
Analysing pedagogy: the problem of framing

Ursula Hoadley

Abstract

The sociologist Basil Bernstein presents a delicate and rigorous conceptual frame for researching pedagogy, which enables an analysis of transmission and acquisition in relation to social class. Bernstein's theoretical project demonstrates how class relations generate and distribute different forms of communication and ways of making meaning which differentially position subjects with respect to schooling and its requirements. The purpose of this article is to interrogate the use of Bernstein's theory in analysing pedagogy, in particular in relation to the two key concepts of classification and framing which underpin his theory. The article considers the application of the theory in the South African context, and the emergence of empirical texts that 'fall out' of the theoretical frame. The development of the theory in relation to these texts is consequently explored.

The article is located within a broader study addressing the reproduction of social class differences through pedagogy (Hoadley, 2005). The research was conducted in South African primary schools in 2004. Drawing on a range of data, including classroom observation, interview and student task data, the study sought to develop a framework for the analysis of pedagogic variation across social class school settings, and to show how inequalities are potentially amplified through the pedagogic practices found in classrooms.

Bernsteinian studies of pedagogy have asserted the centrality of the evaluative criteria in identifying pedagogic practice optimal to promoting success in schooling for, especially working class, students. The evaluative criteria specify the requirements for students' production of the legitimate text. Making the evaluative criteria explicit involves "clearly telling children what is expected of them, of identifying what is missing from their textual production, of clarifying the concepts, of leading them to make synthesis and broaden concepts and considering the importance attributed to language as a mediator of the development of higher mental processes" (Morais, Neves and Pires, 2004, p.8). A number of careful empirical studies have emphasized making the evaluative criteria explicit as a key variable in optimising working class students' success in school (for example, Rose, 2004; Fontinhas, Morais and Neves, 1995; Morais, 2002). It is framing, or control, over the evaluative criteria that is particularly interrogated in this article.

The article begins with a discussion of Bernstein's theory, focusing particularly on classification and framing, and the concepts that are used later in the discussion of data and theory development. An analysis of classroom observation data is then presented, and the use of the theory in relation to that data is considered. The article concludes with some reflections on the implications of the analysis presented.

Bernstein and pedagogy

For Bernstein, education specializes consciousness with respect to school ways of organising experience and making meaning, or what has been referred to elsewhere as context-independent meanings (Holland, 1981), elaborated code (Bernstein, 1975), or a 'school code' (Taylor, Muller and Vinjevo, 2003). Whereas everyone has access to the commonsense knowledge of everyday life, schooling inducts learners into the 'uncommonsense' knowledge of formal education - or, the school code. Bernstein talks about this process in terms of the specialization of 'voice', which refers to the way in which "subjectivity is created through the socialization of individuals into categories of agents, knowledge and contexts that are distinguished by the particularity of their voice" (Dooley, 2001, p.77). 'Specialization' then "reveals differences from, rather than commonality. It means that your educational identity and specific skills are clearly marked and bounded" (Bernstein, 1975, p.81).

The purpose of schooling then is to specialize learners' voice with respect to the school code. Put another way, pedagogy in this view inducts learners into a 'school' way of organizing experience and making meaning. This essentially entails the transmission and acquisition of *context-independent meanings*, or an 'elaborated code'.

How do we identify the specialization of voice, or more precisely, whether the transmission is doing the work of specializing? Conventionally, in the Bernsteinian literature, specialization of voice is adumbrated in terms of classification and framing values – particular combinations of these dimensions give rise to variations in the form of the elaborated code.

In summary then, the specializing of consciousness (and this generally will entail the acquisition of context-independent means of organizing experience and making meaning) happens through two key mechanisms which are at the heart of Bernstein's theory: classification and framing, which refer, respectively, to power and control.

Bernstein's theory of pedagogy is encapsulated in his theorizing of pedagogic discourse. Pedagogic discourse describes the specialized form of communication whereby differential transmission and acquisition is effected (Bernstein, 1990). Pedagogic discourse describes the *relay* of pedagogy. It consists of an instructional discourse embedded in a regulative discourse, where the instructional discourse is concerned with the transmission/acquisition of specific competences, skills and knowledge, and the regulative discourse is about the underlying theory of pedagogy and the expectations of character, conduct and manner. Put simply, instructional discourse is concerned with the transmission of knowledge and skills; regulative discourse is akin to the 'hidden curriculum'.

Classification and framing

Bernstein provides a language for the description of pedagogic discourse through the concepts of classification and framing. At a higher level of abstraction, classification refers to the social division of labour. At the macro level classification generates categories of agents and discourses: the categories or insulations are instantiations of power. At the micro level, classification is about the organizational or structural aspects of pedagogic practice. Classification is about *relations between*, and the degree of maintenance between categories, and these include the boundaries between agents, spaces and discourses.

Classification is expressed as being strong (where boundaries are explicit and categories are insulated from one another), or weak (where there is integration, or where the boundary is weak or blurred). In terms of discourses, the relations between different subject areas (inter-disciplinary relations), and between school knowledge and everyday knowledge (inter-discursive relations) are considered, as well as the relation between knowledge within a particular subject area (intra-discursive). With respect to agents, the theory identifies how teachers and learners' pedagogic identities are demarcated.

Where classification at the macro level is related to the social division of labour, framing refers to social relations within this social division. That is, specific social relations in production/reproduction generate particular practices which we can talk about in terms of framing, or control relations. Framing, therefore, refers to *relations within* (within boundaries). Framing, in a sense, supports classification, it produces 'the animation of the power grid' (Hasan, 2002), but it also opens up the potential for the change of boundaries, the contesting of power relations. It is through interaction (framing) that boundaries between discourses, spaces and subjects are defined, maintained and changed.

There is, therefore, a crucial relation between classification and framing. It is framing (control) which contains within it the making and the unmaking of the classification (power). It is in the distinction between power and control that Bernstein allows the intentional and structural aspects of power (Atkinson, 1985) of conventional sociological theories to co-exist, and operate dialectically.

At the micro level of pedagogic practice, framing refers to the location of control over the rules of communication. “Framing refers to the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluation of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship” (Bernstein 1975, p.88). Conventionally, framing has to do with the way in which the relationship between the teacher and the learner is set up, where strong framing refers to a limited degree of options for students, and weak framing implies more ‘apparent’¹ control by learners. Again, framing is expressed in terms of its strength or degree of control. Strong framing would imply that students have limited control over the ‘relations within’ and a limited degree of control over the sequencing, pacing, selection and evaluation of the knowledge transmitted.

There are, however, difficulties in working with the concepts of classification and framing empirically. Because they are dialectically linked, to ‘see’ them separately poses a challenge for the researcher. Classification cannot maintain itself without framing. Thus, instances of the classification relation are evident only through the framing relations, the interactional. The interactional and the organizational are dialectically linked, and empirical instances of one always imply the other. Framing is, after all, defined as pedagogic discourse, which Bernstein (1996, p.28) sets out as:

$$\text{Framing} = \frac{\text{instructional discourse} \quad \text{ID}}{\text{regulative discourse} \quad \text{RD}}$$

Classification is in a hierarchical relation to framing, it is prior, but it is empty without the mechanisms to achieve the boundary – that is, framing. Hence the dialectic. The difficulty is also alluded to in Bernstein (1996, p.19), where he argues that “power and control are analytically distinguished and operate at

¹ Because Bernstein privileges a particular definition of pedagogy which is hierarchical, and where the transmitter is in possession of the rules for evaluation, learner control over the discursive rules of pedagogic practice must be ‘apparent’. This would also explain why the rule for regulating the conduct of transmitters and acquirers is the ‘hierarchical’ rule (Dooley, 2001, p.61).

different levels of analysis. Empirically, we shall find that they are embedded in each other.”

The relationship between everyday knowledge and school knowledge is a case in point. Bernstein would describe these differences in terms of framing: “Thus we can consider the variations in the strengths of frames as these refer to the strength of the boundary between educational knowledge and everyday community knowledge of teacher and taught” (Bernstein, 1975, p.206). Atkinson (1985), referring to the same quotation, has argued that, in practice, “this latter aspect of boundary seems equally a matter of classification and frame, since it is often related directly to the relative purity and strength of the membrane of curriculum contents. Empirical research tends to reflect this overlap and ambiguity” (Atkinson, 1985, p.136).²

In relation to framing, Bernstein asserts that “control is double faced for it carries both the power of reproduction and the potential for its change” (Bernstein, 1996, p.19). The distinction between power and control, unique in the discipline of sociology, thus allows for the description of the making and potential unmaking of the social reproduction of inequality, one of the key concerns of Bernstein and those who draw on his work.

Bernstein (2000, p.100) provides a taut formula for classifying codes in terms of the different dimensions and values outlined above:

$$\frac{E}{+-C^{ic}/+-F^{ic}}$$

Here E stands for orientation to meaning – elaborated, or what was referred to earlier as the school code. The line stands for the embedding of the orientation in classification and framing values. Variation in these classification and framing values gives rise to different *modalities of pedagogic practice* (Bernstein, 2000).

Classification and framing describe the structural and interactional aspects of pedagogic practice, exposing the power and control relations that inhere in

² Thus, for example, classification can be used to describe the way in which knowledge is organized and the relationship between educational knowledge and everyday knowledge. When talking about the extent to which teacher and learner control selection of content (i.e. the recruitment of everyday narratives, for example), this could constitute framing over selection, not classification. When framing over selection is weak, this has an effect on classification in that, at least temporarily, it reduces the specialty of the pedagogic discourse.

pedagogic practice. These concepts are connected at both macro and micro levels to a set of related concepts which allow for the analysis of the workings of power and control, in particular in relation to transmission and acquisition processes.

Classification provides the key to distinguishing contexts. It is classification which orients the speaker to what is expected and what is legitimate given the context. It provides the recognition rules for *what* is required. Framing regulates how legitimate meanings may be put together and made public, crucially through the evaluative criteria. These are the realization rules, referring to *how* an appropriate text may be realized. The related concepts are summarized in diagrammatic form below.

Figure 1: Classification and framing and related concepts (adapted from Dowling, 1999, p.9; Bernstein, 1990, p.31 and Bernstein 1990, p.38)

Power	Control
Social division of labour (structural)	Social relations (interactional)
Classification	Framing
Relations between	Relations within
Recognition rules	Realization rules

The point is that there is a differential distribution of power and control relations across different social classes, and these produce different practices and forms of consciousness. It is through the codes that we see the differential positioning of subjects of different social class groupings, dominant and dominated. Bernstein poses the question in this way:

What we are asking here is how the distribution of power and the principles of control are transformed, at the level of the subject, into different, invidiously related, organizing principles, in such a way as to create the possibility of change in such positioning (1990, p.13).

And he answers his own question like this:

The broad answer given by this thesis is that class relations generate, distribute, reproduce, and legitimate distinctive forms of communication, which transmit dominant and dominated codes, and that the subjects are differently positioned by these codes in the process of acquiring them (1990, p.13).

Applying the theory: the social reproduction of inequalities through pedagogy

The broader study referred to earlier (Hoadley, 2005) sought to develop a model that showed the mechanisms whereby social differences are reproduced through pedagogic practice. The main data source in this regard was classroom observation data, collected across three days in eight Grade 3 teachers' classrooms, teaching in different social class school settings in the greater Cape Town area. Literacy and mathematics lessons were extracted from the data for analysis.

The analytic frame consisted of a number of dimensions, and considered the instructional form (drawing on Pedro, 1981), and the strategies deployed by teachers (drawing on the work of Dowling, 1998), and the structure of the pedagogy (using the work of Bernstein, 1975; 1990; 2000). It is the latter aspect of the analysis, and the use of the concepts of classification and especially framing, that are considered in this article.

In relation to the analysis of the classroom observation data, classification and framing addressed two dimensions of variation across the different classrooms: classification identified the structuring of discourses, spaces and agents (the 'what' and 'who' of pedagogy), and framing, described the relative control teachers and learners had over selection, sequencing, pacing, evaluation and hierarchical rules (the 'how' of pedagogy). These conceptual dimensions are summarized in Figure 2 on the next page:

Figure 2: Conceptual categories for characterising pedagogy

Framing	Discursive rules	Extent to which teacher controls selection of content
		Extent to which teacher controls sequencing of content
		Extent to which teacher controls pacing of content
		Extent to which teacher makes explicit the rules for evaluation of learners' performances
	Hierarchical rules	Extent to which teacher makes formal or informal the social relations between teacher and learners

Classification	Relations between discourses	Inter-disciplinary (strength of boundary between the subject area and other subject areas)
		Inter-discursive (strength of boundary between the subject area and everyday knowledge)
	Relations between spaces	Teacher–learner (strength of demarcation between spaces used by teachers and learners)
		Space for learning (strength of boundary between space , internal and external, to the classroom and learning)
	Relations between agents	Teacher–learner (strength of demarcation of pedagogic identities)

For the broader study (Hoadley, 2005), a coding instrument broadly following the work of Morais and Neves (2001), was designed to assign values, in terms of framing, to the discursive rules of pedagogic practice: the selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluative criteria of educational knowledge. The coding instrument also assigned values to the hierarchical rules (the extent to which teacher and learner have control over the order, character and manner of the conduct of learners). The instrument also considered discourse relations in terms of the strength of classification (or boundedness) between different subject areas (inter-discursive) and between school knowledge and everyday knowledge (inter-discursive). The instrument further looked at the classification of spaces and agents.

In the coding instrument, the high-level concepts of classification and framing were translated into a coding scheme to read the data. The indicators, or theoretical constructs, named empirical instances of particular abstract

concepts. The coding scheme comprised 19 indicators, providing a means for making the conceptual categories shown in Figure 2 ‘observable’. An example of one of the indicators (No.5), for the framing of the evaluation criteria, is given in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Extract from the coding instrument for analysing the classroom observation data in terms of the classification and framing of pedagogic discourse

Discursive rule **EVALUATION CRITERIA (F⁺)**

The extent to which teacher and learner have control over the evaluative criteria of the instructional knowledge pertaining to the meaning of concepts and principles and their appropriate realisation

5. In the course of learners conducting an activity or task	F⁺⁺	F⁺	F⁻	F⁻⁻	F⁰
	Evaluative criteria very clear and explicit	Evaluative criteria quite clear and explicit	Evaluative criteria quite unclear and implicit	Evaluative criteria very unclear and implicit	Transmission of evaluative criteria not observable
	The teacher constantly moves around and monitors what learners are doing and makes comments. To the whole class, and to individuals, she repeatedly goes over what constitutes an appropriate performance.	The teacher makes some points, either to the whole class or to individual learners, so as to clarify what is expected of them in the task.	The teacher makes a few comments during the course of the task and looks at some of the learners work or listens to them read. However, this is not sustained and the criteria for a successful production are not made explicit to all.	The teacher looks at a few learners’ work when it is brought to her attention. She rarely or never listens to them read. She seldom makes a comment to the learner. Comments are not extended to the whole class.	The teacher engages in other work in her space and is not seen to look at what the learners are doing. She makes no comment on the work as it proceeds. No action is taken to ascertain what the learners are doing.

In Figure 3 framing is expressed in terms of its strength or weakness using standard Bernsteinian notation – F^{++} representing the strongest framing (or teacher control) over the evaluation criteria and F^{-} representing very weak framing. F^0 will be explained below. A sample of lessons was then coded using the coding scheme. Each lesson was coded for 19 indicators (such as the one above) for the different dimensions of pedagogy as offered by the theory. In the course of this initial analysis changes were made to the coding scheme. A similar process had already been undertaken with the pilot data and the coding scheme, and this was repeated. The coding scheme in the end went through at least six iterations. The ‘external language of description’ (Bernstein, 2000) – the indicators, or theoretical constructs – was thus developed through iterations between the theory and the empirical data.

An analysis of text and the F^0 value

Criticisms of the use of Bernstein’s work in South Africa have often referred to the mechanical deployment of the categories, where “It would appear, from the criticisms made, that we enter the field with categories shaped rather like containers, into which we scoop our data!” (Ensor and Hoadley, 2004). Here, I want to show, at some length, how the potential for theory development opens up through analysis. This is a modest exemplar, but it does illustrate the generative effects of the process of analysis in terms of the theoretical concepts informing the study. In its specificity, Moore (2001) explains how Bernstein’s theory holds the potential to avoid the circularity referred to earlier:

By rigorously specifying in advance what we should expect to see if the theory holds, we can measure the limitations of the theory if we fail to find it or encounter other things unexpected and unspecified. In this way the theory can avoid the circularity that so often characterises (and vitiates) research applications of theories lacking such methodological depth (p.368).

Bernstein’s sociological theory of pedagogy presents the researcher with a highly systematic account of how pedagogy works. The theory is worked out with a rigour and precision that gives rise to an array of inter-related concepts that have a delicacy and ‘methodological depth’ which is extremely useful to the researcher.

However, Bernstein’s theoretical categories do not allow for a direct reading of the empirical: a language of description is needed, and a significant amount of work needs to be undertaken in order to bring the concepts closer to the data for its reading. Here I illustrate an instance of where such work was done, in relation to the conceptual category framing. I also reflect on some of the

difficulties raised earlier in working with the concept. I take an example from classroom observation data generated in the broader study (Hoadley, 2005) to show how the theoretical range F^{++} to F^{--} for the evaluative rules failed to capture certain pedagogical forms in the data. The example comes from a Grade 3 literacy lesson in a classroom in a school in Khayelitsha. The children in the classroom come from the surrounding working class community. The lesson is one of a number focusing on the theme of trees.

The teacher stands at the front of the class and pages through the textbook. All the learners have a copy of the textbook in front of them.

- 1 Teacher: 'Here people, I like this section on leaves. We were learning about trees, neh? And
- 2 then went on to leaves.

The teacher goes on to explain what the book says about colours, that there are shades of colours, for example, blue-green. She copies a set of leaves, which shows these colour variations, from the textbook onto the board. However, she copies only the set of leaves, not the colours. What the teacher has encountered in the textbook is the end of a previous section on colours, which precedes a section on trees. The iconographic indicator – leaves – has led her to select this page as leaves relate to the more general theme in use, trees. But the topic of trees is only addressed halfway down the page. The lesson continues.

The teacher numbers the leaves she has drawn on the board and the learners shout out the numbers as she writes them. The teacher then moves directly onto the next section in the book on trees.

- 3 Teacher: He says here there are parts of the tree, that's what I like, but then he says we don't
- 4 tell colours as they are. So here are the parts of the tree. He says write them in their order from
- 5 the biggest to the smallest. Read these as I write them on the board.

The teacher writes on the board: tree, leaf, branch, bush, and addresses the learners.

- 6 Teacher: Which are found at the bottom of a tree?
- 7 Learner: Roots are found at the bottom of the tree.
- 8 Teacher: No no. Don't tell me things you haven't seen. I'm not asking for what you've thought
- 9 about, I'm asking for what you've seen. Okay, from the tree, bush, leaf and branch, which one
- 10 do you get from the bottom of the tree? Things that you get at the bottom. Bottom, bottom.'

The teacher underlines 'bottom' on the board. Another learner says roots. After a while the teacher looks back at the text book and realises that she has made a mistake, reading 'tree, bush, branches, leaf', instead of 'stem, roots, branches, leaves'. She moves directly on to the next question, which requires writing from biggest to smallest, tree, branch, leaf, bush. Learners respond and the teacher writes each word on the board. She then returns to the question of what is found at the bottom of the tree. As she writes, learners repeat the words over and over again. The following exchange occurs as she moves onto the next section in the book:

- 11 Learners: leaves, leaves, leaves, leaves, leaves, leaves leaves, leaves, leaves leaves, leaves,
12 leaves leaves, leaves, leaves
13 Teacher: Hey stop. The reason why we are repeating this is because you do your own thing
14 when I turn my back on you. Now the writer says the same words rhyme at the end. Now
15 we've done a tree. Haven't we done a tree?
16 Learners: Yes Miss. Yes we've done it.
17 Teacher: Now we know how a tree is formed. Now the writer says there are certain words that
18 rhyme at the end. This is what I like. And he also says write those that rhyme in the box.
19 [Teacher looks at the book for a while] Ja, here's work. Close your books. I'll give you work on
20 the board. Don't talk Grade 3. Don't talk, don't talk. Sleep on your desks. Lower your heads.

The teacher writes 6 words on the board: tree, fruits, home, flowers, smoke, bushes, roots.

- 21 Teacher: Listen, listen. I did not say shout on the top of the roof. Now write the rhyming words.
22 He [the author of the textbook] says some words are rhyming at the end so he wants you to
23 write those that rhyme at the end. Here's the correct date, the thirty-first. Let's write. Let's
24 work. No talking. I want rhyming words. I want rhyming words. I want rhyming words.

Later the teacher bangs on her table with a ruler and shouts at the learners to be quiet.

- 25 Teacher: Write, write, even though you don't know.

The teacher sits at her desk for the remaining 23 minutes of the lesson. At no point does she see what learners are writing. The bell rings for break and learners close their books and go out.

A consideration of the coding of this lesson will be illustrative of the coding procedure in general, and what I define as the F^0 category in particular.

In terms of the regulative discourse, the hierarchical rules would be coded F^{++} . The control relation is generally about constraint and is based on the teacher/pupil hierarchy, rather than an explication of rules or principles underlying the control. In this imperative form (F^{++}) the acquirer is given no options in responding to the control of the teacher, apart from an explicit challenge to authority.

Selection and sequence in this instance would both be coded F^{++} . The reason for this is that the teacher decides what knowledge will be transmitted and in what order transmission will take place. Learners are not given opportunities to alter the selection and the sequence of the knowledge, even where, at one point (line 7) their interjections potentially are a corrective to the teacher's

misreading of the text.³

The coding of the framing of pacing is slightly more complex. Although it is clear that the pace of the lesson is extremely slow, it is the teacher who controls this. Learners do not intervene when they have completed work well ahead of time. It is the teacher who asserts the pacing or expected rate of transmission. She decides that the lesson will continue until the bell rings, and learners do not have control over the stipulated pacing. Pacing is therefore also coded F⁺⁺.

A problem arises, however, in the coding of the evaluative criteria. The required performance of learners ultimately is to copy down words that rhyme, but no concept of rhyming is transmitted, and its recognition is potentially opaque to the learners. Because the evaluative criteria have not been transmitted, the teacher can only elicit the legitimate text from the learners on the basis of assertion: 'Write, write, even though you don't know' (line 25), and that legitimate text appears devoid of instructional content. The learners are required to write; *what* they write does not seem to matter.

Similarly, the earlier exchange in the same lesson unfolds as:

Teacher: Now we've done a tree. Haven't we done a tree?

Learners: Yes Miss. Yes we've done it.

Teacher: Now we know how a tree is formed (lines 14–17).

Again, the legitimate text is extracted on the basis of assertion. The learners had merely named parts of a tree up to this point; they had not addressed 'how a tree is formed'.

The framing of the evaluative criteria is difficult to categorise as either weak or strong. Thus the category F⁰ in the coding scheme has been developed in order to capture such instances of transmission, which appear devoid of evaluative criteria relating to the instructional discourse, or where these are

³ However, it could be argued that, in this case, the teacher in fact substitutes the textbook for herself; or she recruits a proxy voice – the sequence and selection of the textbook – because her voice isn't able to do the pedagogic work. Neither student nor teacher here appears to be controlling the knowledge but rather the textbook is followed to the word, strongly dictating the sequence and selection. So an initial (iconic) selection in terms of the theme 'trees' is made, but from there the sequencing follows that of the textbook from the top of the page to the bottom.

obscured by regulative criteria.⁴ That is, the transmission of principles relating to the subject knowledge are obscured. All is about comportment, form, or behaviour. The descriptor for one of the indicators for F^0 for the evaluative criteria reads:

Evaluative criteria: In the introduction/explanation/exposition to a topic/task
 F^0 – It appears as if no attempt is made to transmit the concepts and principles in the instructional practice. What counts as a successful production in terms of instructional knowledge is therefore totally unclear. The purpose of the task/activity/discussion is unclear. Learners are unclear as to how to proceed, or they are only given criteria relating to how they should *behave*.

It is also evident from this example that the coding of the data can at times be derived only in conjunction with an assessment of what learners recognize and realize in their performances. This is because there must be certainty (using this instance as an example) that the learners have not spent several prior lessons focusing on rhyme, and that the absence of an explicit articulation of the evaluative criteria could therefore be considered redundant. In such cases reference can be made to learner productions and learner notebooks, or to observation of learners carrying out the tasks, or to a consideration of a ‘teaching unit’: a series of lessons with a particular trajectory.

The evaluative criteria can also not be coded as extremely weak (F^-), as this would imply that it is the learners who have control over what the legitimate text would constitute. The strong framing over the hierarchical rules and rules of selection mitigate against this. It must be emphasized that F^0 does not lie on the continuum (i.e. it is not extremely weak framing), but rather is a rupture. F^0 represents an inability to observe the code. It may also point to a breakdown in pedagogic discourse, or the absence of (a particular dimension of) pedagogy. Bernstein (2000) at one point does suggest the possibility of the F^0 . In the following quotation we recall that realization rules are transmitted and acquired through framing relations and the recognition rules through classification:

Many children of the marginal classes may indeed have a recognition rule, that is, they can recognise the power relations in which they are involved, and their positioning in them, but they may not possess the realisation rule. If they do not possess the realisation rule, they cannot speak the expected legitimate text. These children in school, then, will not have

⁴ There is not an absence of control. The teacher asserts control here, but there is no evidence of the teachers’ specialized voice. Without the evaluative criteria – that which specifies the legitimate text, students are unable to recognise what is required, and the teacher does not evaluate their productions according to instructional criteria. Consequently the evaluative rules are coded F^0 .

acquired the legitimate pedagogic code, but they will have acquired their place in the classificatory system. For these children, *the experience of school is essentially an experience of the classificatory system and their place in it* (Bernstein, 2000, p.17, my emphasis).

Bernstein here acknowledges the possibility that one can be positioned within the school (that is, one always gets sorted into the social relation) but have no access to the realization rule. The question arises as to how one codes framing values in such a pedagogy. Here I propose the necessity of including an F^0 value for the framing over the evaluative criteria where the absence of being able to observe the pedagogic code for instructional discourse is confronted. In a sense, it represents a *collapse of the instructional discourse into the regulative discourse*.

Dowling (1999) develops a detailed critique of framing. His response to the difficulties alluded to above is to dispense with framing. He does this because he does not operate with a notion of boundary. Classification for him refers to degrees of specialization rather than strength of insularities, and his project is to analyze the contents of the classification rather than elucidate its structure. I would argue, however, that the distinction between classification and framing in the analysis of the reproduction of differences through pedagogy and the specializing of consciousness is crucial. This is because the theoretical underpinnings of these concepts in power and control, and the social division of labour and social relations, allow for a consideration of the making and the unmaking of power.

This brings us back to the power (classification) and control (framing) dialectic. If the framing (over instructional content in the evaluative rules) is absent, the potential for the unmaking of the classification is compromised. In the extract we see a weak classification of school knowledge – the labeled parts of the tree are not related to the formation of the tree, the words are not interrogated in terms of the concept of rhyming. There is a predominance of everyday activity in naming, and conceptual elements are subordinated to the theme of trees. It is through the evaluative rules that we would see the strengthening (or weakening) of these boundaries. This would entail a specification of what it is that learners should know, do or understand with respect to the instructional knowledge. Without this there can be no change in the classification. One is merely sorted. One is stuck.

When there is an apparent absence of evaluative criteria, what then is sequenced, selected and paced? Is it possible that F^0 in fact represents an absence of pedagogy, and should therefore be bracketed off from an analysis of classification and framing? The reluctance to do this is based on what we know from classroom research – that this is a form of pedagogy (or non-

pedagogy) not uncommon in schools in South Africa (see especially Ensor *et al*, 2004; Hoadley, 2003; Jacklin, 2004). Within the same analytic framework, therefore, I have attempted to capture more conventional understandings of what pedagogy entails, and that which appears to fall outside these understandings, or 'pedagogic breakdown'.

But there is not an absence of transmission activity. It is still necessary to elucidate what it is that is transmitted, if not the evaluative rules. This is where the theory needs to be either extended or considered in relation to alternative explanatory frameworks. In the broader project (Hoadley, 2005) I drew on the work of Dowling (1998) to look at the contents of the meanings transmitted. His notions of localizing and specializing strategies in particular allowed for a consideration of the relationship between what was transmitted and the domain to which it referred. Knowledge in this analysis draws its authority either from the public domain (broadly everyday meanings), or the esoteric domain (disciplinary understandings). Unlike Dowling, however, I do not eschew framing. In this particular case, framing allows for the analysis of what it is that is absent in the structure of the pedagogy, and what the implications are with respect to power and control relations.

To return now to the extract and its analysis, it is not possible to draw conclusions on the basis of a single lesson, but were we to find this patterning of pedagogy across a series of lessons, weeks, a year, we could then say that the potential for the specialization of the students' voice is seriously undermined in the pedagogy. The students' potential for acquiring the school code is compromised.

The general methodology for operationalizing the concepts of classification and framing broadly follows the work of Morais and Neves (2001); Morais, Neves and Pires (2004); and more generally the work of the Sociological Studies of the Classroom project at the University of Lisbon (ESSA). However, the original theory of classification and framing was developed in contexts of schooling that were possibly far more functional, in conventional notions of the working of schools, than many schools found in South Africa. Further, the theory and its application to classroom observation data was extended and developed largely in Portugal with respect to science, two contexts which are in all probability far more strongly classified than phenomena that arise in other contexts (for example, literacy learning in South Africa, shown in the example above).

Thus, in order to capture pedagogy of very different types on the same scale, it was necessary to extend that scale to include a greater range of pedagogic forms, and this emerged in relation to the framing of the evaluative rules. In this way the original theory begins to open up both the possibilities and the

exigencies for further theorizing. However, it was necessary to start with a sound theory in order to make this visible. “Without a model, the researcher can never know what could have been and was not” (Bernstein, 2000, p.135).

Discussion

What does classification and framing offer? It shows the inner logic of pedagogy and reveals the structuring of inequality with respect to different groups of pupils. We have known for a long time that schooling reproduces inequalities, or at the least interrupts these in very limited measure. We need to know exactly how. Why, beyond academic interest? A number of studies have attempted to make explicit pedagogic modalities which optimise learning for working class children.

The on-going work of ESSA (for example, Morais and Miranda, 1996; Morais and Neves, 2001; Morais, Neves and Pires, 2004) has focused on the micro processes in the classroom to explore the “relations present in the context of reproduction of the pedagogic discourse” (Neves, Morais and Afonso, 2004, p.280). The various authors show that specific aspects of pedagogic practice are favourable to the development of the elaborated coding orientation required by the school (Fontinhas, *et al.*, 1995). The work of ESSA comprises action research, and more effective pedagogic modalities, derived from the research, are designed and tested with learners from different social class backgrounds. Teachers are thus explicitly trained to teach particular modalities of elaborated code.

Morais (2002) summarizes some of the results of the empirical work of the ESSA, explicitly defining what values of classification and framing, along which dimensions, proved optimal for enhanced achievement of working-class students. Consistent with all of the ESSA work, Morais (2002) again stresses “explicating the evaluative criteria as the most crucial aspect of a pedagogic practice to promote higher levels of learning of all students” (p.568).

In particular, for students from lower social groups, the explication of the evaluative rules, and weak framing over pacing, creating the opportunity for students to intervene in the expected rate of their acquisition, are those aspects identified as being most crucial in facilitating their access to school learning. Likewise Rose (2004), in his research into literacy pedagogy for ‘indigenous learners’, specifies precisely the dimensions facilitating a weakening of the negative relation between social class and educational achievement: a weakening of the framing of pacing and sequencing rules, and a weakening of “the framing regulating the flow of communication between the school classroom and the community the school draws on” (p.106).

In the light of these findings, F^0 for the evaluative criteria is a particularly devastating indictment on what opportunities, especially working class, children have for learning in some South African schools. There is an opening to explore further, in the South African context, what the optimal variation along the pedagogic dimensions offered by the theory, are for working class children here.

Further, and particularly in relation to the South African context, an analysis of pedagogy which specifies its intricate dimensions allows us to think more carefully about the external regulation of teaching. If we are aware that there are many teachers whose voice is inadequately specialized for the task of transmitting school knowledge, then questions are raised as to what form of teacher training we advance, and what type of curricula and textbooks we construct. In the latter case, if teachers recruit the textbook as a proxy voice, it is necessary to consider the level of specificity in particular in relation to conceptual knowledge contained in textbooks. We need to question how it is that we can design curricula most likely to advantage those that most need teachers to make explicit what the criteria are for their success at school. Bernstein's theory allows us to pay close attention to how power structures and how control makes and unmakes the categories into which learners are sorted.

References

Atkinson, P. 1985. *Language, structure and reproduction: an introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Methuen.

Bernstein, B. 1975. *Class, codes and control volume 3: towards a theory of educational transmissions*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, B. 1990. *Class, codes and control, volume 4: the structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. 1996. *Pedagogy symbolic control and identity: theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Bernstein, B. 2000. *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: theory, research and critique*. Revised edition. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dooley, K.T. 2001. *Adapting to diversity: pedagogy for Taiwanese students in mainstream Australian secondary school classes*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Brisbane: Griffith University. Available at: <http://www4.gu.edu.au:8080/adt-root/uploads/approved/adt-QGU20030102.105906/public/02Whole.pdf>

Dowling, P. 1998. *The sociology of mathematics education: mathematical myths/pedagogic texts*. Falmer: London.

Dowling, P. 1999. Basil Bernstein in frame: ‘Oh dear, is this a structuralist analysis?’. Available at:
<http://www.ioe.ac.uk/ccs/dowling/kings1999/index.html>

Ensor, P. and Hoadley, U.K. 2004. Developing languages of description to research pedagogy. *Journal of Education*, 32, pp.81–104.

Ensor, P., Dunne, T., Galant, J., Gumedze, F., Jaffer, S., Reeves, C. and Tawodzera, G. 2002. Textbooks, teaching and learning in primary mathematics classrooms. In Lubisi, C. and Malcolm, C. (Eds), Proceedings of the 10th SAARMSTE Conference. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.

Fontinhas, F., Morais, A.M. & Neves, I.P. 1995. Students’ coding orientation and school socializing context in their relation with students’ scientific achievement. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32(5): pp.445–462.

Hasan, R. 2002. Semiotic mediation, language and society: three exotropic theories – Vygotsky, Halliday and Bernstein. Presentation to the Second International Basil Bernstein Symposium: Knowledges, pedagogy and society. Cape Town, July.

Hoadley, U.K. 2003. Time to learn: pacing and the external regulation of teachers’ work. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 299(3): pp.47–62.

Hoadley, U.K. 2005 Social class, pedagogy and the specialization of voice in four South African primary schools. Unpublished PhD thesis. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Holland, J. 1981. Social class and changes in orientations to meaning. *Sociology*, 15: pp.1–18.

Jacklin, H.J. 2004. Repetition and difference: a rythmanalysis of pedagogic practice. Unpublished PhD thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Moore, R. 2001. Obituary: Basil Bernstein 1924–2000. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(3): pp.367–370.

Morais, A. 2002. Basil Bernstein at the micro level of the classroom. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4): pp.559–569.

Morais, A.M. and Miranda, C. 1996. Understanding teachers' evaluation criteria: a condition for success in science classes. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 33(6): pp.601–624.

Morais, A. and Neves, I. 2001. Pedagogical social contexts: studies for a sociology of learning. In Morais, A., Neves, I., Davies, B. and Daniels, H. (Eds). *Towards a sociology of pedagogy: the contribution of Basil Bernstein to research*. New York: Peter Lang.

Morais, A., Neves, I. and Pires, D. 2004. The *what* and the *how* of teaching and learning. In Muller, J., Davies, B. and Morais, A. (Eds). *Reading Bernstein, researching Bernstein*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Neves, I., Morais, A. and Afonso, M. 2004. Teacher training contexts: study of specific sociological characteristics. In Muller, J., Davies, B. and Morais, A. (Eds). *Reading Bernstein, researching Bernstein*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Pedro, E.R. 1981. *Social stratification and classroom discourse: a sociolinguistic analysis of classroom practice*. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education, Department of Educational Research.

Rose, D. 2004. Sequencing and pacing of the hidden curriculum: how indigenous children are left out of the chain. In Muller, J., Davies, B. and Morais, A. (Eds). *Reading Bernstein, researching Bernstein*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Taylor, N., Muller, J. and Vinjevold, P. 2003. *Getting schools working*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.

Ursula Hoadley
University of Cape Town and Human Sciences Research Council

uhoadley@hsrc.ac.za