involved identifying key readings for each of these three strands, and a shared framework of review questions was customised as appropriate to each strand. For example, drawing on the social capital matrix (bonding, bridging and linking, networks, norms and trust) the inter-professionalism sub-group formulated the following questions:

- What are the norms (including ethical bases and codes) that teachers and other practitioners in schools respond to as individuals, professionals and as practitioners who work for different agencies with different professional cultures?
- What connections — bonding, bridging, linking — and networks or partnerships of professional support do individual teachers and other professionals use or need in schools and in the other spaces and places in
which they work, for example, in integrated schools, communities and other children's services workplaces?

- To what extent might these networks and norms initiate and build up social capital in relation to the values and current overarching policy imperatives of social justice and inclusion?
- Are new relations of active mutual trust, respect and reciprocity being forged across schools and communities and children's services?
- What are the effects of new social capital relations for the initial professional formation and on-going professional development of teachers and other professionals in terms of previous and new professional knowledge bases, skills, values, attitudes and practices?

The ‘redesigning professionalism’ literature review suggests that social capital theory allows at least a re-framing of issues relating to teacher professionalism and development, something identified by the SMG Network as an opportunity to be seized within the post-devolution/post-McCrone context. For example, in relation to teachers’ professional knowledge, the review found there were different sorts of knowledge bases, each important in professional formation and working and each with a possibly different link to social capital. The group characterised these as follows:

- Knowledge of own professional knowledge base: this may be related to professional norms of ‘expertise’ and ‘disciplinary knowledge’ that may have been inculcated in separate training (see Hoyle and John, 1995).
- Knowledge about own professional practice and skills: this is often formed in individuals’ initial education in particular disciplinary knowledge bases and discourses – for example, thinking scientifically, thinking linguistically (Hoyle and John, 1995). In interdisciplinary working, there is a risk that one’s own ways are privileged over others’ knowledge bases and ways of thinking about practice.
- Inclusive professional knowledge: this is about knowing what practitioners need to know in order to function in schools and children’s services at this moment. Communities of practice can act as a focus for democratic discourse resulting in co-construction of knowledge (Sachs, 2003).

As outlined above, the ‘redesigning professionalism’ review has identified and analysed new and potentially fruitful ideas relating to the professional formation, knowledge bases and development of teachers and other practitioners working in schools and children’s services; and in terms of the kinds of changes and transformations that are needed in existing educational networks and structures to meet new social challenges and needs.

THE LLT NETWORK

The inter-related processes of teacher change and professional development are central to the work of the ‘Teachers as Learners’ project within the LLT Network. This project and the Network as a whole, draw on social learning theory and the concept of community of enquiry to shed light on these processes. One of the intended outcomes of the study is the development of a model that has the potential to be used to understand in a holistic way the professional development opportunities experienced by teachers.

The implementation of the McCrone Agreement in Scotland provides a unique context for the consideration of existing understandings of the relationship between teacher development and professionalism. The positioning of professional development within a series of progressive professional standards can be seen as
codifying teachers’ rights and responsibilities within a systems-led framework, that
arguably ‘does not serve to build capacity for ongoing change in a dynamic world’
(Alexandrou, et al., 2005:142). As such, it reveals a particular view of the nature
and credibility of the concept of teacher professionalism. The Teachers as Learners
project set out to interrogate the validity of the assumptions that underpin this view.
A review of international literature on teacher development revealed the contested
nature of terminology and concepts surrounding the area of study.

A major issue that emerged from the literature in terms of teachers’ rights and
responsibilities was the link between teacher development and school improvement.
The extent to which teacher learning could, or should be, ‘measured’ by changes
in practice provided a focus for debate within the group. This reflected a theme
dominant in the literature around the rise of ‘managerial professionalism’ (Sachs,
2003) in education. The group supported Wolf’s (2002) challenge to this move, in
which she questions the appropriateness of a business model with its focus on global-
economic competitiveness as a driver of educational policy. What emerged from
this consideration was an interest in the potential for teachers to realise autonomy
within their professional lives.

The project group was interested in investigating alternatives to a functionalist
approach to teacher professionalism which might be more empowering for teachers
and which also addressed the needs of their pupil learners. The current Scottish
context was seen generally as a positive one in which potential exists for increasing
professional autonomy for teachers, both individually and as a professional group.
Highlighting the importance of teacher autonomy within educational systems resulted
in a focus on the nature of teacher learning and its capacity to support educational
change. Teacher learning which enabled change and led to transformative practice
was more prioritised over learning which simply involved knowledge transfer for
teachers (Kennedy, 2005).

Teacher development is commonly described in Scotland as ‘continuing’ and
referred to using the acronym ‘CPD’. This reveals an underlying assumption about
the long-term nature and duration of teacher learning as an ongoing process. It also
locates it within the wider arena of lifelong learning (Coolahan, 2002). As such,
teacher learning can be thought of as comprising personal, social and occupational
‘domains’ which are interrelated (Bell and Gilbert, 1996). Consideration of teachers’
needs in all of these domains of their lives is seen as important for the realisation of
teacher change and the related development of professional autonomy. While learning
in isolation is seen as problematic, communities of practice engaged in a common
enterprise is seen as both empowering (Lave and Wenger, 1991) and knowledge
generating. It seemed to the project group that the tensions that exist between what
it means to be a learner within a particular learning context, and the restrictions
created by what it means to be a learner within a particular school context need to be
resolved (Reeves and Forde, 2004). This echoes Hargreaves’ (1994) concern raised
earlier about the potentially restrictive nature of existing structures and organisation,
and also relates to the SMG Network’s consideration of the relationship between
teacher professionalism and school management.

From the literature review, three different ‘lenses’ were identified through
which teacher learning might be viewed. The group proposes that such a composite
model provides a much more viable model for understanding the complexities of
teacher development and learning than any one single model could. This model is
presented in detail in Fraser, et al. (forthcoming), but in brief, the three lenses can
be described as follows:

Lens 1: A Learning Continuum (Kennedy, 2005)
The first of the lenses saw teacher learning as occurring on a continuum which
ranged from transmissive learning, through ‘transitional’ types of learning,
towards learning that was perceived to be transformative. Transformative learning
was highly valued because it had the potential for the realisation of professional autonomy and collaborative engagement.

Lens 2: Domains of Influence (Bell and Gilbert, 1996)
The second lens was concerned with the domain of influence of the learning for teachers. Each teacher was seen as being influenced by learning in three ipsative domains: the personal, the social and the occupational. Learning that acknowledged needs in one domain without acknowledging teacher needs in other domains was unlikely to result in meaningful professional learning.

Lens 3: Spheres of Action
The third lens allowed for consideration of the sphere of action in which teacher learning may occur. Four quadrants were proposed, grouped around the intersection of two dimensions: formal-informal and planned-incidental. These dimensions represent polarised positions that encompass the range of learning opportunities encountered by teachers. They allow consideration of teacher behaviours, rather than merely emphasising the delivery style of CPD opportunities.

The project group engaged in using these lenses to view teacher learning in three major CPD initiatives that reflected a range of professional experience in the group (see Fraser, et al., forthcoming). Using all three lenses to interrogate these studies seemed to offer a more comprehensive view of the process of teacher learning and development than was possible with previous single-focused frameworks for analysis.

The triple-lens framework has also been deployed in the analysis of key-informant interviews. Early analysis of interview data indicates that the lenses selected offer an illuminating perspective on the current CPD scene in Scotland. This view supports a values-based approach to CPD, which acknowledges that although teacher CPD has been positioned within a codified framework in Scotland, a flexible approach can be taken to the interpretation of that framework. This could ensure that teachers’ rights are addressed as well as allowing them to meet pre-defined professional responsibilities. That flexibility, however, should acknowledge the value of the diversity of less formal learning opportunities that exist in schools and foster their growth. It should also acknowledge the importance of the affective dimensions of teacher learning by valuing more equally the contribution that personal and social domains of teachers’ professional lives make to their learning. Future empirical studies will explore teachers’ views of this model of teacher learning and development, providing opportunities for further testing and refinement of the triple-lens framework, and ultimately a means through which teacher learning and development and teacher change might be better understood.

TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM AND DEVELOPMENT – INFORMING AN AGENDA FOR CHANGE
It is clear from earlier discussion that teacher professionalism and development are inextricably linked to processes of educational reform and change, whether they serve to facilitate or impede change. It is vital, then, that related research takes into account this dual possibility, and indeed the earlier discussion of Trowler’s (2003) distinction between enlightenment and engineering models of research helps to understand how the role of research might contribute to either position. In this final section of the paper, we discuss the implications arising from the work of the three AERS networks, and identify a number of important questions for future consideration.

All three networks have identified teacher professionalism and development as significant to their respective enquiries. The prominence and content of such debates
would seem to provide additional weight to the claim that teacher professionalism can be seen as a site of struggle and of change (Sachs, 2003). The extent to which that change is driven by teacher professionalism, or whether teacher professionalism is driven by wider, contextual change is a moot point, but there is no doubt that teacher professionalism and development is a highly political and contested area, and as such is one worthy of enlightened research.

Indeed, the extent to which teaching should be deemed a ‘political’ endeavour is itself a contentious area of debate. Contemporary conceptions of professionalism tend to contrast a democratic perspective with a managerial perspective (Sachs, 2003). Under a democratic perspective teachers are involved in a collaborative endeavour which has at its core the desire to ensure equitable distribution of resources and opportunities; this involves teachers in active political engagement and transformative practice. It is, however, worth sounding a note of caution in relation to the role of political socialisation. Ginsberg and Lindsay (1995) highlight a growing body of research which takes as its premise the notion that it contributes both to the ‘reproduction and the transformation of the structural and ideological context’ (p.9), thereby suggesting that teacher professionalism and development can indeed be a powerful means of transforming education, but might also serve to reproduce, and perhaps entrench, existing structures and cultures.

The managerial perspective, on the other hand, promotes such things as effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and compliance with policy. This perspective has much more limited potential for teachers to contribute to change to any great extent, and is linked with global influences which privilege economic achievement in nation states (Carlgren, 1999; Smyth, et al., 2000). The work on teacher professionalism and development emanating from the three AERS networks appears to address more explicitly issues relating to the democratic perspective, contrasting with the more managerial focus of evaluative research commissioned by government and other policy makers.

There are, therefore, some important implications for the AERS networks, and the wider education and research community, in relation to future research on teacher professionalism and development in changing times. In exploring and comparing current research in this area, it seems obvious that different agendas favour different research perspectives. It has been useful to take a more detailed look at where AERS research into teacher professionalism and development fits with other existing or planned research, and this raises important questions about how can we identify and ensure a combination of engineering and enlightenment approaches to education research, capable of satisfying a broad range of purposes.

While the collaboration undertaken in the development of this article has helped to articulate some key issues, equally it raises some important questions:

- How can the insights gained into teacher professionalism from the perspectives of the three AERS Networks be used to enhance policy and practice?
- How can AERS and its legacy help to address Trowler’s criticism about communication between policy-makers and researchers?
- In what ways might knowledge exchange regarding teacher professionalism and development be made more effective and wide-ranging, helping to ensure a balance of research priorities are identified and followed through?

While pertinent to this article, the general considerations in these questions will be equally applicable to other AERS projects and to educational researchers and policy-makers more widely. It seems clear that in order to support diverse research approaches, potential synergies across the AERS networks must be capitalised upon. As the empirical work of the three AERS Networks unfolds, there will be exciting opportunities to draw together their respective conceptual, methodological
and evidential insights. For example, in relation to teacher professionalism and development, the analytic tools associated with social capital may facilitate better understanding of both the patterns of school management, which are evolving in Scotland, and the contexts for teachers’ professional learning, which are being created under the new arrangements for CPD. Similarly, the features associated with the concepts of community of practice and community of enquiry might shed light on the extent to which schools and their communities may or may not be capable of adopting inclusive approaches, both towards harnessing social capital and towards developing effective processes of leadership and management which can drive educational change.

It seems fitting to conclude the paper by considering the unique advantages of collaborative research afforded by AERS. The alliance of researchers from across Scotland has opened up previously non-existent opportunities for collaboration, partnership and knowledge exchange. This opportunity to write collaboratively across networks has provided further opportunity for such activities, allowing important, but often overlooked, issues relating to teacher professionalism and development to be discussed, debated and disseminated. It seems, in conclusion, that exploring the capacity for educational change through examining teacher professionalism and development, might usefully be undertaken through a more widespread but similar, collaborative and dynamic model of interaction between researchers, policy makers and practitioners.
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