Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Producing the shadow curriculum: an evaluation of recent changes to initial teacher education in England

Mandy Pierlejewski

Published online: 28 Jan 2025.

Submit your article to this journal ↗

Article views: 582

View related articles ↗

View Crossmark data ↗

Producing the shadow curriculum: an evaluation of recent changes to initial teacher education in England

Mandy Pierlejewski

Carnegie School of Education, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK

ABSTRACT

Recent government accreditation of initial teacher education provision in England has resulted in a deep sense of unrest within the sector. Along with an intensely regulated accreditation process embodied in the Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Market Review, a revised framework, known as the Core Content Framework (CCF) has been introduced. This paper provides an analysis of the CCF, bringing together Foucauldian discourse analysis and a new emerging methodology, doppelganger as method. This approach explores situations of conflict, asking where a double or doppelganger emerges and how it functions as a technology of power. It finds that the conflicting demands of the CCF and the quality benchmarks that regulate university provision produce a dual curriculum. An authorised curriculum is established by the CCF, while a shadow curriculum emerges from the aspects of curriculum which are rendered invisible in the framework. I find that the CCF represents an attack on teacher educator professionalism as it removes the autonomy of the educator to choose their own content, pedagogy and key texts. Resistance to this regulation, however, emerges from more holistic ideologies and can be found hidden within classroom interactions and practices.

Introduction

Being a teacher educator in England over the last few years has been no fun. All providers have had to apply for accreditation against the new initial teacher training (ITT) Quality Criteria as a result of the policy of the Conservative government that was in office until July 2024. This is a part of the global movement of what Cochran-Smith et al. (2018, 108) call the 'era of accountability' where teacher education is seen as a 'policy problem' which must be fixed. In order to fix this 'problem' the then UK government reviewed the ITT market (Department for Education 2021) in England and directed all providers to apply for new accreditation. Alongside this is an obligation to deliver the Initial Teacher Training Core Content Framework (CCF) (Department for Education 2019b). Even within a global culture of intense focus on teacher education, the 'rigid accountability regime' executed in England is something of an outlier (Brooks 2021, 139).

In this paper, I analyse the CCF using a highly original approach called 'doppelganger as method' as a conceptual framework. This approach takes the idea of a 'doppelganger' or 'double' and asks how this double operates as a technology of power. I locate this double in the shadow curriculum: a curriculum composed of the many elements of initial teacher education which are rendered invisible in the CCF and thus moved into the shadows. Although the CCF is referred to as a 'framework' rather than a 'curriculum', I argue that it acts as a curriculum as it determines the content and pedagogy to be taught on all initial teacher education (ITE) courses and meets Shulman's (1986, 10) definition of a curriculum as the 'range of programmes designed for the teaching of particular subjects and topics'. Rather than being, as it claims, a framework around which a curriculum can be designed, I argue that it is a very detailed and prescriptive outline of what should be taught, which leaves little room for further curricular design. A review of current literature relating to the ITT Market Review reveals limited analysis of the CCF (Ellis 2023; Hordern and Brooks 2023, 2024), indicating that this is an under-researched area. I have focused on critiques of the CCF, specifically within university-based ITE, as this is the largest provider of ITE in England. The outcome of this analysis is a conceptualisation of two contrasting curricula. One is the authorised version of the curriculum found in the CCF and the other, a shadow curriculum, which is rendered invisible in the document and therefore becomes inherently subversive through its absence.

Policy context

In a wide range of countries, the university involvement in teacher education is seen as problematic. This arises from, first, a public discourse of university-led ITE promoting an approach which overly emphasises theory at the expense of practice and, second, issues with meeting very different quality benchmarks for ITE and higher education. Brooks (2021) argues that this creates a 'hostile climate' (5) in which to operate. Her study of university-led ITE in the United States of America, Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand Aotearoa reveals intense political regulation of the discipline in all localities.

The recent changes to initial teacher education in England sit within a historical backdrop, which helps to contextualise more recent developments both in the English and international arena. The move towards greater control and regulation of teacher education in England began when Margaret Thatcher's Conservative party was elected in 1979. Following a period where teachers and teacher educators enjoyed high levels of professional freedom (Furlong 1992), right wing politicians began to question the autonomy of universities in educating teachers. Furlong (1992) argues that there has been an ideological struggle between the right wing ideology of the state and the left wing ideology of the teaching profession. He defines ideology as 'sets of values, beliefs and practical experiences' (165) and argues that an ideology of technical rationality, which had grown out of the Frankfurt school, was introduced to teacher education in the late 1980s. This proposed the aim of education to be the acquisition of technical knowledge to facilitate the control of the natural world. It focused on educational outcomes as the purpose of education and used scientific methods to analyse the effectiveness of approaches. The dominant ideologies of university educators, Furlong proposes (1992), were more holistic and aligned to left wing politics. He outlines four main ideologies that

underpinned teacher education. These were educational conservatism, which focused on transmitting current values; liberal education, which promoted the idea of an autonomous learner; progressive education, which focused on child-centred learning, and social reconstructionism, which focused on education as transformation. Furlong argues that the move towards a technical rationalist view of education began a transformation of teachers from autonomous professionals to deliverers of government policy. The changes implemented by the Conservative party of the 1980s, which emerged from a technical rationalist ideology, were an attempt to reduce the power of university educators who were viewed as 'low level intellectuals with Marxist inclinations' (Wilkin, 1996 quoted in Ellis, 2023, 6).

Moves to limit the influence of universities continued under the Labour government of 1997 to 2010. A first Initial Teacher Training National Curriculum was proposed in 1997 (DfEE 1997) which outlined the minimum requirements for all courses teaching primary mathematics and English. Following on from this was an extension of the ITT curriculum to secondary English, mathematics and science (DfEE 1998). Both primary and secondary ITT National Curricula were soon abandoned. Unlike the CCF, this ITT National Curriculum was designed in consultation with educational experts and was overseen by a public body called the Teacher Training Agency (TTA). It was not enforced directly by the Department for Education and failure to comply did not result in the closure of courses. Ellis (2023) argues, however, that it is an example of an early attempt of the state to control teacher education in universities.

Following the election of a Conservative Liberal Democrat coalition in 2010, the movement to increase government control over initial teacher education continued. A new route into teaching was introduced in 2011, called 'School Direct' which enabled schools to recruit and train their own teachers (Department for Education 2011b). Ellis and Childs (in Ellis 2023) describe this as an attempt to destabilise university ITE but, if so, it proved to be unsuccessful as universities subsequently absorbed some School Direct provision into their own ITE portfolios. However, some 'third sector' provision remained, such as School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT), which involves groups of schools delivering post graduate ITT courses that operate outside the university and Teach First, a charity which works with university partners to deliver post-graduate teacher training.

In 2015, the by then Conservative-led UK Department for Education commissioned a review of ITT in England, reported in the Carter Review (Carter 2015). A version of the Core Content Framework was developed by Stephen Munday and an expert group (Munday 2016), which used the Teachers' Standards (Department for Education 2011a) as a basis for the framework. In response to falling teacher numbers and difficulties in recruiting new teachers, the Conservative government of the time, implemented a recruitment and retention strategy (Department for Education 2019c). As part of this strategy an early career framework (ECF) was launched (Department for Education 2019a) to support teachers in the first 2 years of teaching. Later that year, the ITT Core Content Framework (Department for Education 2019b) was introduced, which almost exactly replicates both the structure and wording of the ECF. A review of English ITT was produced in 2021, taking the form of the ITT Market Review (Department for Education 2021).

The CCF and the ITT Market review were each led by an Expert Group. These expert groups were made up of mainly private sector and third sector participants,

with some representatives from the school sector but very little representation from the university sector, which provides the bulk of initial teacher education. These small expert groups (5 members of the ITT market review group, 8 members of the CCF group) have been solely responsible for evaluating the current market for ITT, making recommendations for change and designing the new framework. Interestingly, four key actors were members of both groups, giving John Blake (Now Teach), Richard Gill (Teaching School Council) Reuben Moore (Teach First) and Professor Sam Twiselton (Sheffield Hallam University) significant power in shaping future teacher education.

The ITT Market Review led to a new round of accreditation which required all providers to submit a detailed application, followed by a scrutiny of sample lessons (Department for Education 2021) and a requirement to work with Department for Education (DfE) representatives. Providers who failed to meet the DfE's criteria in their initial application were given one opportunity to resubmit. Those who failed the resubmission had their accreditation to provide ITT from 2024 onwards removed.

The UK Department for Education tightly regulates ITE provision in England, producing teachers' standards against which all teachers are measured (Department for Education 2011a), determining how many places each provider will supply and accrediting providers in a range of settings including school-centred ITT as well as university-led provision. All provisions are inspected by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted), with the current inspection framework evaluating providers' adherence to the CCF in their judgement of the overall effectiveness of the provision (Ofsted 2022). The benchmarks for university-led undergraduate education courses are outlined in the Subject Benchmark Statements (Quality Assurance Agency for UK Higher Education 2019), which define the academic standards that can be expected of a graduate.

The CCF outlines the 'minimum entitlement for all trainee teachers' (Department for Education 2019b, 3). Its aim is to inform all ITE curricula. The emphasis within the document is on evidence-based approaches to teaching and its bibliography contains a range of texts focusing on this form of research. A wide range of authors, however, have noted significant absences in the document. The British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2022) and the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) (Vare et al. 2022) identify a lack of critical thinking as well as the omission of a robust research base.

Methodology

In order to determine the research context for this study, I reviewed literature relating to initial teacher education and the CCF itself. I chose to present the analysis of the CCF and the literature relating to the CCF together, in an attempt to provide a coherent discussion of recent changes to ITE. As the implementation of the CCF and the ITT Market Review are recent developments in England, there is, at the time of writing, limited academic literature focusing on this topic. In order to explore the concerns raised by the sector, I chose to review a range of academic blogs as well as articles, books and responses, which focused on critiquing the CCF. I used two inter-related approaches to analysis, beginning with a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) and following this using doppelganger as method.

Foucauldian discourse analysis

My approach to analysing the literature was to use Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). Foucault explores the topic of discourse in *The History of Sexuality Volume 2* (Foucault 1978) and it is a reading of this text which helps formulate my understanding of the topic. Discourse can be described as the way we talk and think about a particular subject and how this generates power. Some discourses are privileged, representing the dominant view of a subject, while others are marginalised or rendered invisible, embodying resistance to dominant discourses. Discourses are seen as producing a 'truth' about the subject (Foucault 1994a, 223).

I was also interested in notions of power as I was influenced by Foucault's work on governmentality (Foucault 1977). Foucault suggests that technologies of power such as normalising judgements, whereby individuals are compared to norms; hierarchical observation, by which subjects are put under surveillance and the examination, which is the process by which normalising judgements and hierarchical observation are combined, are used to govern and regulate the individual. These concepts were very relevant to this study. The CCF can be seen as a set of norms against which teacher educators are judged and the ITT Market review can be conceptualised as an examination. Foucault's notion of power centred on the idea of power being a productive force. In *Truth and Power*, Foucault describes it as a 'productive network which runs through the whole social body' (Foucault 1994b, 120). It not only restricts individuals but also produces discourse and subjectivity. Power produces both political violence, which exercises itself obscurely through the workings of institutions, and resistance, through which individuals fight against them (Chomsky and Foucault 2006).

After reading the CCF and each piece of relevant research literature, I evaluated how language had been used to create discourse, highlighting key words and phrases within the texts. I asked the following questions based on those posed by Foucault (1978):

(1) What has been said and why has it been discussed?
(2) How has this generated power?
(3) What is the link between discourse, power and experience?
(4) What knowledge is formed by these linkages?
(5) What is rendered invisible?

Using these questions and my analysis of discourse, I created a table of key texts. I included a brief overview of the main discourses present in each text and then began to identify themes. I found four main themes emerged from this analysis. These were first, a discourse of ITE as hostile. Examples of key words related to this theme are: 'under attack' (Newman 2022, 1); 'hostile climate' (Brooks 2021, 5) and the silencing of the HE voice (Murtagh and Rushton 2021). Second, the language of transgression and resistance with examples being discussions of space for activism (Evans 2022), finding pockets of possibility (Smith and Lander 2023) and negotiating compliance and resistance (Murtagh and Ball Smith 2023). Third, the simplification of teaching, with examples being the move to an instrumentalised profession (Gabi et al. 2022), discussions of the oversimplification of teaching (Turvey et al. 2019) and the discourse of the simple view of teaching (Jones and Ellis 2023). Finally, a theme of knowledge as resistance to the truth game of the

simple view of teaching. Examples of this can be seen in the discussion of Bernstein's (1999) repertoire and reservoir concept of knowledge (Brooks 2021), the idea that knowledge has been divorced from the knower (Hordern and Brooks 2023) and the importance of the flow of ideas in developing teacher identity (Brooks 2021). Of these four themes, I chose to focus on two for the purposes of this paper. These were the discourse of changes to Initial Teacher Education as hostile and its opposing concept of resistance. I selected these two as the themes were particularly dominant in the literature and included aspects of the other themes.

The CCF and the market review as hostile

The discourse of the CCF and the ITT market review as a form of hostility is found in the wide range of texts relating to the current state of ITE in England. It can be seen in the language of hostility, with references to 'threats', 'barriers', 'attack', 'intimidation' and 'hostile environments' (BERA 2022; Brooks 2021; Cushing 2023; Gabi et al. 2022; Newman 2022; Russell Group 2021; Spendlove 2022, 2023). I will begin by discussing the most vivid and powerful metaphor for the ITT market review- Spendlove's (2022) blog comparing the current changes in English ITE with the South Korean dystopian drama, Squid Game (Dong-Hyuk 2021).

In this series, the main character, Seong Gi-hun is offered the opportunity to solve his financial problems by playing a series of children's games. He soon discovers, however, that losing a game results in death and the apparently meaningless games are an extreme form of violence. The parallel between the popular drama and the ITT market review focuses on the high-stakes nature of the 'game'. Losing in both the squid games and the ITT reaccreditation game is an existential threat. Just as players who fail the squid games are killed, so providers who failed the accreditation process were unable to run their teacher education courses after 2024. This has become a reality for 68 providers, including both universities and school-based providers, who failed or left the accreditation process, resulting in the 'death' of their courses (French, n.d.). This intense form of governmentality moves away from more subtle forms of regulation such as surveillance and standardisation towards a more direct approach in which failure to comply results in the termination of provision.

An analysis of the CCF also reveals hostility towards ITE providers, particularly in a university context. The CCF is not simply a guidance document. Unlike the English National Curriculum for schools (Department for Education 2014), which mandates subject content alone, the CCF effectively serves to dictate curricular content, pedagogy *and* literature. The National Curriculum for English, for instance, outlines that children in key stage 3 (aged 11–14) should read 'English literature, both pre-1914 and contemporary, including prose, poetry and drama' (Department for Education 2014, 83). The scope of literature is outlined but no key texts are given. It is up to the teacher to decide which texts to teach and how to teach these texts. The CCF, however, gives not only subject content, for example, 'learn that … Working memory is where information that is being actively processed is held' (Department for Education 2019b, 11), but also pedagogy. This can be seen in the instructions of how to train pre-service teachers which are repeated throughout the CCF:

> - *Discussing and analysing with expert colleagues*: Interrogate with an expert colleague – using the best available evidence – what makes a particular approach successful or unsuccessful, reflecting on how this approach might be integrated into the trainee's own practice. (Department for Education Department for Education 2019b, 5)

In addition, the CCF also outlines the underpinning texts that should be used in teacher education: 'A full bibliography is provided with suggested reading, which can be shared with trainee teachers to support their critical engagement with research' (Department for Education 2019b, 4). As Hordern and Brooks (2024) point out, guidance for the accreditation process dictates that only additional literature which is 'coherent with the [CCF] framework' (Department for Education 2022, 6–7) would be accepted by the accreditation panel. While school teachers in England have some autonomy of what and how they teach, teacher educators' autonomy has been removed by the recent changes to teacher education. This can be seen as an attack on the professionalism of teacher educators, whose expertise and knowledge of teaching are the basis of their academic credentials. They are no longer able to choose the content, pedagogy or even the research they use in their programmes. There is an absence of any reference to social learning, embodied learning, child-centred learning, active learning, affective aspects of learning, early years pedagogies and any reference to the context of the learner. These aspects are rendered invisible in the CCF and are therefore marginalised. The CCF explicitly promotes an ideology of technical rationality through its definition of outcomes as the purpose of education. This can be seen in the opening lines of the document which state: 'The quality of teaching is the single most important in-school factor in improving outcomes for pupils' (Department for Education 2019b, 3). The focus on approaches or techniques as seen in the 'learn that' and 'learn how to' statements and the use of a scientistic evidence base are also central to this ideology. The hostility therefore can be perceived as ideological warfare. It is an attack not just on teacher educators' professionalism but also on their values and beliefs.

Spaces for resistance

Within this hostile environment (Brooks 2021; Cushing 2023) in which the provision of university-based ITE is under attack, many authors suggest that there are spaces for resistance. Spatial terminology is used in a range of texts to denote possibilities for providers to oppose the changes engendered in the market review. Smith and Lander (2023), for example, use Joseph-Salisbury and Connolly's (2021) term 'pockets of possibility' (1) to explore the opportunities for anti-racist activism within restricted systems. Cushing, also focusing on racism within initial teacher education, uses Weber's (Cushing 2023) term 'cracks in the system' (57) to explore small spaces in which activism can take place. He develops this metaphor further to suggest that these cracks are in an apparently insurmountable wall, which can widen to become spaces for resistance. These tiny, hidden spaces, pockets or cracks in a seemingly impenetrable edifice, are seen as offering a measure of hope that resistance is possible. For example, the CCF states:

> The ITT Core Content Framework does not set out the full ITT curriculum for trainee teachers. The complexity of the process for becoming a teacher cannot be overestimated and it

remains for individual providers to design curricula appropriate for the subject, phase and age range that the trainees will be teaching. (Department for Education 2019b, 4)

Thus, this document is designed to be the skeleton of the provision (Hordern and Brooks 2024). It leaves some room for curricular design by providers of ITE and acknowledges the complexity of teaching in a statement which interestingly, contradicts the main message of the CCF (that teaching is a sequence of approaches). There are also cracks located within the space where teaching actually occurs. While the documented provision can be analysed by regulators such as Ofsted and the Department for Education, the vast majority of teaching and learning occurs within a space which is invisible to the outsider. Classroom discussions, conversations and the teaching ideology embodied by the teacher educator cannot be seen by the regulatory bodies, and it is here that a shadow curriculum can be enacted.

Doppelganger as method

Alongside the FDA, I used doppelganger as method as an approach to analysis. This is a novel approach which I have been developing over a number of years (Pierlejewski 2020, 2024) in which I use the idea of the 'doppelganger' or 'double' to explore situations in which there is conflict. It is based on the literary genre of the doppelganger, which features a second self or double of the main protagonist. Rank's psychoanalytic reading of the genre reveals specific features of all doppelganger stories (Rank 1971): all texts focus on the relationship between the self and the self; the doppelganger both realises desires and restricts the subject's autonomy and an encounter with the doppelganger always causes intense emotional distress. The doppelganger always acts as a technology of power because it alters the behaviour the subject. I take the imaginary arena of the doppelganger as a position from which to examine the situation, asking where a double is located and how the doppelganger functions as a technology of power. Taking this novel approach led me to identify a doppelganger, not in an individual but of the curriculum. I reflected that there were key aspects of teacher education which I no longer included on my lecture slides but taught none the less. These aspects, which I felt were essential to the process of educating teachers, were no longer prioritised, but were pushed into the shadows and partially hidden.

The use of doppelganger as method to analyse the CCF revealed stark absences, which could be conceptualised as a hidden or shadow curriculum. Further reading of current literature, using doppelganger as method to identify doublings, also reinforced the concept of a hidden curriculum as authors noted the aspects of teacher education which had been rendered invisible (Hordern and Brooks 2024; Smith and Lander 2023; Tillin 2023). I chose to refer to these invisible aspects of ITE as shadow curriculum as shadows are created by an intense beam of light. Through its intense focus on the curriculum delivered in ITE provision, the Market Review shines a penetrating shaft of light onto the CCF. It is the implementation of this curriculum which will come under the gaze of the English regulatory body, the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) and which has formed the centre of the reaccreditation process. Returning to Foucault's work on discipline (1977), it is the focus of hierarchical observation.

Analysis of the ITT core content framework

Shulman (1986, 10) defines curriculum as 'the full range of programs designed for the teaching of particular subjects and topics at a given level'. It is *what* is taught on a particular course. This *what*, however, is a product of the knowledge which must be acquired by the pre-service teachers and the pedagogy or *how* of teaching. Curriculum, pedagogy and knowledge cannot exist without each other on any given programme. The curriculum must convey knowledge through pedagogy.

This analysis looks at both the authorised curriculum, found in the CCF and the shadow curriculum, rendered invisible, discussing aspects of knowledge and pedagogy as well as curriculum. Before this can be analysed, however, the discourses of teacher education which underpin these aspects of provision must be explored.

The authorised curriculum

The CCF is organised into a range of 'learn that' and 'learn how to' statements (Department for Education 2019b, 4–5). The 'learn that' statements refer to the knowledge which must be delivered to the pre-service teacher. This knowledge is based on the 'best available evidence' (3), by which the DfE mean the evidence-base included in the CCF bibliography. Hordern and Brooks (2023) have evaluated this evidence-base in their analysis and found that literature focused on the limiting concept of 'what works' was overwhelmingly dominant. This narrow interpretation of 'best available evidence' supports the view of teaching as the acquisition of a range of approaches and is referred to by Furlong and Witty as the 'new science of education' (Furlong and Whitty 2017, 1). An example of this can be seen in the following 'learn that' statement:

> 'learn that . . . to access the curriculum, early literacy provides fundamental knowledge; reading comprises two elements: word reading and language comprehension; systematic synthetic phonics is the most effective approach for teaching pupils to decode'. (Department for Education 2019b, 14)

This statement presents itself as *the truth* about learning to read. It does not give any opportunity for critique or space for alternative viewpoints. It coerces teacher educators into teaching this approach to reading in an uncritical fashion, which, as the Russell Group (a group of self-selecting British universities) (2021) and BERA's (2022a) responses to the public consultation on the ITT market review rightly point out, threatens academic autonomy and contradicts the requirement of the QAA benchmarks for education at level six to:

> 'demonstrate the ability to use their knowledge and understanding to critically locate and justify a personal approach in relation to the subject'. (Quality Assurance Agency for UK Higher Education 2019, 8)

Although not all ITE is taken at undergraduate level, the requirement to be critical is present in both undergraduate and postgraduate university provision. A preservice teacher who is expected to learn that 'systematic synthetic phonics is *the* most effective approach for teaching pupils to decode' (my emphasis) cannot 'critically locate and justify a personal approach' to teaching of reading as no other interpretation of the research evidence is permitted. Research, such as Wyse and Bradbury's review of research

evidence, policy and practice in teaching of reading, found that 'contextualised teaching of reading, or balanced instruction, is the most effective way to teach reading' (Wyse and Bradbury 2022, 2). This, however, is not included in the authorised curriculum, meaning that teacher educators must teach systematic synthetic phonics uncritically and despite the fact that this approach is not supported by robust research evidence. Such regulation of the curriculum is *such* a threat to academic autonomy that an alternative curriculum must emerge.

The 'learn how to' (Department for Education 2019b, 3) statements refer to the application of this set of 'learn that' statements. 'Learn how to' statements are organised into two categories. These are 'an entitlement to practise key skills' and 'an opportunity to work and learn from expert colleagues as they apply their knowledge and understanding of the evidence in the classroom' (5). An analysis of these two categories is useful in revealing the underlying discourses communicated through them.

The term *entitlement* gives a moral rationale for delivering the CCF. Providers who fail to deliver the CCF will be withholding the training to which the pre-service teachers are entitled. It is the *right* of the teacher to practice skills; failure to do this would be denying pre-service teachers their rights. The approach to learning privileged in the CCF, embodied in the 'entitlement to practise skills' is 'practice'. The document defines practice as rehearsing and refining particular approaches. It is through repetition of the approaches outlined in the CCF that becoming teachers will master the craft of teaching. The notion that relentless and prescriptive practice is the formula for successful teaching has been promoted by authors such as Lemov (2010) and the Deans for Impact (Deans for Impact 2016) who feature in the CCF's bibliography. This behaviourist view of learning as repetition renders other forms of learning such as meaning making, social learning and co-constructed learning invisible. It also removes the individual from the learning equation as the focus is on the approach rather than the teacher.

The shadow curriculum

The shadow curriculum can be found by asking where the doppelganger or double of the authorised curriculum is located. In this context, the shadow curriculum can be found in the omissions and marginalised aspects of the CCF. It is located in the aspects of teacher education that are forced into the shadows, rendered invisible or insubstantial. With reference to the 'learn that' and 'learn how to' statements, Knight and Early Career Framework (2023) draws our attention to the absence of 'learn why' statements. The term *why* is conspicuously absent in the CCF. Instead, the framework uses the phrase 'discussing and analysing with expert colleagues' (Department for Education 2019, 5). They define it thus: 'Interrogate with an expert colleague – using the best available evidence – what makes a particular approach successful or unsuccessful, reflecting on how this approach might be integrated into the trainee's own practice' (5). The focus of the 'interrogation' must be on the success of an approach, not why an approach might be appropriate or why a teacher might adopt a particular pedagogy. The CCF also refers to 'deconstructing an approach', again focusing on 'what might make it successful or unsuccessful' (5). The nearest this framework comes to focusing on *why* therefore, is to 'interrogate' and 'deconstruct' approaches in relation to successful outcomes. This is because the purpose of education in this document, is defined as 'improving outcomes

for pupils' (Department for Education 2019b, 3). Any discussion or analysis that does not focus on outcomes and the most effective and efficient methods to achieve these outcomes is therefore irrelevant. This leads to explorations of the question *why* being located not in the authorised curriculum but forming part of a shadow curriculum.

Another related aspect which is rendered deliberately invisible in the CCF is theory, as it is theory that provides answers to questions of *why*. The new science of educational research focuses on 'what works', not on *how* or *why* we educate as we do. Biesta explores the move towards evidence-based practice arguing 'Evidence-based practice assumes that the ends of professional action are given, and that the only relevant (professional and research) questions to be asked are about the most effective and efficient ways of achieving those ends' (Biesta 2010, 32). What is missing from questions of efficiency and effectiveness is the focus on meaning-making. Biesta argues that for learning to take place, pre-service teachers must make sense of and interpret what they are being taught. They do this by asking questions of *why* and exploring different theoretical viewpoints which seek to explain *why*. A key aspect of the shadow curriculum therefore, which is not only marginalised but absent from the authorised curriculum, is a focus on questions of why teachers teach as they do.

Finally, in a system which privileges approaches over people, a formula for teaching is presented. This simple view of teaching (Jones and Ellis 2023), in which the adoption of a number of tried and tested approaches will lead to successful teaching leaves no room for innovation. This formula could be summarised as:

evidence-based practice × repeated application = effective teaching.

Creative pedagogy and innovative thinking are rendered invisible in the CCF as any untested strategies cannot be a part of the 'package of support' (Department for Education 2019b, 3). When a curriculum is determined by evidence-based practice, there is no space for new or bespoke approaches to teaching. This approach also denies pre-service teachers the opportunity to become active researchers in school as they may find themselves unable to investigate any approaches that are not already proven to lead to improved outcomes. This proves problematic for undergraduate degree programmes which must include an extended research project at level six. In this way, creative and innovative pedagogies are relocated into the shadows.

Conclusion

The perceived attack on teacher educators' professionalism, values and beliefs has led to a doubling of the curriculum. The authorised curriculum emerges from technical rationality, and it is this curriculum that is privileged and presented for inspection. The values and beliefs of teacher educators, however, cannot be eradicated and instead, emerge in the shadow curriculum, which is located within the cracks of the CCF and hidden from sight in undocumented classroom interactions.

As Ellis (2023) makes explicitly clear, the situation described is a stark warning to teacher educators outside England. The desire to change ideology within teaching is not unique to England, as documented by Brooks in her comparative study (2021). Ellis argues that 'England now has the most tightly regulated and centrally controlled system of ITE anywhere in the world' (2). I echo Campbell and Crow in their chapter

entitled *ITE in England: a cautionary tale for Europe* (Ellis 2023) in suggesting that the situation in England is an example of how *not* to try to regulate initial teacher education and the lessons learned need to be heeded by teacher educators across the globe.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

BERA. 2022. "*BERA Response to the Public Consultation on the ITT Market Review (ITTMRR)*." London: British Educational research Association.

Bernstein, Basil. 1999. "Vertical and Horizontal Discourse: An Essay." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20 (2): 157–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425699995380.

Biesta, Gert. 2010. *Good Education in an Age of Measurement Ethics, Politics, Democracy*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Brooks, Clare. 2021. *Initial Teacher Education at Scale: Quality Conundrums*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Carter, Andrew. 2015. *Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (ITT)*. London: Crown.

Chomsky, Noam, and Michel Foucault. 2006. *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate: On Human Nature*. New York: The New Press.

Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, Molly Cummings Carney, Elizabeth Stringer Keefe, Staphani Burton, Wen-Chia Chang, M. Beatriz-Fernández, Andrew F. Miller, Juan Gabriel-Sánchez, and Megina Baker. 2018. *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cushing, Ian. 2023. "Raciolinguistic Policy Assemblages and White Supremacy in Teacher Education." *The Curriculum Journal* 34 (1): 43–61. https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.173.

Deans for Impact. 2016. *Practice with Purpose: The Emerging Science of Teacher Expertise*. Austin.

Department for Education. 2011a. *Teachers' Standards: Guidance for School Leaders, School Staff and Governing Bodies*. London: Crown. DFE-00066-2011.

Department for Education. 2011b. *Training Our Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers*. London: Crown Publications Ltd.

Department for Education. 2014. "The National Curriculum in England: Framework Document." *Department for Education* (December): 264.

Department for Education. 2019a. *Early Career Framework*. London: Crown.

Department for Education. 2019b. *ITT Core Content Framework*. London: Crown.

Department for Education. 2019c. *Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy. Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy*. London: Crown.

Department for Education. 2021. *Government Response to the Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Market Review Report*. London: Crown.

Department for Education. 2022. *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Provider Guidance On*. London: Crown.

DfEE. 1997. *Teaching: High Status, High Standards. Requirements for Courses of Initial Teacher Training (Circular 10/97)*. London: Department for Education and Employment.

DfEE. 1998. *Teaching: High Status, High Standards. Requirements for Courses of Initial Teacher Training (Circular 4/98)*. London: Department for Education and Employment.

Dong-Hyuk, Hwang. 2021. *Squid Game*. South Korea: Siren Pictures Inc.

Ellis, Viv. 2023. *Teacher Education in Crisis: The State, the Market and the Universities in England*. London: Bloomsbury Acasemic.

Evans, Katherine. 2022. "Spaces for Activism in Early Years Initial Teacher Education in England." *BERA Blog*.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: The Will to Knowledge*. Vol. I. London: Penguin Books Ltd. https://doi.org/10.2307/1904618.

Foucault, Michel. 1994a. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. Edited by P. Rabinow. New York: The New Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1994b. *Power Essential Works 1954-84*. Edited by James Faubion. London: Penguin.

French, Jenni. n.d. "Diminished Numbers of Teacher Training Providers Threaten Recruitment into Shortage Subjects | Education | Gatsby." *Gatsby*. Accessed July 3, 2023. https://www.gatsby.org.uk/education/latest/diminished-numbers-of-teacher-training-providers-threaten-recruitment-into-shortage-subjects .

Furlong, John. 1992. "Reconstructing Professionalism: Ideological Struggle in Initial Teacher Education." In *Voicing Concerns: Sociological Perspectives on Contemporary Education Reforms*, edited by Madeleine Arnot and Len Barton, 163–185. Wallingford: Triangle Books Ltd.

Furlong, John, and Geoff Whitty. 2017. "*Knowledge and the Study of Education: An International Exploration*." In Knowledge Traditions in the Study of Education, edited by John Furlong and Geoff Whitty, 13–57. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Gabi, Josephine, Anna Olsson Rost, Diane Warner, and Uzma Asif. 2022. "Radical Imagination: Enacting Anti-Racist Practice and Decolonial Praxis in Initial Teacher Education in England." *BERA Blog*.

Hordern, Jim, and Clare Brooks. 2023. "The Core Content Framework and the "New Science" of Educational Research." *Oxford Review of Education* 00 (00): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2023.2182768.

Hordern, Jim, and Clare Brooks. 2024. "Towards Instrumental Trainability in England? The "Official Pedagogy" of the Core Content Framework." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 72 (1): 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2023.2255894.

Jones, Jane, and Viv Ellis. 2023. "Simple and Complex Views of Teacher Development." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1–2 . Oxford: Oxford University Press. 26 Apr. 2019; Accessed 7 Jan. 2025. https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-418

Joseph-Salisbury, Remi, and Laura Connolly. 2021. *Anti-Racist Scholar-Activism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Knight, Rupert, and Early Career Framework. 2023. "Revisiting the Role of Case Knowledge in Teacher Development." *BERA Blog*.

Lemov, Doug. 2010. *Teach Like a Champion: 49 Techniques That Put Students on the Path to College*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Munday, Stephen. 2016. *A Framework of Core Content for Initial Teacher Training (ITT)*. London: Crown.

Murtagh, Lisa, and Claire Ball Smith. 2023. "Early Career Teacher Mentoring in England: Compliance and Mediation." *Professional Development in Education*: 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2291357.

Murtagh, Lisa, and Elizabeth Rushton. 2021. "Mobilising Critique Through Twitter: Exploring the ITE Sector Response During the ITT Market Review." *BERA Blog*.

Newman, Stephen. 2022. "Teacher Education Under Attack." *Journal of Education for Teaching* 48 (1): 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.2014241.

Ofsted. 2022. "Guidance: Initial Teacher Education (ITE) Inspection Framework and Handbook." *Gov. Uk* , 1–60. Accessed February 23, 2023.

Pierlejewski, Mandy. 2020. "The Data-Doppelganger and the Cyborg-Self: Theorising the Datafication of Education." *Pedagogy Culture & Society* 28 (3): 463–475. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1653357.

Pierlejewski, Mandy. 2024. "Doppelganger as Method: A Framework for Examining Datafication." *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 25 (3): 322–332. https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491241273927.

Quality Assurance Agency for UK Higher Education. 2019. *Subject Benchmark Statement Education Studies*. Gloucester: The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Rank, Otto. 1971. *Double : A Psychoanalytic Study*. Edited by Harry Tucker. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Russell Group. 2021. *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Market Review: Russell Group Response*. Accessed May 30, 2023. https://russellgroup.ac.uk/news/russell-group-response-to-the-itt-market-review/

Shulman, Lee S. 1986. "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching." *Educational Researcher* 15 (2): 4–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004.

Smith, Heather, and Vini Lander. 2023. "Finding "Pockets of Possibility" for Anti-Racism in a Curriculum for Student Teachers: From Absence to Action." *The Curriculum Journal* 34 (1): 22–42. https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.177.

Spendlove, David. 2022. "Proposals for Initial Teacher Training – Welcome to ITT Squid Game." *WONKHE*. https://wonkhe.com/blogs/proposals-for-initial-teacher-training-welcome-to-itt-squid-game/.

Spendlove, David. 2023. "Just Trying to Make Some Sense of it All . . . Golden Thread of Distraction: It Doesn't Have to Be This Way !" *Dr David Spendlove's Blog*. https://davidspendlove.wordpress.com/ .

Tillin, Jane. 2023. "The University Role in New Teacher Learning – Why it Matters: Teach First Trainee Perspectives." *London Review of Education* 21 (1): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.14324/lre.21.1.03.

Turvey, Keith, Viv Ellis, Anne Watson, Matthew Slocombe, Peter Kutnick, Sue Cowley, Sue Harrison, and Kenny Frederick. 2019. "Total Recall? The ITE Content Framework, Research and Teachers' Understandings of Learning | BERA." *BERA Blog*. https://www.bera.ac.uk/blog/total-recall-the-ite-content-framework-research-and-teachers-understandings-of-learning .

Vare, Paul, Lizana Oberholzer, Mohammad Shamin Ahmad, Hannah Durham, Jon James, Hilary Lee, Caroline Linse, et al. 2022. *Golden Thread or Gilded Cage? An Analysis of Department for Education Support for the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers*. London: UCET.

Vare, Paul, Lizana Oberholzer, Mohammad Shamin Ahmad, Hannah Durham, Jon James, Hilary Lee, Caroline Linse, et al. 2022. *Golden Thread or Gilded Cage ? An Analysis of Department for Education Support for the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers*. London: UCET.

Wyse, Dominic, and Alice Bradbury. 2022. "Reading Wars or Reading Reconciliation? A Critical Examination of Robust Research Evidence, Curriculum Policy and Teachers' Practices for Teaching Phonics and Reading." *Review of Education* 10 (1): 1–53. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3314.