The research and policy discourses of service integration, interprofessional and interagency working: ESRC seminar 1 proceedings

UNIVERSITY
OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

UNIVERSITY of
ULSTER

The research and policy discourses of service integration, interprofessional and interagency working: ESRC seminar 1 proceedings

Joan Forbes (Editor)

THE RESEARCH AND POLICY DISCOURSES OF SERVICE INTEGRATION, INTERPROFESSIONAL AND INTERAGENCY WORKING: ESRC SEMINAR 1 PROCEEDINGS

Research Paper Editor:

Joan Forbes

University of Aberdeen

In 2005 a group of researchers from the universities of Aberdeen, Birmingham and Ulster was successful in winning an award in the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Seminar Series competition.

In May 2006, the first two day research seminar in the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Seminars Series: *Service integration in schools: research and policy discourses, practices and future prospects* was held at the School of Education, King's College, Aberdeen, to explore recent research concerned with the discourses which are currently constructing children's services integration and how professionals and professional groups work together in schools and communities in Scotland, Northern Ireland and England.

The aim of this seminar series is to bring together practitioners, researchers, and policy makers from the various disciplines that inform policy and practice in education, health and social care, together with representatives of voluntary agencies, professional associations and service users, to explore a number of important questions for practitioners and professional groups arising from current moves towards children's services integration. Seminar themes include:

- the changed policy goals and mechanisms for policy-making and delivery;
- new 'bottom up' relationships with service users and user communities;
- issues of governance and the organisation of associative and communal relations in schools;
- the operation of new versions of networked professionalism; and

- practitioners' constructions of new professional identities.

The objectives of this seminar series are to:

- examine the tensions and complementarities in the discourses of inter-professional and interagency working which are drawn upon by the different disciplines and professional groups in relation to the idea of service integration;
- explore other 'global' solutions that might inform education and children's services interprofessional and interagency policy and practice within the UK nations;
- identify opportunities to build collaborative research networks and openings for synergies in theoretical scholarship and empirical research.

The papers from the first seminar in the series are now brought together in this collection, *The Research and Policy Discourses of Service Integration, Inteprofessional and Interagency Working: Research Seminar Proceedings*, published in the *Research Papers* series of the University of Aberdeen, School of Education. In keeping with the seminars, this collection is intended for practitioners, managers and leaders, academics and policy-makers from the fields of education, health and social care.

It is intended that this publication, and a series of future research papers linked to the *Service integration in schools: research and policy discourses, practices and future prospects* seminars series, will present thoughtful and challenging analyses of recent developments in children's services policy across the UK nations, critiquing fundamental issues of children's services restructuring and interprofessional relationships.

RESEARCH DIRECTIONS IN THE DISCOURSES OF INTERPROFESSIONALISM

Michael Cowie
University of Aberdeen

Inter-agency networks of professionals in education, health and social welfare, with multi-agency teams collaborating in more meaningful ways than previously found in schools, are central to a new and different approach to schooling in Scotland, with all schools becoming Integrated Community Schools by 2007. Improved co-ordination of existing services is seen as unlikely to be enough and it is argued that collaborative working requires to be guided by a set of integrated objectives, led by staff skilled in and committed to integrated approaches and set within an integrated management structure. The introduction of collaboration is seen as unproblematic.

The papers in this collection, however, illustrate that the nature of collaborative working is not unproblematic. The paper by Janet Shucksmith, Kate Philip, Jennifer Spratt and Cate Watson builds on an empirical study previously undertaken for the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) on how behavioural issues are dealt with in schools and the extent to which these might be caused by mental health problems. The focus of the paper in this collection is on the collaborative partnerships formed by teachers and schools with other agencies and professional groups and on the extent to which teachers were prepared to collaborate and share knowledge and skills with professionals. Based on a wide range of interviews and six detailed case studies of the experiences of several different schools and interventions, Shucksmith and her colleagues highlight some of the difficulties involved in effecting integration. Most schools exported problems off site or offered integrated services on site, utilising another agency or professional group and devolving specific authority to that agency or group. Because the structures that were put in place to support the services were not integrated, most teaching staff were not exposed to the ways of work of other professionals. Very few used integrated service teams to develop practice in innovative ways.

Shucksmith *et al.* point out that much of the literature on collaborative working rests on an easy assumption that through some form of osmosis consensual solutions will emerge if professionals from different fields are brought together. This assumption neglects issues to do with identity, power and status in particular contexts and how these considerations may influence the extent to which professionals are willing to learn from professionals in other fields and collaborate with them in integrated ways.

This paper analyses data gained in the case studies and uses Lam's (2000) typology of knowledge as a heuristic tool to explore and explain the readiness of teachers to collaborate and share knowledge and skills with other agencies and professional groups. What is implicit in the typology is that some forms of knowledge types are of a higher order than others, with 'embrained' knowledge (abstract, theoretical knowledge) and 'encoded' knowledge (which fortifies professional competence) valued more than 'embodied' and 'embedded' knowledge (the individual and collective forms of tacit knowledge). However, analysis of the interview data suggests that the forms of knowledge most valued by teachers are the 'craft skills' developed through reflection on experience over time. This leads Shucksmith and her colleagues to conclude that the value teachers place on 'embodied' and 'embedded' forms of knowledge is an integral part of their professional self-identity. This suggests that co-working challenges the authority and autonomy of teachers in quite fundamental ways and that initiatives are unlikely to succeed if their aims are not in touch with teachers' needs and do not connect with their 'embodied' and 'embedded' knowledge.

Embedded knowledge involves shared norms and professional routines and when it comes to collaborative working Shucksmith *et al.* suggest that teachers may feel uneasy at the boundaries of communities of practice where there may be divergence and interaction with professionals using other forms of knowledge.

However, the paper ends on an optimistic note, with reference to the interplay between agency and structure and to contemporary thinking on how professional knowledge is constructed through the tensions and discontinuities of lived experience, raising the possibility that one reaction of teachers to the challenge to their professional identity may be to 'reinvent their professionality and practice'.

The paper by Elspeth McCartney also tries to get a better understanding of what is involved in inter-agency working by considering how speech and language therapists (who have already 'been around the block') operate in schools. McCartney first describes and summarises some of the models of co-professional working found in the literature. Four dimensions are used (who works with the child; egalitarian relationships; supportive relationships; and who sets targets). As McCartney points out, no model is intrinsically better or worse than any other and different models can be used in different contexts.

The 'consultancy model', where speech and language therapists advise teachers on language teaching procedures, is the most prevalent model in the UK. The limitations of this model are discussed, as are some of the reasons for its continued use. Despite the policy imperative for integrated service delivery and a generally more propitious systems environment, a range of systemic factors continues to impair co-professional working. Drawing on examples raised by speech and language therapist students, as well as examples gathered in research with teachers in schools, McCartney highlights the interactive relationship between social structure and organizational culture.

In exploring some of the functional differences and limits to co-professional working, the paper reviews key issues and provides illustrative examples of 'culture clashes'. This highlights what speech and language therapists can and cannot do as employees of the National Health Service and regulated by the Health Professions Council, and McCartney contrasts this with learning support teachers who can work with all pupils. Other issues discussed include the limitation placed on the ability to be flexible caused by heavy case loads, measures of success and the influence of different research paradigms, and the right of children not to accept the service offered by speech and language therapists.

McCartney suggests some practical measures that could be taken to improve roles and relationships within existing structures and suggests that some reconfiguring within new structures would be helpful, but she also argues that there are some immutable differences between the health and education services, which means that convergence of the two services is unlikely. She also points out, however, that immutable

differences in professions need not prevent the co-working necessary for understanding the perspectives of others.

The paper by Julie Allan provides a philosophical basis for considering the implications of policy imperatives. She first considers the discursive aspects of policy; how people are constructed through policy and how this works on people in their particular professional contexts. The reader is reminded of the political nature of the policy making process and that policy texts are not the rational documents they may appear to be, but Allan's main focus is on policy as discourse and how policy discourses constrain inter-professional practice.

Like the other papers in this collection, this paper also questions the presumption that enjoinders to collaborate will be productive. Allan argues that collaborative working both among teachers and with others needs to be learned and developed over time because complex relationships are involved. She also points out that government policy itself is not entirely 'joined up,' with some policies encouraging practice which runs counter to the collaborative policy imperative.

The paper draws on the work of Derrida (1974) and Deleuze and Guattari (1987, 1994) ('philosophers of difference') and challenges the prevailing policy discourse. Allan argues that the certainty and closure of official policy documents on professionalism and inter-professionalism can be interrupted by thorough analysis (deconstruction) to expose double contradictory imperatives (aporias) that pull teachers in different directions. Allan goes on to argue that deconstruction of policy texts should be explored in preparing teachers because until these aporias are opened up they will be a source of confusion and uncertainty. Although disruptive, Allan argues that deconstruction should be seen as a positive and empowering process because it is in the areas of uncertainty where choices have to be made that student teachers could be pushed into inventing new practices and be more disposed to collaborate with other teachers and other professionals.

Allan also argues that if existing understandings and ways of behaving are to be changed, teacher education needs to be 'deterritorialized' and the ruptures that would create would encourage more creative thinking and productive learning. Part of this

process, she argues, would involve losing aspects of what is currently undertaken in teacher education, allowing more scope for inter-professional work.

The attractions of disrupting conventional knowledge about teaching and learning through 'rhizomic wanderings' are also discussed, with student teachers supported in creating new knowledge and in becoming the kind of teachers they themselves want to become.

Allan points out that if professionals are to engage in collaborative work then it makes sense that space is needed within pre-service training for people from different professions to learn together and engage with each other, and that this should continue through on-going continuous professional development, with more specific focus on the development of inter-disciplinary working practice and space provided for professionals to recover some lost ground. She also argues that collaboration may not only improve practice but also enable 'rhizomic inter-dependency,' which would support and encourage teachers and other professionals to challenge existing ways of doing things and find creative solutions for themselves.

But first, Allan argues, it is important to recognise the nature of the contradictory demands on teachers before rupturing the processes of teacher education and professional development. What is required is to create opportunities for teachers and others to find creative solutions to the challenges they face which are likely to be more productive than imposed plans.

Taken together, the papers in this collection provide empirical, practical and theoretical perspectives on the nature of collaborative working and demonstrate how problems inherent in the micro realities of implementing a national policy initiative have been ignored or neglected by policy makers. In particular, the papers point to the need to take account of the concerns of individuals and professional groups, the interrelationships of the people involved and the operational assumptions that influence how they approach their work. If individuals working in different public services are to work together in more coordinated ways to achieve the aims of integrated service provision, this collection of papers suggests that more consideration will need to be given to the beliefs, values and assumptions that guide teachers and

other professionals and the means by which these are developed, influenced and shared.

LEARNING HOW TO COLLABORATE? PROMOTING YOUNG PEOPLE'S HEALTH THROUGH PROFESSIONAL PARTNERSHIP IN SCHOOLS

Janet Shucksmith
University of Teesside

Kate Philip, Jennifer Spratt and Cate Watson
University of Aberdeen

Abstract

An empirical study undertaken in 2004/6 for the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) looked at how schools were responding to the increasing incidence and severity of behavioural problems and the extent to which these might be the result of mental health problems in children. A key question within the study was the extent to which schools had formed collaborative partnerships with other agencies or service providers to help them address these issues. While policy since 1997 has consistently advocated co-working for children's benefit, empirical studies have shown a range of difficulties confronting such delivery partnerships.

In this paper Lam's (2000) typology looking at different types of knowledge is used to examine how, in a co-working situation, different professional groups call on different types of knowledge to validate their claims to expertise. How powerful each of these groups are will be significant in how valid their claims to expertise in working on mental health are. Working at the boundaries with other professional groups calls into question the types of knowledge that teachers traditionally rely on and can be an uncomfortable experience.

The paper concurs with the perspective that professionalism is constructed not through bureaucratic diktat, but rather through a struggle from within the cracks, crevices and contradictions of practice. A question remains as to whether the teaching profession can reinterpret such challenges to their authority and autonomy as opportunities to reinvent their professionalism and practice.

Introduction

This paper builds on an empirical study undertaken in 2005/6 for the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) which looked at how schools were responding to the increasing problem with behavioural issues in children and the extent to which these might be the result of mental health problems.

For schools to take on a significant role in the promotion of mental health requires a change in the way schools understand and respond to issues surrounding 'mental

health'. However, Weare (2004) argues that concepts of 'mental health' are not well understood in school, having belonged until recently within a medical discourse. Moreover, she suggests that 'schools often find it hard to see the relevance of mental health to their central concern with learning'. This may in part be related to the unfamiliarity of the language and the tendency for the term 'mental health' to be conflated with 'mental illness' since schools *are* familiar with the language of social and personal development and the importance of self-esteem in learning - both important components of mental health and well-being.

A key element of the study reported here was an observation of the extent to which schools were using collaboration with other agencies and professional groups to improve or extend their ability to deal with the new responsibilities being required of them by a raft of government policies emphasising the need for integrated working, user-led services and so on.

This paper reports on the patterns of service response to the new challenge, and the extent to which teachers seemed ready and willing to collaborate with other professional partners, and to share knowledge and skills in this new area of responsibility. Lam's (2000) typology of different types of knowledge, showing the preferencing of some forms of knowledge over others, is used as an initial framework to help understand how professional groups compete for power in the school setting in ways which may hinder collaboration and restrict professional learning.

Background

Recognition of the extent of children's needs in respect of mental health is just beginning to emerge:

> It has only recently become clear that mental ill health among children and adolescents is not confined to only a small proportion of young people, but is surprisingly common. Although mental disorders may not constitute catastrophes that disrupt young people's lives and futures, they cause much suffering, worry and disturbance and they can be precursors of severe disorders in adults. (World Health Organisation, 2004)

Worldwide, measures of child and adolescent mental health vary and are influenced by social and cultural factors. There is also a lack of consensus or shared understandings as to meanings (Rowling, 2002). However, the World Health Organisation reported recently that 'in many countries 25% of adolescents show symptoms of mental disorder'. The Mental Health Foundation estimates that 20% of children and adolescents are experiencing psychological problems at any one time (Target & Fonagy 1996, cited by MHF website). Bayer and Sanson (2003) within the Australian context discuss the difficulties of estimating the prevalence of childhood emotional problems but suggest that 'up to one young person in five from the general population has an emotional disorder at some time in their childhood'. They suggest that this may be an underestimate and that evidence suggests that prevalence may be greater among those born more recently, so the problem may increase in the future.

In the UK research indicates a decline in the mental health of children and adolescents over the last 25 years (MHF, 1999). However, as West and Sweeting (2003) point out, 'conclusive evidence on the issue is actually in very short supply'. One of the reasons for this lies in the methodological difficulties associated with researching this area. Recent research by Collishaw, Maughan, Goodman, and Pickles (2004) draws on data from three large-scale national longitudinal surveys over a period of 25 years between 1974 and 1999. Findings indicated increases in conduct problems across all social groups and family types for both boys and girls, more especially for what they termed 'non-aggressive' (stealing, lying, disobedience) than for 'aggressive' conduct problems (fighting, bullying). Their findings indicate that emotional problems ('misery, worries, fearful of new situations') remained stable between 1974 and 1986 but have increased in the period 1986 to 1999, again for both boys and girls. The authors also suggested a link between conduct problems in adolescence and 'multiple poor outcomes' in adulthood. While the research has attempted to overcome some of the limitations of previous studies in this area, for example using comparable measures of mental health over the period of investigation, the findings should still be interpreted with caution.

While the term 'mental health' and 'mental health problem' are terms used within health services, schools have, since the Warnock Report (DES, 1978), tended to use the term 'emotional and behavioural difficulties' (EBD) or 'social, emotional and behavioural difficulties' (SEBD) to refer to a range of difficulties that can create barriers to children's learning.

The definition is, however, problematic. SEBD is a non-normative construct, and as a label can be arbitrarily bestowed (Daniels, Visser, Cole, & De Reybekill, 1999). SEBD covers a continuum of behaviour and 'there is often considerable uncertainty about the boundaries between "normal" misbehaviour, emotional and behavioural difficulties, and mental illness' (Atkinson & Hornby, 2002, p.4). Conflation of constructs such as SEBD, disaffection and disruption highlights the value laden-ness of terms used to describe difficulties that impact on behaviour.

Better Behaviour, Better Learning (SEED, 2001a) recognises that there is no agreement on the meaning of the term 'SEBD' and adopts an inclusive definition:

> Whether a child 'acts out' (demonstrates bad behaviour openly) or 'acts in' (is withdrawn), they may have barriers to learning which require to be addressed. Children 'acting out' may be aggressive, threatening, disruptive and demanding of attention - they can also prevent other children learning. Children 'acting in' may have emotional difficulties which can result in unresponsive or even self-damaging behaviour. They can appear to be, depressed, withdrawn, passive or unmotivated; and their apparent irrational refusal to respond and co-operate may cause frustration for teachers and other children. (2.13)

Atkinson and Hornby (2002) suggest that a distinction needs to be drawn between 'occasional withdrawn or disruptive behaviour on the one hand and a continuum comprising EBD, mental health problems and disorders on the other', otherwise the child's problems may be dealt with inappropriately.

Criteria for determining the distinction between 'occasional withdrawn or disruptive behaviour', EBD, mental health problems and mental health disorders depend on such factors as the severity and the persistence of the problem, its complexity, the child's developmental stage, the presence or absence of protective/risk factors and the presence or absence of stressful social and cultural factors.

However, in all these cases the mental and emotional well-being of the child is likely to be compromised. It is necessary to recognise that this may occur either as the result of some long-standing diagnosed mental health problem such as conduct disorder, ADHD, anxiety or depression or it may arise as the result of, or be complicated by, adverse psychological events. Events such as bereavement or divorce, or life situations that give rise to stress (for example, being homeless, subject

to racial or sexual harassment, being bullied) may in themselves be part of the warp and weft of growing up but, coming on top of each other or of other life events, may trigger more deep-seated difficulties.

Policies in Scottish education now recognise the necessity for schools to deal with issues of children's mental well-being. In Scotland, all schools are to be health promoting schools by 2007 (*Being Well, Doing Well: A framework for health promoting schools in Scotland*, SEED, 2004a). Recent legislation on supporting children in schools broadens the previous definition of 'special needs' and shifts to a more inclusive focus of 'additional support needs' (Education Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act 2004). This will encompass any issue which could create a barrier to learning, whether long or short term, and arising from any cause.

The report of the Discipline Task Force (*Better Behaviour, Better Learning*, SEED, 2001a) and the recently published update (*Better Behaviour in Scottish Schools, Policy update*, SEED, 2004b) make a clear link between learning and behaviour and recognise that promoting better behaviour in schools requires the engagement of pupils and parents. The reports also acknowledge that both pupils and staff require adequate support in order to make schools safe and well-managed learning environments.

Recommendations for the development of support for pupils are contained within the National Review of Guidance 2004 (*Happy, Safe and Achieving their Potential: A standard of support for children and young people in Scottish schools*, SEED, 2005a). This report emphasises the importance of partnerships in developing pupil support and is particularly relevant to the programme for all of Scotland's schools to become Integrated Community Schools by 2007. The *Review of Provision of Educational Psychology Services in Scotland* (Scottish Executive, 2002b) addressed concerns about the recruitment, training and role of educational psychologists. The report recommended that educational psychologists develop a greater role in the provision of integrated services for children and families; and in working in a consultative capacity with schools.

In addition to these policy instruments related specifically to education, there has been a range of health and social care policy responses that relate to the support of children's mental well-being in schools. The report, *For Scotland's Children: Better Integrated Children's Services* (Scottish Executive, 2001), sets out the inequalities faced by Scotland's children and sets the agenda for the development of integrated service provision to ensure the best start in life for every child.

> If every child does matter, there is much to do and both the targeted and universal services that children and their families come into contact with must address better the picture presented here.

The *National Programme for Improving Mental Health and Well-being: Action Plan 2003-2006* (Scottish Executive, 2003) identifies the development of mental, emotional and social health and well-being in schools as a priority area and builds on the recommendations of the SNAP report (*Needs Assessment Report on Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, Public Health Institute of Scotland, 2003). This report emphasises the right of children and young people to be heard and their capacity to be engaged in the process of developing effective ways of promoting mental and emotional health; the importance of removing the stigma associated with mental ill-health; and the need to integrate promotion, prevention and care. As part of this programme, a draft consultation was issued in March 2005 (*Children and Young People's Mental Health*, Scottish Executive, 2004).

It's Everyone's Job to Make Sure I'm Alright was produced as a report by the Child Protection Audit and Review (Scottish Executive, 2002a). The review gives a comprehensive overview of services involved in child protection and emphasises the role of schools and other agencies and the need for 'joined up' responses to ensure children's protection. The report makes the link between child abuse/neglect and mental health problems which may manifest themselves as behavioural problems in school.

Taken together, these key reports and policy guidelines constitute a commitment on the part of government to develop 'joined up' responses to social injustice and exclusion. The role of the school within the community, providing a range of integrated services is central to this vision. However, it is apparent that different agencies and professionals have different perspectives about what 'joined up' means. The development of integrated assessment frameworks is an essential step in developing 'joined up' approaches (Gibson, Baldwin, & Daniel, 2005).

Methods

The study reported here did not attempt to make any assessment of the prevalence of mental health-related behaviour problems encountered in Scottish schools, but concerned itself rather with the extent to which schools had in place a culture or ethos which recognised mental health issues as lying at least in part within the professional remit of teachers. Since teachers and schools could hardly be expected to deal in isolation with such issues, a key question was to what extent they had formed collaborative partnerships with other agencies or service providers to help them address these issues.

The study encompassed three main phases of activity: a literature review; a mapping and scoping study to explore the extent of provision of services across all areas of Scotland; and then a more intensive look (through a set of in-depth case studies) at ways in which schools were rising to the challenge of addressing the mental health and well-being agenda with which they were newly charged.

The scoping study comprised a series of telephone interviews undertaken with local authority personnel (particularly educational psychologists and those with responsibility for pupil support) and local health board personnel in all local authority and health board areas in Scotland. In total, 67 interviews were carried out, using a structured framework similar to that developed in the DfES report on CAMHS work in schools (Pettitt, 2003). Additional stakeholder interviews included representatives from:

- Statutory organisations outwith the school system who work to promote mental health and well-being in young people or would have this as part of a general social care remit, e.g., social work, community development and youth workers in specialist settings (for example, alternatives to school projects), community psychiatric nurses, school nurses, early years workers;

- Representatives of children's voluntary organisations and charities concerned specifically with mental health or who have expertise with key groups of 'vulnerable' children;

- Representatives of mental health support groups and parent organisations;

- Those working in national level agencies on mental health and/or behaviour issues, e.g., NHS Scotland, Health Promoting Schools unit.

These interviews, undertaken throughout Scotland, were semi-structured, recorded and transcribed. Most were undertaken over the telephone for reasons of economy and time, but where possible, face-to-face interviews were conducted.

Case studies of the experience of individual schools/interventions formed an integral part of the field work for this project. Undertaking such work involves an in-depth approach to data collection (Yin, 2003) that gathered the views of all stakeholders in a setting, including teachers, managers, parents, pupils and extramural staff concerned with mental health or behaviour issues. Case study involves the compilation of data from a variety of sources and in a variety of formats, allowing - from the triangulation of perspectives - a view to emerge of the features of the setting, along with an analysis of those responses to problems which may hold promise for sustainable good practice in the field and which may be transferable to other practice situations.

Six case studies were undertaken. Case studies were selected from a total sampling frame derived from the stakeholder survey and interviews, and using theoretical parameters or typologies derived from the literature review. These were derived in discussion with SEED in order to ensure that the work was as focused as possible on the issue of interest.

The case studies selected were:

- ASSIST (Aberdeenshire Staged Intervention Supporting Teaching) - an initiative to support classroom teachers dealing with low-level disruption.
- The Place2Be - a UK charity providing therapeutic and emotional support to children in primary schools in Edinburgh.

- **Newbattle Integrated Community School Team** - This had developed from the New Community School pilot initiated in 1997 and was based in an area of Mid-Lothian which included areas of poverty and social exclusion. An integrated team headed up by a manager and including a range of professionals was based near a large secondary and worked closely in the school and feeder primaries.

- **East Renfrewshire Multidisciplinary Support Team** - a well-established Integrated Community School team which included a youth counsellor and a social worker, and demonstrated a commitment to individual and community wellbeing.

- **Clydebank High School Support Services Team** - an extended team in which pastoral care, learning support and behaviour support staff had been amalgamated, together with a group of pupil and family support workers.

- **The North Glasgow Youth Stress Centre** - a voluntary organisation working directly on mental and emotional well-being and behaviour with young people in three secondary schools and community settings.

Field work consisted of a concentrated site visit over a period of one week, with some follow-up interviews by telephone to confirm detail. The following types of data were collected: documentary material relating to the intervention (funding plans, minutes of meetings, letters to parents etc.); ethnographic observation data collected on site and recorded as field notes; semi-structured interviews at individual and group level with those delivering and managing the intervention, collaborating partners in other services, children and young people in receipt of the intervention, parents and carers, and ancillary staff (classroom auxiliaries, guidance staff).

Interviews with professionals were conducted as one-to-one or, where the school timetable allowed, as paired or group interviews. The format was semi-structured, allowing for freedom of response from the participants, and also enabling the interviewer to probe more deeply into areas of interest or concern to the participants. Parents were offered the choice of group interviews or one-to-one, to enable those who felt the issue too sensitive for wider discussion to express their views in

confidence. However, the inclusion of some group interviews allowed for collection of data from a larger number of participants.

Group interviews were conducted with children and young people. The emphasis was on the use of child-friendly methods, which focused discussion on vignettes which presented scenarios featuring fictional children. In this way pupils were invited to discuss issues relating to emotional and mental well-being in the abstract, only disclosing personal information if and when they chose to do so. This avoided drawing children into any discussions which might cause distress.

Data from the case studies were synthesised to produce richly textured accounts of action in practice.

Learning to collaborate

Before moving to examine the results emerging from the empirical work we pause here to explore the framework that has enabled us to begin interrogating the data.

The policy agenda that encourages co-working can be seen (in Foucauldian terms) as one aspect of a governmentality agenda (i.e., part of the formal and informal processes through which populations are governed). Apart from direct regulation, populations are governed more indirectly through processes operating through agencies, programmes, tactics and technologies. The negotiation of professional knowledge and expertise, and the recognition of its value lie at the heart of governmentality.

Lam's (2000) typology looks at different types of knowledge and at the preferencing of some forms of knowledge over others and helps us understand how different forms of power are negotiated. His typology is presented in the following table:

Embrained knowledge	Abstract, theoretical	Linked to professional bureaucracies - external bodies define standards of knowledge
Encoded knowledge	'Information'; does not allow for practical knowledge	Linked to 'machine bureaucracy' - allows standardisation and control; knowledge which fortifies professional compliance
Embodied knowledge	Individual; tacit; practical	E.g., an experienced mother's way of handling a crying child
Embedded knowledge	Collective form of tacit knowledge; based on shared norms, routines	E.g., the 'craft' aspects of classroom teaching

People move between different knowledges in their practices (see Brownlie & Howson, 2006, in discussion of GPs and health visitors in respect of MMR work), but it is also clear that in a co-working situation, different professional groups can call on different types of knowledge to validate their claims to expertise. How powerful each of these groups are will be significant in how valid their claims to expertise in working on mental health care are. Thus if community-based workers are described as 'specialists' in the field, they are accorded kudos but this may be less valid than medicalised specialist knowledge.

Education has struggled to produce an evidence base to support practice and policy, but there are clearly aspects of all these types of knowledge in the work of the teacher. We can look at the work of educational theorists like Bernstein, Bruner and so on as demonstrating examples of the embrained forms of knowledge. However, whilst most teachers will have studied these theories in initial training, it would not be an exaggeration to say that they rarely make much of an appearance thereafter. Perhaps we should also make a distinction between teachers' embrained knowledge about teaching and learning and the embrained subject-specific knowledge which is particularly required by teachers in the secondary sector. Forms of encoded knowledge dominate practice. A recent example might be the government edict about the teaching of synthetic phonics, but one could think of hundreds of others, from the virtues of differentiation to the wisdom or otherwise of the literacy hour. The rationale for these innovations is often shaky - policy-based evidence rather than

evidence-based policy being the order of the day - but standardisation is the goal and compliance is enforced. Teachers are not alone in highlighting the other important types of knowledge in their practice - the 'craft' aspects of classroom work, which are so much harder to teach in the abstract. In this respect they are not very far different from the craft qualities of the doctor whose 'bedside manner' and ability to empathise with patients may be critical to reaching an appropriate diagnosis. Embedded /embodied knowledge is clearly required for classroom management behaviour management and generally forming positive relations with pupils; although it has a basis in theoretical training, it is generally acknowledged to be honed considerably by practical experience, and by observing experienced practitioners.

In negotiating the role of different partners within systems of collaborative working it would seem likely that their understanding of one another's perspective and the complicated rituals involved in the dance to accommodate other people's ways of working owes something to the forms of knowledge which are preferenced in different situations. Thus, in dealing with children's routine bad behaviour en masse, as in the case of dealing with rowdy behaviour in a corridor, for example, teachers' embedded knowledge might seem the most legitimate and useful. In a different situation where a single child's violent or erratic behaviour was self-evidently the result of a form of post-traumatic stress disorder, as in the case of a refugee child arriving from a war-torn area of Africa for example, the educational psychologist's embrained knowledge is likely to be deferred to in choosing a treatment option.

In being asked to deal with mental health issues teachers may feel de-skilled, not only because they do not possess the embrained knowledge about mental health that the psychologist or mental health nurse might have but also because the issue may demand individual or one-to-one ways of working which lie outside the embodied and embedded craft skills of many teachers who habitually deal with children en masse or in groups. There is perhaps also an argument that embodied and embedded knowledge is harder to change. Embrained knowledge can be altered, through exposure to new and convincing forms of evidence, through debate or training and reading, but practical dispositions are harder to change (see our earlier article on Bourdieu and the role of *habitus*) (Spratt, Shucksmith, Philip & Watson, 2006). It is

these practical aspects of teaching that teachers are most fiercely protective of and claim that other workers don't and cannot understand.

Some over-simple assumptions are threaded through the literature on collaborative working which suggest that pulling representatives from different professional groups together to deliver services for children will result in a blurring of professional boundaries, the production of a utopian blend of capacities and insights in which dedicated professionals will come together to share their perspectives and arrive at a consensual resolution as to the best way forward. However, the extent to which collaborative working will result in some form of osmotic learning between professional groups - to produce utopian 'learning communities' - must be affected by the willingness of different partners to appreciate and value the knowledge base from which the others work. Implicit, if not explicit, in Lam's typology is a ranking of knowledge types, where - context aside - encoded knowledge trumps embodied knowledge or embedded knowledge by a long shot.

How willing would teachers be to learn from professional colleagues brought in to work alongside them? Sullivan and Skelcher (2002) suggest that 'assessment of partners' capacity to learn' should be incorporated into any evaluation of collaborative working.

Wight and Buston's (2003) study of teachers exposed to a new training on sexual health (SHARE) showed their reluctance to change and learn. The authors conclude that learning is less likely to occur (and innovations therefore more likely to fail) when the goals of the intervention do not overlap with teachers' previously perceived needs, particularly if these goals involve adopting a theoretical approach unrelated to their existing repertoire of teaching skills and tactics. Teachers in their study showed a singular lack of interest in the intended mechanism of behaviour change (based on a form of embrained knowledge) and were only really interested in facets of the scheme that added to their embodied or embedded teaching knowledge.

There is no reason to think that teachers are the only professional group that operate in this manner. A group of clinical epidemiologists who introduced Evidence Based Practice into medicine at McMaster University in Canada (clearly an attempt to base

practice on embrained or at worst encoded knowledge) have had 10 years to review their original work and now conclude (Guyatt, Meade, Jaeschke, Cook & Haynes, 2000, p.954) that for general practice doctors in the community:

> Habit, local practice patterns and product marketing may often be stronger determinants of practice [than research evidence]. Controlled trials have shown that traditional continuing education has little effect on combating these forces and changing doctors' behaviour. On the other hand, approaches that do change targeted clinical behaviours include one-to-one conversations with an expert, computerised alerts and reminders, preceptorships, advice from opinion leaders, and targeted audit and feedback. Other effective strategies include restricted drug formularies, financial incentives, and institutional guidelines.

We now explore the data generated in the scoping studies and more particularly the case studies to examine whether Lam's typology offers a way of understanding teachers' reactions to new challenges to their professional remit and identity.

Results

Patterns of ownership

The data demonstrate that co-working was being used to deliver a range of different or additional services in both universal and targeted ways. A crude description of the range is that children with difficult behaviour arising out of mental health problems were being dealt with in three main ways. Schools would either:

- **Export problems** off-site by referring troubled or poorly behaved children off for expert services delivered elsewhere or into containment schemes;
- **Import skills** into schools to solve problems of mental well-being/indiscipline, but devolve authority to another agency or professional group;
- **Retain ownership** of 'problem' in school, importing skills and personnel, but using these in integrated service teams to develop new approaches that are embedded in school life.

In practice there was considerable overlap between these categories. In addition, the tendency to see the categories as transitional (with a gradual move towards greater ownership of mental health/discipline issues by schools) may be misleading. Essentially, however, the typology is useful in forcing consideration of the extent to which schools are prepared to locate mental well-being/discipline issues in the school environment as well as in the child and his/her family background and to put in place structures which support young people, remediate problems and which operate preventatively.

The first of the three actions above obviously denies any 'ownership' of the problem, implies lack of skills in dealing with such issues and also perhaps a lack of willingness to learn. Both local authorities and health boards worked hard to stop schools shipping problems off-site. For some children with severe/enduring problems, access to specialist help will always be necessary, but it seems unlikely that Scottish schools in particular will be able for much longer to evade responsibility for tier 1 activities. Taking on the new challenge will necessitate a change of mindset and language, the development of new skills and the establishment of new structures within school.

A number of schools, already moving fast towards offering integrated services on site, were importing skills. Within this category, however, some bought-in other services, but many seemed reluctant to develop ownership of the problems, which meant little or no integration of work between professional groups. Parallel rather than integrated structures were put in place and the possibilities for collaborative working or learning from one another's practice were limited to a few members of staff only. This second model was by far the most common - offering additionality, rather than genuine integration.

Of the third model we saw precious few examples. The road to full integration and proper whole school working is, we suspect, a long and meandering one, involving full-scale review of structures, ethos and relationships inside and outside school. What new skills or new knowledge might teachers require to get them to the stage where they were able to be full participants in the integrated service delivery offered to young people with mental health problems?

New knowledge; new skills?

What opportunities were made in schools for learning to take place in respect of the need for new skills to tackle new responsibilities? In-service training is the obvious place to look, but from most accounts given to the researchers, it appeared that issues

of mental well-being were largely presented as part of an optional or extended menu. The implication of this is that not only were such opportunities brief but that it is likely to leave the issue of dealing with the topic to an (already involved) minority:

> In-service days are usually planned like years in advance and you'll get phone calls, 'We'd like you to come along and do an input on mental health'. 'Very good and how long would you like this session to last?' 'Oh, we're thinking about 45 minutes.' 'Right… ok.' So that is one of the challenges and one of the barriers. We do appreciate that time is precious for them but there is no way that you can do it justice [in that time] at all. (Voluntary sector representative)

> We just ignore that side… leave that to the pastoral people… 'that's your job, you can go and do all that'.. Probably we're so flaming busy delivering a curriculum that it's not the kind of thing that I would seek out on the CPD catalogue, you know. (Principal teacher)

Perhaps if opportunities to learn new skills formally are few, there is a lot of informal learning going on through working in proximity to one another? Unfortunately data from this study show that, even leaving aside the cases of overt hostility and 'trial by fire', there was a general and studied indifference between teachers and their professional colleagues (mostly on the part of teachers) with relatively little leakage of professional learning, dispositions and attitudes between teachers and others.

We found some indication that this was being tackled head on in some authorities by the deliberate establishment of 'mentoring' schemes, aimed at building capacity. Thus in Glasgow a team of peripatetic teachers had been trained to work with schools, both with pupils and teachers, to develop their understanding of mental health issues. Also within Glasgow we found a number of health development workers assigned to school clusters with a remit which deliberately included capacity building of other staff. One of these workers commented on the uphill struggle faced in her role:

> It's early stages and you have to have the same person in post to actually become ingrained into the education system. And for them to begin to value what you put in … it doesn't happen overnight. They still do see people like me as an add-on, not part of the bigger picture. (Health development officer)

People like us

Many teachers feel strongly that they can only learn from 'people like them' who work within the same environment and face similar problems, e.g., they feel that the

problems facing a class teacher are not the same as those facing people working one-to-one with children.

> Teachers don't like it when experts come in and tell them what to do but don't get their hands dirty with the pupils. (Education authority health staff tutor)

What we have here is a conscious valorising of the embodied and embedded forms of knowledge in Lam's framework.

> You can talk professional development all you like, but if it is done in an intellectual way people find it hard to take it on board in terms of their own practice. You would always hope that children and young people wouldn't suffer a significant emotional and mental health issue, but it's difficult for staff to understand these issues if they haven't experienced it. I think staff develop a better understanding if they have seen a case and experienced the interagency working. (Head of service)

In Wight and Buston's (2003) evaluation of a programme of training for teachers asked to deliver a new sex education programme, they found that this preferencing of embodied knowledge continued despite all attempts to drive forward a model of teaching action based on encoded knowledge. They comment:

> …there was little evidence that the third objective of the training, to improve teachers' understanding of the theoretical rationale for this behavioural change programme was achieved. This seemed to be of little concern to the teachers: when interviewed they rarely referred to the behavioural change objectives of the programme…and only one referred to its theoretical basis. (p.540)

Ten years before them, Brown and McIntyre (1993) had come to the same conclusion, namely that the poor level of success of many classroom innovations was due in large part to teachers' perceptions that the innovations were impractical. In terms of our analysis here, no amount of theoretical or empirical proof that method A was most effective could trump teachers' embodied and embedded knowledge of how to run a classroom.

> For the innovation to be 'practical', however, it would have to be so clearly superior to the established practices, and so certainly achievable and safe, as to justify the abandonment of the extensive repertoire of teacher tactics, and the even more extensive craft knowledge about when to use what tactics,

that each teacher had built up over the years. (Brown & McIntyre, 1993, p.116)

Rather than seeing this as an indication that teachers are somehow stubborn, subversive and work at 'lower' levels than other professional groups, it may be useful to see the problem as one where, in teachers' eyes, embodied or embedded knowledge is implicitly valued above embrained and encoded knowledge. Where researchers are in the habit of developing curriculum or classroom innovation based on some 'gold standard' or supposedly blue chip knowledge, without taking into account the professional knowledge and understandings of teachers, there is bound to be a disjunction or a lack of 'buy-in' by the profession. Such relationships approximate the expert-aide characterised by McCartney (2006), where the teacher is quite definitely the subordinate partner.

It may be useful to digress briefly here to look at Wenger's work (2000) on 'communities of practice', in which the author reflects that 'knowing is a matter of displaying competencies defined in social communities' (p.226). He claims that knowing involves two components: the competence that our communities have established over time (i.e. what it takes to act and be recognised as a competent member); and secondly, our ongoing experience of the world as a member. These chime with Lam's embedded and embodied knowledge types respectively.

Wenger goes on to describe how communities of practice define competence by combining three elements; *joint enterprise* (a collectively developed understanding of what the community is about); *mutuality* (interaction with one another, establishing norms that reflect these interactions; and a *shared repertoire* (communal resources, languages, routines, tools, stories). One suspects that it is these elements that take so long to develop even after policy diktat brings professionals together under one roof.

Importantly, Wenger warns that communities of practice should not be romanticised, and notes that they can 'learn not to learn'. To grow and make progress they need to recognise and address gaps in their knowledge, develop mutuality through enhancing social capital and trust and also develop a degree of self-awareness.

A key notion in the communities of practice literature is that of boundaries. The boundary around a community of practice might be fluid and unspoken, but it is nevertheless real. The learning that takes place inside the boundary is quite different from that which takes place at the boundary, which is often a site of contestation and colonisation. Inside the boundary there is a convergence of competence and experience - this is a comfortable place to be. At the boundary there is a divergence. As Wenger (2000, p.233) says: 'A boundary interaction is usually an experience of being exposed to a foreign competence'. In terms of Lam's model, this will often be a challenge to the embedded and embodied knowledge that teachers feel comfortable with by professionals using encoded or embrained forms of knowledge.

A recent review (Brown & White, 2006) highlighted the fact that the process of moving towards more integrated services for children does not presume the emergence of a 'melting pot' workforce where individual professional skills are lost or melded. Instead they point to evidence (Rushmer & Pallis, 2002) that suggests that the most successful collaborations are where boundaries are clear rather than blurred and the individual contribution made by different agents is recognised.

Discussion

The drawing into schools of other professional groups offers the chance to build capacity on this issue within the teaching group and to provide for young people additional and different services from those which teachers can offer. An overview provided by this empirical study would indicate that we have the latter but not the former in most instances. Additionality has been achieved, but it may take time to build capacity in this way.

Why is it so difficult to effect integration and build capacity? From the current project we have seen that because ways of working are often parallel rather than truly integrated, many staff are still not exposed to other professionals and their ways of working. Moreover, school leaders are not exposed to the same degree of training/exposure on multi-agency working - real institutional support may not be there for workers at the practice level.

This paper begins a tentative exploration of why teachers are resistant to changing practice. Lam's framework gave us an initial template within which to start exploring the different kinds of knowledge that teachers value, and the way this embrained and embedded knowledge is valorised and seen as central to their identification of themselves as teachers. The valorisation of these forms of knowledge may also act as a way of resisting the governmentality agenda, whereby governments increasingly try to rule education through centralised and encoded knowledge (see Flynn, 2002).

Recent writings about professional knowledge suggest that it is constructed and/or sustained through the working out of tensions at different levels of experience (Stronach, Corbin, McNamara, Stark & Warne, 2002). This situational and constructivist view of professional knowledge, as Gleeson and Knights (2006) point out, contrasts sharply with the more disembodied cognitive conceptions of the professional as the harbinger of esoteric knowledge or competencies (Eraut, 1994). Parallel research in medicine, nursing health, the probation service and so on, all indicates the ways in which professional identity and knowledge are constructed through the micro-politics of the workplace.

Gleeson and Knights (2006) feel that this perspective draws attention to the ways in which professionalism is constructed not through bureaucratic diktat, but rather through a struggle from *within* the cracks, crevices and contradictions of practice. Such a perspective is essentially an optimistic one, emphasising the role of agency rather than that of structure. Reflexive interpretation of professional change by professionals, according to Stronach *et al.* (2002), allows a group like the teaching profession to reinterpret challenges to their authority and autonomy as opportunities to reinvent their professionality and practice.

According to Martin and Wajcman (2004) it is through such living tensions that a multiplicity of professional roles and identities are experienced and developed. The ambiguities and tensions, the disruptions and discontinuities of lived professional experience will stimulate creative, pragmatic and potentially innovative practice. It is to be hoped that this innovative practice does indeed come about as a consequence of service integration in schools and that it is ultimately to the benefit of the many young people with mental health problems needing attention and support.

References

Atkinson, M. & Hornby, G. (2002) *Mental health handbook for schools*. London: Routledge.

Bayer, J.K. & Sanson, A.V. (2003) Preventing the development of emotional mental health problems from early childhood: Recent advances in the field. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 5 (3), 4-16.

Brown, S. & McIntyre, D. (1993) *Making sense of teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brown, K. & White, K. (2006) *Exploring the evidence base for integrated children's services*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.

Brownlie, J. & Howson, A. (2006) 'Between the demands of truth and government': Health practitioners, trust and immunisation work. *Social Science and Medicine*, 62, 433-443.

Collishaw, S., Maughan, B., Goodman, R. & Pickles, A. (2004) Time trends in adolescent mental health. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45 (8),1350-1362.

Daniels, H., Visser, J., Cole, T. & De Reybekill, N. (1999) *Emotional and behavioural difficulties in mainstream schools*. London: DfEE.

Department of Education and Science (1978) *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Special Educational Needs of Children and Young People* (Warnock Report). London: DES.

Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Falmer.

Flynn, R. (2002) Clinical governance and governmentality. *Health, Risk and Society*, 4 (2), 155-173.

Gibson, P., Baldwin, N. & Daniel, B. (2005) *Integrated assessment framework for children. Evaluation report for SEED.* Available at: http://www.south-ayrshire.gov.uk/news/2005/publications/Assessment%20Report.pdf

Gleeson, D. & Knights, D. (2006) Challenging dualism: Public professionalism in 'troubled' times. *Sociology*, 40 (2), 277-295.

Guyatt, G.H., Meade, M.O., Jaeschke, R.M., Cook, D.J. & Haynes, R.B. (2000) Practitioners of evidence based health care. *British Medical Journal,* 320, 954-955.

Lam, A. (2000) Tacit knowledge, organizational learning and societal institutions - An integrated framework. *Organizational Studies,* 21, 487-513.

Martin, B. & Wajcman, T. (2004) Markets, contingencies and preferences. *Sociological Review*, 52 (2), 240-264.

McCartney, E. (2006) *Joined up working: Terms, types and tensions.* Paper given at first seminar of ESRC Seminar Series on collaborative working, Aberdeen, May.

Mental Health Foundation (1999) *Bright futures. Promoting children and young people's mental health.* London: Mental Health Foundation.

Mental Health Foundation (2001) Available at: www.mentalhealth.org.uk.

Pettitt, B. (2003) *Effective joint working between child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) and schools.* RR 412. London: DfES.

Public Health Institute of Scotland (2003) *Needs assessment report on child and adolescent mental health.* Edinburgh: NHS Scotland.

Rowling, L. (2002) School mental health promotion: Perspectives, problems and possibilities. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion,* 4 (4), 8-13.

Rushmer, R. & Pallis, G. (2002) Inter-professional working: The wisdom of integrated working and the disaster of blurred boundaries. *Public Money and Management*, 23 (1), 59-66.

Scottish Executive (2001) *For Scotland's children. Better integrated children's services.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2002a) *'It's everyone's job to make sure I'm alright.'* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2002b) *The review of provision of educational psychology services in Scotland.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2003) *National programme for improving mental health and well-being: Action plan 2003-2006.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2004) *Children and young people's mental health: A framework for promotion, prevention and care. Draft Consultation.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2001a) *Better behaviour, better learning.* Report of the Discipline Task Group. Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2001b) *A teaching profession for the 21st Century: Agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone Report.* Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2003) *Moving forward: Additional support for learning.* Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Departmnt (2004a) *Being well, doing well: A framework for health promoting schools in Scotland.* Scottish Health Promoting Schools Unit. Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2004b) *Better behaviour in Scottish schools. Policy update.* Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2004c) *A curriculum for excellence.* The Curriculum Review Group. Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2004d) *Support in school: The views of harder to reach groups.* Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2005a) *Happy, safe and achieving their potential: The report of the National Review of Guidance 2004.* Edinburgh: SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2005b) *Ambitious, excellent schools.* Edinburgh: SEED.

Spratt, J., Shucksmith, J., Philip, K. & Watson, C. (2006) Interprofessional support of mental well-being in schools: A Bourdieuan perspective. *Journal of Interprofessional Care* (forthcoming.).

Stronach, I., Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S. & Warne, T. (2002) Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: Teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Education Policy*, 7 (1), 110-138.

Sullivam, H. & Skelcher, C. (2002) *Working across boundaries - Collaboration in public services.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weare, K. (2004) The international alliance for child and adolescent mental health and schools (INTERCAMHS). *Health Education,* 104 (2), 65-67.

Wenger, E. (2000) Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, 7 (2), 225-246.

West, P. & Sweeting, H. (2003) Fifteen, female and stressed: Changing patterns of psychological distress over time. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry,* 44 (3), 399-411.

Wight, D. & Buston, K. (2003) Meeting needs but not changing goals: Evaluation of in-service teacher training for sex education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 29 (4), 521-543.

World Health Organisation (2004) *Pre-conference on mental health of children and adolescents*, Luxembourg, 20-21 September.. Available at: www.euro.who.int/mentalhealth/ChildAdolescent/20040917_1 [1709/2004, 2004].

Yin, R. (2003) *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd edn.). London: Sage.

THE RESEARCH AND POLICY DISCOURSES OF SERVICE INTEGRATION: INTERPROFESSIONAL AND INTERAGENCY WORKING

Elspeth McCartney
University of Strathclyde

Abstract

Terms for models of co-professional working are at times used interchangeably in policy documents, but definitions for 'named types' do exist. A classification framework is outlined, and discussed. The models that may be used are influenced by the structures within which staff work and the ease with which co-professional contact can be made. Integrated services will require to make decisions about the models they intend to foster, but resource limits will play a part. Options are discussed with reference to speech and language therapists and teachers working together, which provides a long-established and well-researched example, and the practical need for 'good enough' models of co-working is stressed.

Introduction

This introductory seminar is concerned with interprofessional and interagency working, and this paper specifically addresses seminar questions three, four and five about the effects of specific models of co-practice, the implications for practitioners and the ways in which schools need to reconfigure to include professionals from other agencies.

These issues are illustrated with reference to the work of speech and language therapists (SLTs) in schools in the United Kingdom as they seek to provide 'front-line delivery' of service. This is an illuminating example for several reasons. SLTs have already 'been around the block' with respect to their structural involvement in schools. Until 1974 therapists who provided services to schools were employed by education authorities. Since that date the vast majority have worked in the health service, and are now Allied Health Professionals (AHPs), regulated by the Health Professions Council. Their current involvement in schools is therefore an example of cross-sector or interagency working, where new structures are only now developing which aim to foster co-professional working.

SLTs' work in school has been subject to research and evaluation over time (for Scotland see Reid *et al.*, 1996, and HMI, 1996; for England and Wales Law *et al.*,

2000, 2002, and Lindsay *et al.*, 2002, 2005a; for Northern Ireland NICCY, 2005). Their role is specifically discussed in relevant education acts and codes of practice across the UK.

SLTs are professionally committed to basing their services within schools and to planning jointly with education professionals (Gascoigne, 2006, p.17; RCSLT, 2005, p.25) to provide services as an integral part of a child's school life (RCSLT, 1996, p.54 currently being updated). Their focus on language and communication fits with the centrality of the language curriculum in schools, and large numbers of children have additional learning needs with a language and communication basis. As Forbes (2006) notes, a specific focus on SLT-education relationships has now been subsumed into wider policies of service integration. As these are being formulated it may be worth revisiting this relatively well-explored example to shed light on issues that affect interagency working between education and the other services in general, and health services in particular.

The paper therefore considers the variety of ways in which co-professional working can operate, how SLTs and teachers currently operate and why this is, and considers future options for integrated services.

Models of working together

It is worth considering what models of co-professional working are available. Several are described, usually defined from the perspectives of the professionals involved.

Terminology is problematic and terms are used differently across policy documents and within the literature. For example, 'multidisciplinary' appears in both *For Scotland's Children* (Scottish Executive, 2001) and *Every Child Matters* (DES, 2003) in what is probably a common usage to describe the situation where a number of different professionals are involved. *For Scotland's Children* lists education, social work and health staff (p.74) and then community education, mental health and housing management staff (p.85) as forming multidisciplinary teams. *Every Child Matters* uses 'multi-disciplinary' for co-working amongst education, social care and health services (p.60), and later amongst health visitors, nursery nurses and community development workers (p.93). However, *Supporting Children's Learning: The Code of Practice* (Scottish Executive, 2005, p.135) retains the term multidisciplinary for instances where professionals from different disciplines within the same agency work together, such as an SLT with a health visitor. Where the professionals come from different agencies the term 'interagency' is used, and by this definition a teacher and SLT working together would not be described as a multidisciplinary pairing.

'Collaboration' is another term that has received several definitions. Williams and Salmon (2002) use the term generically when discussing all aspects and styles of joint working practice. However, Kersner (1996) discussing SLTs in schools follows Conoley and Conoley (1982) in retaining 'collaboration' to describe situations where individuals join in an egalitarian partnership to achieve a mutually determined goal. Marvin (1990) uses the term to describe teachers and SLTs engaging in informal networking who have a shared responsibility for children and DiMeo, Merritt, and Culatta (1998) use collaboration only where there is trust, mutual respect and personal support, free and honest discussion and shared responsibility for planning.

Where terms are used differently and are also in common usage it is unlikely that their meanings can now be constrained - document-specific definitions and glossaries are probably the best that can be expected. However, it is worth attempting a classification to consider and gain some clarity about dimensions considered relevant by those describing co-professional practice.

Writers have tended to classify models of co-professional working using four aspects: first, who works with a client to carry out planned activities, usually designed to meet health or learning targets; second, how egalitarian and third, how supportive are professional relationships, and last who agrees targets, here used as shorthand for any agreed end. These will be considered in turn in relation to professional working with school pupils, leaving aside for the moment considerations of how children and their families also are involved in agreeing and meeting targets.

Who works with the child

Professionals may work either directly with a child or indirectly, where learning activities are delivered by others (and so these terms are used from the professional's point of view). 'Others' can include professionals or assistants such as SLT assistants, classroom assistants or learning support assistants. Where implementation is through an assistant a professional retains responsibility and accountability for the assistant's performance: otherwise much responsibility for implementation lies with the professional undertaking the activities.

Egalitarian relationships

Some inequalities are formalised within job descriptions, such as that between a professional and an assistant or a professional and a manager. Here good relationships can be formed, but by definition not egalitarian relationships. Co-professional work often involves professionals who have nominally equal status in that neither is 'the boss of' the other in formal employment terms, and each has their own area of knowledge and expertise to share. Working together with equals should be a key feature in co-professional work, although in practice some may prove to be more equal than others.

Supportive relationships

Supportive and trusting relationships and mutual respect can arise or not irrespective of how egalitarian a relationship is – it is possible to trust, respect and receive support from an assistant or boss and to mistrust an equal. This dimension is concerned with inter-personal comfort and rapport.

Who sets targets

Where nominally equal professional relationships pertain, ways of setting targets have been used to distinguish models of working. McGrath and Davis (1992) distinguish 'multidisciplinary' models that involve professionals setting targets independent from 'interdisciplinary' models where targets are set and agreed jointly. In both cases

learning activities are often delivered by professionals separately. Mackey and McQueen (1998) use the term 'transdisciplinary' to reflect joint goal-setting where the resulting learning activities are delivered by the professionals together, with considerable role-release as every member of the team contributes to holistic learning experiences as the need arises. RCSLT (Gascoigne, 2006, p.16) regard transdisciplinary models as central to work with children within integrated teams.

Named types

Considering these dimensions allows us to chart some of the types of co-professional working that have been described. Figure 1 summarises some of the types noted in the literature. In each instance some information is shared, and used to influence future decision-making: 'expert' models where one professional works quite independently are omitted. Figure 1 uses only three dimensions, but Marvin (1990) and DiMeo et al. (1998) would add the dimension of positive interactions through relationship building to interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary types to form 'collaborative' modes.

Targets agreed jointly:	Activities delivered by:	Nominally egalitarian relationships:	Named variety:
No	Each professional separately	Yes	Multi-disciplinary [1]
Yes	Each professional separately	Yes	Inter-disciplinary [1]
Yes	Professionals together	Yes	Trans-disciplinary [2]
No	Professionals together	Yes	Co-teaching [3]
No	Assistant	No	Expert – aide or Transfer [4]
No	Another professional	Yes	Consultancy [5]
Yes	Another professional	Yes	Co-operation [6]

Figure 1: 'Named Types' of professional co-working
1 McGrath & Davis (1992); 2 Mackey & McQueen (1998); 3 Creese (2002); 4 Cunningham & Davis (1985); 5 Law et al. (2002); 6 McCartney et al. (2006).

There is nothing intrinsically better or worse about any type of co-working, and each model may be used successfully in some contexts. (The somewhat anomalous situation where professionals in formally egalitarian relationships deliver activities together without planning targets jointly is found in a study by Creese, 2002, describing how teachers specialising in English as an additional language co-taught with secondary school subject teachers, concentrating on language issues. The pairs had not consistently planned together, and in this example were all teachers rather than coming from different professions. Creese's example is not an entirely happy one - the relationships became less than egalitarian in practice - but the named type of working is not dissimilar to that used successfully within many higher education post-graduate tutorials.) Some types, however, share more dimensions considered to be positive than others, particularly joint target-setting and working together, and much writing is from professionals celebrating the achievement of closer working relationships in terms of professional satisfaction (Miller, 2002) and (more rarely) child benefits (Wren, Roulstone, & Parkhouse, 2001). These two aspects should probably be kept separate - there is to my knowledge no strong evidence that closer working relationships that benefit staff also benefit children, despite a common (and commonsense) assumption that is does. Different types may also have different 'transaction' costs (Hudson & Ranade, 2003), the time spent meeting, agreeing, planning and working together as well as maintaining relationships, and so different staffing implications.

Closer interactions may flourish where there is continuity of staffing, joint responsibility, and time to plan and discuss together. For example, Wright (1996) reports that the more SLTs and teachers had opportunities to collaborate the more they valued it, and that working in close proximity helped information exchange. DiMeo *et al.* (1998) note that building a collaborative working relationship is like building a personal friendship, requiring time to develop and sustain, and so it is not reasonable to expect SLTs or teachers to achieve collaboration with all professionals with whom they interact. Williams and Salmon (2002) suggest that working together is facilitated where teams can anticipate long-term relationships amongst members, with stability in the appointment of key individuals, and with regular contact sustained.

Such facilitative factors should be considered when considering building new integrated services, if an aim is to develop closer partnerships. However, at present they do not commonly pertain, and the current situation reflects their absence.

What currently happens in the UK

Types of co-professional working encountered in practice reflect the opportunities afforded to professionals. McCartney, Ellis, and Boyle (2006) discuss how SLTs' and teachers' desire to develop language skills in the social and educationally rich classroom environment has coincided with SLTs' need to offer service to a large number of children with limited staff resources. This has led to widespread, although not exclusive, use of consultancy models of SLT service delivery (Law *et al.*, 2000), where SLTs provide teachers with advice and guidance on language teaching procedures to be implemented by school staff.

Consultancy approaches are not particularly close models of collaboration, and their widespread adoption has received critical comment. Law *et al.* (2002) recognise the assumed learning benefits for children who undertake language work in their classroom, but also that severe service capacity limits have motivated the move towards consultancy services as 'a pragmatic solution to the problem of coverage' (p.154). Lindsay *et al.* (2002) make similar points, questioning whether consultation approaches have become the method of choice for professional or pragmatic reasons (p.200). Law *et al.* (2002, p.158) note that the consultancy model relies heavily on the availability and commitment of educational staff with whom to consult, and that there are low numbers of staff with specialist language skills in schools, running the risk that activities recommended by an SLT may not be implemented systematically in the classroom. McCartney, Boyle, Ellis, Turnbull, and Bannatyne (2004a) found this fear was justified, in that language intervention activities shown to be effective in developing expressive language for children with language impairment when delivered by SLTs or SLT assistants (Boyle, McCartney, O'Hare, & Forbes, 2006) were less effective when delivered by classroom staff. This appeared to be related to the amount of time children spent on the activities, which was less than in the Boyle *et al.* (2006) study and which varied considerably across schools. SLTs can advise, but if classroom staff cannot deliver language activities consultation approaches may

not result in particularly effective experiences for children.

RCSLT (Gascoigne, 2006) have also registered concerns about consultancy approaches, stressing the need to replace the term with a more accurate description of the service being delivered, and to uncouple consultancy used to enhance a child's levels of activity and participation from resource issues:

> Unfortunately, where models involving the delegation of tasks and programmes to others have been perceived as resource saving strategies, the positive reasons for such approaches have been lost. (p.18)

McCartney *et al.* (2006) suggest some ways of developing and improving the consultancy model, but this is hardly service-integration utopia. The SLT will still tend to be seen as an 'outside expert', advising teachers on what to do rather than developing partnerships that draw together the specialist knowledge of each profession. Teachers may feel pressurised or coerced into carrying out language activities, or into allocating tasks to their classroom assistant without feeling confident about their ability to supervise appropriately. The SLT's priorities may clash with the teacher's. Misunderstandings may arise, and synergy may not be achieved.

Why is this situation continuing?

Given that 'better' ways of working together exist, it is worth considering what has led to consultancy models being set up and sustained in mainstream schools. Hopes for language learning and generalisation and limits of staff to carry out direct work have been raised, but other factors are also relevant. As McCartney (1999) discusses, health and education services are radically different organisations, giving rise to systemic factors which tend to hinder co-professional working. These will be considered using the systems headings presented by McCartney but in reverse order.

It is particularly encouraging that the systems environment in which services operate has become publicly friendly to interagency service development, although the opinions of staff and service users about integrated services will require to be continually monitored. Processes of planning for and delivering learning activities remain similar in health and education, involving the setting up and reviewing of co-ordinated support plans and statements of special educational need; devising and

delivering individualised education programmes; and children monitoring their own learning. Limits to co-working remain chiefly around structures and functions. Structures that should facilitate co-professional working are now developing, such as new community schools, community health partnerships, children's services commissioners and aligned budgets. These are not as yet fully in place, and the continuing structural split between SLTs as health employees and education services has implications for models of co-professional working in terms of the different functions or goals of service that pertain.

Functional differences and limits to co-professional working

SLTs conform to highly determined health service philosophies and policies and their resulting procedures. Current key issues are reviewed here, and illustrative examples of 'culture clashes' raised by SLT students or collected during research with classroom teachers are presented.

SLT remains a commissioning service, offered only to targeted children where a specific need arises. SLTs also must prioritise such needs against the competing needs of other children for a similar service, taking into account both the potential benefits to be gained by the child and the costs of providing the service. This contrasts with education services who have to meet the needs of all children in their care, and who cannot take resources into account as a prime determinant of service provision.

Working only with selected children who have been accepted onto a case-load explains why an SLT cannot just 'take a look while they are in' at a child who is causing concern to a school: a clash that can be highly annoying to teachers.

As NHS employees SLTs may work only with children who are referred, accept service and join the 'case-load'. This has implications for ways of working in schools. As it is highly unlikely that all children in a class, particularly in a mainstream school, would be on an SLT case-load, types of co-working are limited. In particular, classroom-based group work carried out by an SLT or team teaching between an SLT and a teacher will be difficult to implement: the SLT has no 'right' to interact with children in the class who are not on the case list and cannot include them

in groups along with a child who is (although the class teacher may do so if they consider it in the interests of all children). Lindsay, Dockrell, Mackie, and Letchford (2005b) found examples of joint SLT-teacher implementation of programmes and of SLTs offering direct support to children in curriculum subjects like science in specialist provision such as language units, but it would be most unusual to find this in mainstream provision, which is of course the default placement option for children in the UK.

This contrasts with education employees, for example learning support teachers, who form part of a school's repertoire of learning and teaching resources, and can work with all children. This difference explains why SLTs are surprised (and a bit shocked) when parents do not know that their child is working with a learning support teacher.

Selecting children also means that SLTs have to have clear standards of what will constitute 'case status', as they have a public health service responsibility to maintain equality of access to service (even and particularly where service is insufficient). SLT services therefore continue to spend time managing fair access to services, and attempting to construct equitable decision-making frameworks. This can compete with time taken to actually deliver services (and can cause problems - cf. Puttick, 2006) but is a corollary of selection, to prevent arbitrary or biased decision-making or services going to those who make the greatest demands. Prioritisation parameters are not easy to construct and can be used to limit access to service (McCartney, 2000), and can upset schools, which offer services to all enrolled children. Determining who should receive intervention can lead SLTs to spend a lot of time re-assessing and updating rather than 'getting on with' intervention - which can also annoy teachers who tend to assess children 'on line' while teaching.

Selecting children for service is ongoing in a context where there have been few attempts to plan a workforce sufficiently large to meet demand, unlike the planning undertaken to secure teacher numbers. Some workforce planning has begun in England in respect of AHPs (NHS Workforce Review Team, 2005) and has recorded low numbers of SLTs, who remain a shortage profession (Home Office, 2004) so that services struggle with high demand for services compared to staff resources. For example, Law et al. (2000) suggested that a case-load of around 40 children per SLT

would be manageable in a school context, but Law et al. (2002) reported the average primary school case-load for children with speech and language needs as 123. There is therefore considerable overload on individual SLTs and pressure on services to be as fair and efficient as possible. Large case-loads also mean that SLTs run rigid timetables and cannot adapt to rapid short-term changes. This can frustrate teachers who want to liaise, and also SLTs if their work in schools is disrupted by other school activities. This is reportedly not a rare occurrence.

SLTs must ensure that confidentiality is assured, and information on children, families and services can only be transferred in pre-agreed circumstances, and with their consent. This explains why a teacher wanting to build up their personal skills and knowledge cannot visit to watch an SLT working with a child who is not the teacher's direct responsibility - or at least not without extensive discussion and agreement by all parties.

The health service is concerned with intervention and with 'what works' in a highly deterministic way. This affects the research designs used to measure 'outcome'. These are more complex than is sometimes realised, and are concerned not only with success but with the opportunities lost by offering or withholding service, and of the potential harm that can be caused by inappropriate interventions. Acceptable evidence of 'good outcomes' can reflect many aspects of health and wellbeing, and can relate to personal opinion, quality of life and evaluation of services received as well as measures of functioning. The aim is to perfect procedures and optimise interventions and to base procedures on the best evidence available. This has differences with the research paradigms developing in education (Furlong & Oancea, 2005), particularly with respect to the idea of how far one can remove context from learning (McCartney, 2004).

Individual SLTs are therefore being judged against different research criteria from schools. NHS concentration on interventions and effects can mean that SLTs are puzzled by arguments for social inclusion framed only in terms of a child's rights and not as a matter of providing 'best' educational outcome. An understanding of research as an iterative investigative process involving trials and control of extraneous factors can mean that SLTs are unimpressed by policies that impose one educational

approach (such as the use of synthetic phonics) upon children and their teachers without definitive randomised controlled trials (RCTs).

On the other hand, SLT services along with other health services are not compulsory. Unlike schooling which is unavoidable for children within prescribed age bands, each 'episode' of SLT intervention has to be agreed to by a child's parents, and by the child themselves from the point at which they have the capacity to understand the implications of the decision. For example, no research study concerning primary school age children would be funded that did not include procedures for obtaining the formal consent of each child, and extensive attempts must be made to ensure each child has understood and agreed to participate. A child can also leave such a study at any time, without giving reasons. A child's right to accept or reject SLT service can cause clashes with schools, particularly towards the end of primary school, when competence to make an informed decision about therapy can often be assumed, but where a statutory language curriculum still exists.

Given these factors, working together in the classroom and transdisciplinary approaches would be very difficult to operate, and a consultancy model or at best a co-operative model is almost inevitable in mainstream schools, despite their limitations. This is less a decision about optimal co-working than the result of an absence of opportunity to make alternative decisions. It appears to be the best that can be done in the circumstances.

Reconfiguring services and preparing professionals

This seminar is taking place in a context where new services are being developed, and where the hope and expectation is that they will improve children's health, social and emotional development and their ability to learn. It is worth thinking forward to how services can be improved and better meet these ends. One of the research questions posed concerns how schools should re-configure to include professionals from other agencies, but the discussion will continue to focus on both SLT and education services, and both pre-service and in-service issues, as a surrogate for health and education generally.

Considering the issues discussed above it seems to me there are some things that can be done to improve roles and relationships within existing structures and to 'work' the prevalent consultancy model in a more productive way. There are also some things that new services could envisage changing, and some features that will probably not change and have to be recognised and lived with.

Reconfiguring within existing service structures

Suggestions for changes within existing services are based partly on recent research (Boyle *et al.*, 2006; McCartney *et al.*, 2004a, 2005a) which surveyed and talked to classroom teachers in mainstream schools and SLTs about their experiences of working together, as part of larger studies concerned with models of service delivery and cost-benefit analyses.

Co-working can be helped, we heard, by explaining the factors that lie behind unexpected cross-professional clashes as they arise, as is attempted in this paper. For example, teachers can be told that referrals are needed: they tend not to know this. However, they can also be told that SLT services will happily accept referrals from teachers with parental agreement (although headteachers tend to get a bit twitchy about this). Explaining professional assumptions before surprises occur is even better. Notions of consent, confidentiality, ethics, competition for service, efficiency and outcomes are perfectly comprehensible to both health and education staff, but they often require to be pointed out. Some SLT services have developed useful documents for schools explaining such factors.

Explaining, agreeing and committing to roles and responsibilities when using some version of a consultancy model, and recording what happens, is discussed at length in McCartney *et al.* (2006). Their model envisages that the considerable transaction time requirements needed for discussion, joint target-setting, and differentiated activities are built into such agreement. Existing monitoring and audit procedures that evaluate interagency work can be used to track how agreements are implemented.

Although this would be a step forward, this model probably places insufficient emphasis on the processes of learning to work together, and of learning how to do a new job, and on the feelings of uncertainty that can arise when coping with

understandings one knows to be less than expert. Pre-service AHPs and pre-service teachers are now meeting with 'other' professionals to investigate co-working, and there are some in-service opportunities, but the issues remain new and challenging to many professionals. More training opportunities would help.

There are also issues about the inclusion of 'visiting' services that are only just emerging. Boyle *et al.* (2006) asked SLTs and SLT assistants who had been delivering services in schools to 119 children three times per week over 15 weeks how welcomed they felt by the schools. Schools for 69% of the children made SLT/As feel welcome or very welcome, for 27% of children schools made SLTs feel fairly welcome, and for 3% they were not very welcome (with 1% no response). Comments on 'very welcoming' schools included 'I was shown the staffroom, instructed to make coffee if I wanted to; the headteacher was often around and had informal talks'. Feelings of being 'not very welcomed' resulted when, for example, 'They never remembered I was coming'. Monitoring such factors and discussing the reasons behind such variation is probably needed before mutual trust and respect can be considered.

Configuring within new structures

New services should consider their functions in order to set up structures. For example, if transdisciplinary working were considered desirable new services could move SLTs into the position now occupied by learning support staff who may work with children in addition to those on a defined case-load, although the views of parents and children about the value of this should be canvassed, and the need for parental permission considered. This would open up new types of co-working such as classroom-based group work including SLTs. It would need careful management with issues of confidentiality as probably the major sticking point, and issues of best use of staff time would no doubt arise.

New services could, as Williams and Salmon (2002) suggest, aim to make and sustain long-term professional relationships and key appointments, rather than relying on short-term projects as has been common. This would make efforts to foster team-building worthwhile. Appointing individuals specifically responsible for managing

and championing service integration and maintaining co-working (Ranade & Hudson, 2003) would be appreciated, preferably if these individuals were accessible and relatively local.

New structures to plan SLT and other AHP services to meet the expected demands would be very helpful. Workforce planning is already carried out for schools, and although not perfect provides a rough-and-ready match of staff numbers to children and classes. At present AHP planning is at a much more rudimentary stage, with limited agreement about the job to be done and who is going to do it. The background question is whether supported assistants could contribute to the provision of the same service just as effectively but more cheaply. And transferring skills to support workers is a main way in which SLT and other AHP services are being extended at present (McCartney *et al.*, 2005b), with similar moves in schools. New structures that could reach principled decisions about such matters and determine appropriate staff numbers could remove the need to limit practice to meet resources.

Immutable differences?

This leaves out certain aspects of difference where I can foresee very little chance of convergence between health and educations, even within new services. A major instance is research, which I perceive to be a very sticky sticking point indeed. I see no way in which the evidence-based health service will accept the models of research being codified in education at present - they are too far away from the complex models currently in use. Whether education will bend towards health service models is also doubtful - an RCT of the literacy hour profiting from large numbers, assured 'compliance' and 'manualised intervention' seems unlikely, although without such studies policy decrees cannot be challenged. Perhaps the best solution is to explain the differences that pertain in the two services and ensure that professionals understand the paradigms that operate, and the limits to evidence that each produces.

But we can cope with diversity

New structures tend to want to set up teams by bringing a range of professionals 'in-house', and as stated there can be advantages. However, this cannot extend indefinitely - working with those not in the core team will often be needed, with

'outside' expertise required. Given this, even immutable differences between professions need not stop co-working. People need to work together specifically to gain access to the perspectives of others. A unifying culture is not essential - if teachers want to work with other teachers or other kinds of teachers they may do so. Where teachers want an SLT's perspective, they need a real SLT, including (most of!) their professional baggage. Explaining one to the other can be helpful, as suggested, but there is no need to construct some complex hybrid before co-working can take place. It is precisely the differences between professions that are relevant.

References

Boyle, J., McCartney, E., O'Hare, A. & Forbes, J. (2006) *An RCT and economic evaluation of direct versus indirect and individual versus group modes of speech and language therapy for children with primary language impairment.* Final Report to the National Co-ordinating Centre for Health Technology Assessment.

Conoley, J.C. & Conoley, C. W. (1982) School consultation: A guide to practice and training. Oxford: Pergamon.

Creese, A. (2002) The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36 (4), 597-616.

Cunningham, C. & Davis, H. (1985) *Working with parents: Frameworks for collaboration.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Department of Education and Science (2003) *Every child matters.* London: DES.

DiMeo, J. H., Merritt, D.D. & Culatta, B. (1998) Collaborative partnerships and decision making. In D.D.Merritt & B.Culatta (Eds.), *Language in the classroom.* San Diego, CA: Singular.

Forbes, J. (2006) Types of social capital: Tools to explore service integration? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10 (6), 565-580.

Furlong, J. & Oancea, A. (2005) *Assessing quality in applied and practice-based educational research*: *A framework for discussion.* Available at: www.bera.ac.uk/pdfs/Qualitycriteria.pdf

Gascoigne, M. (2006) *Supporting children with speech, language and communication needs within integrated children's services.* RCSLT Position Paper. London: RCSLT.

HMI (1996) *The education of pupils with language and communication disorders.* Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education & Industry Department/HMSO.

Home Office (2004) *Work permits UK.* http://www.workingintheuk.gov.uk/workingintheuk/en/homepage/workpermits/ applyingforawork/businessandcommercial/howdoimakeanapplication/shortageo ccupations/healthsector.html. Downloaded 5th July 2005.

Kersner, M. (1996) Working together for children with severe learning disabilities. *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy*, 12, 17-28.

Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J., Band, S. & Fitzgerald, L. (2000) *Provision for children with speech and language needs in England and Wales*: *Facilitating communication between education and health services.* DfEE Research Report 239. Norwich: HMSO. Available at http://www.dfee.gov.uk

Law J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J. & Band, S. (2002) Consultation as a model for providing speech and language therapy in schools - A panacea or one step too far? *Child language, Teaching and Therapy*, 18, 145-163.

Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J. with Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2002) *Educational provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales.* Coventry: Centre for Educational Appraisal and Research.

Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J., Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2005a) Local education authorities' approaches to provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20 (3), 329-345.

Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J., Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2005b) The roles of specialist provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales: A model for inclusion? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 5 (3), 88-96.

Mackey, S. & McQueen, J. (1998) Exploring the association between integrated therapy and inclusive education. *British Journal of Special Education*, 25 (1), 22-27.

Marvin, C. (1990) Problems in school-based language and collaboration services: Defining the terms and improving the process. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools,* 25, 258-268.

McCartney, E. (1999) Barriers to collaboration: An analysis of systemic barriers to collaboration between teachers and speech and language therapists. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 34, 431-440.

McCartney, E. (2000) Include us out? Speech and language therapists' prioritisation in mainstream schools. *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy*, 16, 165-180.

McCartney, E. (2004) 'Hard health' and 'soft schools': Research designs to evaluate SLT work in schools. *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy, 20*, 101-114.

McCartney, E., Ellis, S. & Boyle, J. (2006) Support your local co-op: Developing co-operative approaches to speech and language therapists and teachers supporting children with language impairment. In J. Forbes (Ed.), *Proceedings of the research seminar*: Children's services integration in Scottish schools (pp.7-23). Education Research Paper 13, University of Aberdeen.

McCartney, E., Boyle, J., Ellis, S., Turnbull, M. & Bannatyne, S. (2004a) *A survey and cohort intervention using indirect speech and language therapy for children with primary language impairment in mainstream schools.* Final report to the West of Scotland Research and Development Partnership, July.

McCartney, E., Boyle, J., Bannatyne, S., Jessiman, E., Campbell, C., Kelsey, C., Smith, J. & O'Hare, A. (2004b) Becoming a manual occupation? The construction of a therapy manual for use with language impaired children in mainstream primary schools. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 39, 135-148.

McCartney, E., Ellis, S., Boyle, J., Turnbull, M. & Kerr, J. (2005a) *The development and validation of materials for use by classroom teachers working with children with primary language impairment.* Final report to the West of Scotland Research and Development Partnership, November.

McCartney, E., Boyle, J., Bannatyne S., Jessiman, E., Campbell, C., Kelsey, C., Smith, J., McArthur. J. & O'Hare, A. (2005b) 'Thinking for two': A case study of speech and language therapists working through assistants. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 40, 221-235.

McGrath, J.R. & Davis, A.M. (1992) Rehabilitation: Where are we going and how do we get there? *Clinical Rehabilitation,* 6, 225-235.

Miller, C. (2002) Learning from each other: Practitioners in school-based support for children with language and communications needs. *Support for Learning,* 17 (4), 187-192.

NHS Workforce Review Team (2005) *Workforce review* 2006-7. Available at: www.healthcareworkforce.nhs.uk

NICCY (2005) *Northern Ireland Commissioner for Children and Young People's Overview of SLT provision in Northern Ireland 2004/2005: 2005. Available at:* www.niccy.org/helpful/speechtherapy.asp

Puttick, H. (2006) Children lose out on specialist support. *The [Glasgow] Herald*, 23rd January, pp.4-5.

Ranade, W. & Hudson, B. (2003) Conceptual issues in inter-agency collaboration. Local Goernment Studies, 29 (3), 32-50.

Reid, J., Millar, S., Tait, L., Donaldson, M.L., Dean, E., Thomson, G.O.B. & Grieve, R. (1996) *The role of speech and language therapists in the education of pupils with special educational needs.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Centre for Research in Child Development.

Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (1996) *Communicating quality: Professional standards for speech and language therapists.* London: RCSLT.

Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (2005) *Clinical guidelines.* Bicester: Speechmark.

Scottish Executive (2001) *For Scotland's children: Better integrated children's services.* http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/education/fcsr-00.asp Downloaded 5th July 2005.

Scottish Executive (2005) *Supporting children's learning*: *The Code of Practice.* Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Williams, R. & Salmon, G. (2002) Collaborations in commissioning and delivering child and adolescent mental health services: Editorial review. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 15 (4), 349-353.

Wren, Y., Roulstone, S. & Parkhouse J. (2001) A model for a mainstream school-based speech and language therapy service. *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy*, 17, 108-122.

Wright, J. A. (1996) Teachers and therapists: The evolution of a partnership. *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy,* 17, 108-122.

AFTER THE BREAK? INTERRUPTING THE DISCOURSES OF INTERPROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Julie Allan
University of Stirling

Abstract

Despite the abundance of calls within policies to undertake collaboration and 'joined up' working, we know very little about how this should be achieved and what might constitute good outcomes for children and families. The policies themselves provide little insight on the nature of interprofessional practice and their privileging of consensus among professionals creates closure. This paper considers how the expectations of both beginning and established teachers to engage in interprofessional practice are inscribed within formal policy discourses and the effects of these upon them. Drawing on some of the analytical devices of two key philosophers of difference, Derrida and Deleuze, the paper explores how the discourses create aporias, or double contradictory imperatives, which pull teachers in different directions, territorialize difference between themselves and other professionals and force them to maintain rigid knowledge and professional boundaries. Some new propositions are offered for consideration. These are 'new lines of flight' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.9) and which are aimed at interrupting the closure and exclusion contained in these discourses. They involve seeking recognition of the aporetic nature of the demands on teachers, rupture of teacher education and professional development processes, and repair, through more explicitly political forms of engagement within and across professions.

Introduction

This paper will consider the ways in which expectations of both beginning and established teachers to engage in interprofessional practice are inscribed within formal policy discourses and the effects of these upon them. Drawing on some of the analytical devices of two key philosophers of difference, Derrida and Deleuze, I will explore how the discourses create aporias, or double contradictory imperatives, which pull teachers in different directions, territorialize difference between themselves and other professionals, and force them to maintain rigid knowledge and professional boundaries. I argue that the initiative for interprofessional practice might need to come from within teacher education, if it is to happen at all.

Policy discourses and the 'interprofessionals'

Policy is as much a mindset as a set of texts. It is recognised as an expectation, and even an imperative, as much as it exists in written form. It is presented as rational, coherent, explicit, yet it is 'unscientific and irrational' (Ball, 1990, p.3) and is certainly opaque.   Furthermore, its inherently political nature is downplayed, as is the way in which teachers, children and others are constructed *through* policy, becoming its effects, for example those who undertake interprofessional practice. The consensus which is assumed to characterise the policy-making process is far, however, from the reality:

> There is ad hocery, negotiation and serendipity within the state, within the policy formulation process … The point is that quibbling and dissensus still occur with the babble of 'legitimate voices' and sometimes the effect of quibbling and dissensus results in a blurring of meanings within texts, and in public confusion and a dissemination of doubt. (Ball, 1994, p.16)

Policies themselves are also transient, subject to shifting interpretations - indeed to 'interpretations of interpretations' (Rizvi & Kemmis, 1987, cited in Ball, 1994, p.16) - and representations. As Ball (1994) notes, sometimes the policy texts are not read in the original but are mediated and delegitimized, for example by teacher unions. Even where they are read, however, this is done in a very particular way, with teachers' readings and reactions constructed for them by the very nature of the text and its positioning in relation to the teachers' professional contexts.

Ball (1994) helpfully distinguishes between policy as text and policy as discourse. As was seen above, the texts themselves are full of contradictions and contestations. As discourses, policies create effects through the way they speak of objects and of people. It is the discursive aspect of policy that is the most significant because it works on people in their local situations and masks its own effects:

> It changes the possibilities we have for thinking *otherwise*; thus it limits our responses to change, and leads us to misunderstand what policy is by misunderstanding what it does. Further, policy as discourse may have the effect of redistributing *voice*, so that it does not matter what some people say or think, and only certain voices can be heard as meaningful or *authoritative*. (Ball, 1994, p.23; original emphasis)

As Brantlinger (2004) has observed, education policy has replaced theory as a source of guidance for practitioners and this forms the content of much of teacher education. At the same time as student teachers are required to buy into a version of teaching which encourages them to control students' behaviours by modifying their own, they are kept under a veil of uncertainty about whether they will 'make it' as teachers, by ensuring that their knowledge of teaching is always partial:

> Incompleteness, often valorized in textual politics as ambiguity which exposes the limits of the metaphysics of voice, in the discourse of corporate training (which in a way has colonized the discourse of education) becomes another tactic of control in human resource management. (Gregoriou, 2001, p.230)

Student teachers are thus controlled by being perpetually in training (Derrida, 1992), never finished with education, in the sense of not yet having proved themselves as competent, and remain, according to Deleuze (1992, p.3), 'in debt'. At the same time, the notion of a teacher as expert persists and forces beginning teachers to feign confidence in an effort to convince onlookers of their competence. Interprofessional working is, in this context, understood as an incapacity to go it alone; and so the kind of person who might be designated the 'interprofessional' is a shadowy character, not quite complete and what Burgess (2004, p.244) refers to as a 'tragedy of insufficiency - half an egg, not half a double yolk'.

The standards which new teachers must achieve before they are accorded the status of qualified status territorialize teaching and envelop them within rigid stratifications (Roy, 2003). These deny complex thinking and firmly entrench their novice and incompetent identities. The standards have been recognised as invalid indicators of good teaching generally (Mahony & Hextall, 2000; Smyth & Shacklock, 1998) and as part of the 'struggle over the teacher's soul' (Ball, 2003, p.217). Furthermore, the higher education institutions (HEIs) in which teacher education takes place are driven by the standards agenda and managerialism and this creates exclusion (Allan, 2003; Booth, 2003). Within Scotland, the *Standard for Full Registration* (GTC, 2002a) to which beginning teachers have to aspire includes working co-operatively with other professionals and adults. To meet this particular element teachers merely have to demonstrate that they can 'create and sustain appropriate working relationships with other teachers, support staff and visiting professionals'. Such low expectations in relation to interprofessional practice, together with the scarce mention of other

professionals, and even then only as generalised 'others', inevitably leaves the beginning teacher surmising that a lack of importance is given to this work and encourages a focus on the more singular aspects of professional practice. This othering of professionals with whom teachers are supposed to engage 'appropriately' which is seen in the *Standard for Full Registration* is continued in the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTC, 2002b). However, in order to gain this enhanced status, teachers are expected to exert an 'influence' on these generalised others. This does not appear to be a positive kind of influence, in the way I will suggest teachers might be encouraged to initiate engagement with colleagues in other professions, but calls on teachers to act as exemplars, the details of which remain unspoken.

The policy imperatives for 'joined up working' thrust teachers together with professionals from health and social work and make them search for a common purpose. Despite the abundance of calls to undertake collaboration and joined up working (Makareth & Turner, 2002; Milne, 2005), we know very little about how this should be 'done' and are even less clear about how it is experienced by children and young people and by their parents. Instead we are forced to talk in clichés - joined up working, the 'whole' child and initiatives being rolled out - the last of which, as Daniels (2005) suggests, conjures up notions of laying carpets and ensuring all the bumps are ironed out. The language used in policy privileges consensus and creates closure. The Agreement reached following the McCrone Report, *Teaching for the 21st Century* (Scottish Executive, 2001) for example, talks of clarity, commitment, harmonisation, all of which seeks to erode differences between practitioners. Collaboration among teachers and with other professionals is a complex knot of relationships which has to be learned and worked at. It is an interesting presumption that by issuing an enjoinder to collaborate, and by placing people together, that the outcomes will be positive. Research by Forbes (2003) illustrates how teachers and speech therapists, espousing the value of, and 'doing', collaboration, frequently talked past one another and maintained their own work practice boundaries. In research on the New Community Schools initiative (Remedios & Allan, 2004), professionals from education, health and social work described a prolonged period of fighting for resources - territorialization - for their own service or school, before they learned to make decisions collectively.

At the same time as policies explicitly espouse joined up working, others appear to create an imperative against it. The most recent example of this is the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Bill (2005), the legislation which introduced measures for the statutory assessment and support of children and young people. Leaving the confusion created by the tautological definition of Additional Support Needs aside, the legislation sought to distinguish between those who would be given a Co-ordinated Support Plan and those who would not on the basis of requiring to seek the support of professionals beyond those within the school. This 'negative ontology' (Baker, 2002) constructs interprofessional working as a last resort for schools rather than as something that would be sought to enhance practice. Of course, if Co-ordinated Support Plans become, like the Record of Needs, a much coveted resource pursued by canny schools and informed parents, we may see a proliferation of interprofessional practice.

Philosophy goes professional

How might the enormous constraints on interprofessional practice produced by the policy discourses be challenged? I am suggesting that some constructs of two key philosophers of difference offer some possible ways of interrupting the policy discourses. Deleuze and Guattari, Derrida and Foucault, along with Irigary, Kristeva, Lyotard and others, have been recognised as philosophers of difference because of their concern with achieving the recognition of minority social groups and their attempt to formulate a politics of difference which is based on an acceptance of multiplicity (Patton, 2000). Each of these writers has in common an orientation to philosophy as a political act and a will to make use of philosophical concepts as a form not of global revolutionary change but of 'active experimentation, since we do not know in advance which way a line is going to turn' (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p.137). Their work is a philosophy of affirmation which is a 'belief of the future, in the future' (Deleuze, quoted in Rajchman, 2001, p.6) and is intended to lighten and provide release:

> *To affirm is not to take responsibility for, to take on the burden of what is, but to release, to set free what lives.* To affirm is to unburden: not to load life with the weight of higher values, but *to create* new values which are those of life, which make life light and active. (Deleuze, 1983, p.185; original emphasis)

Nietzsche's notion of the creation of 'untimely' concepts is taken up by Deleuze and Guattari as depicting the kind of political work they see as important: 'acting counter to our time and thereby acting on our time and, let us hope, for the benefit of a time to come' (Nietzsche, 1983, p.60).

A key role for philosophy, if it is to be put to work on inclusion, is in relation to language and the challenge here is complex. It involves, following Deleuze (1998, p.107), making language stutter, creating 'an affective and intensive language, and no longer an affectation of the one who speaks'. This is no easy task, as it involves taking language out of its natural equilibrium where there is security with definitions and meanings, but Deleuze suggests this is essential in order to move forward:

> Can we make progress if we do not enter into *regions far from equilibrium?* Physics attests to this. Keynes made advances in political economy because he related it to the situation of a 'boom', and no longer one of equilibrium. This is the only way to introduce desire into the corresponding field. Must language then be put into a state of *boom,* close to a *crash?* (p.109; original emphasis)

Derrida (1974, p.5) contends that language itself has lost some of its meaning and significance:

> The devaluation of the word 'language' itself, and how, in the very hold it has upon us, it betrays a loose vocabulary, the temptation of a cheap seduction, the passive yielding to fashion, the consciousness of the avant-garde, in other words - ignorance - are evidences of this effect.

Disruptive work on language has the potential to create an inclusiveness and high degree of reflexivity because disjunctions that are created 'follow a rolling gait that concerns the process of language and no longer the flow of speech' (p.110). The process of causing language to stutter also creates a silence:

> *When a language is so strained* that it starts to stutter, or to murmur or stammer … *then language in its entirety reaches the limit* that marks its outside and makes it confront silence … To make one's language stutter, face to face, or face to back, and at the same time to push language as a whole to its limit, to its outside, to its silence - this would be like the *boom* and the *crash.* (p.113; original emphasis)

The key ideas of the philosophers of difference have been utilised to reframe the problem of inclusion and to attempt to reform teacher education (Allan, forthcoming). The particular 'conceptual *bits'* (Rajchman, 2001, p.21; original emphasis) I want to

consider here as having particular significance for interprofessional practice are Derrida's deconstruction, and, from Deleuze and Guattari, deterritorialization and rhizomic learning.

Exposing aporias and deconstructing dogma

Deconstruction of the official texts on professionalism and interprofessionalism involves looking at how they get into trouble, come unstuck and contradict themselves. It is a kind of two-handed reading which looks for the *this* and the *that*, looks for the other in the text and discovers their 'scrupulous and plausible misreadings' (Spivak, 1996, p.45). Deconstruction, which Critchley (1999, p.41) describes as a 'philosophy of hesitation', is directed at decidability and closure, for it is these which create injustices. Derrida regards the instant of the decision as 'a madness' (1990, p.26), which is also profoundly irresponsible:

> When the path is clear and given, when a certain knowledge opens up the way in advance, the decision is already made, it might as well be said that there is none to make; irresponsibly, and in good conscience, one simply applies or implements a program . . . It makes of action the applied consequence, the simple application of a knowledge or know how. It makes of ethics and politics a technology. No longer of the order of practical reason or decision, it begins to be irresponsible. (pp.41-45)

The function of deconstruction is to interrupt closure and certainty within texts and to create undecidability about their meaning and intent. It opens up what Derrida calls aporias, double contradictory imperatives which pull the student teacher in different directions and create impossibilities for them. These might include, for example, acquiring and demonstrating the necessary competences to qualify as a teacher *and* understanding themselves as in an inconclusive process of learning about others; developing as autonomous professionals *and* learning to depend on others for support and collaboration; allowing children and young people to make decisions *and* ensuring that they do not make choices which will harm them.

These aporias, ambivalences and contradictions could be exposed explicitly to students, as part of the challenge of becoming a new teacher, rather than as a source of confusion or disconnectedness for them. Uncertainty, the greatest torment for the student teacher, could become an acceptable part of the process, with the moments of

undecidability being where they learn to do their most effective work. Exposing these aporias within teacher education, rather than being disruptive and negative, in which the adjudication between imperatives has created chasms and impasses, could force students to invent new practices which always involve at least two ways.

They may be more willing and able to connect with other teachers and other professionals if they can read playfully those texts which simultaneously urge them to undertake joined up working and fragment their practice and their sense of professionalism. Deconstruction may also help student teachers to acquire a more realistic sense of their responsibilities than is conveyed in policy discourses.

The process of preparing student teachers to meet the Professional Standards for teaching might be undertaken in a way which still ensures these are achieved, but also alerts them to some of the limitations of these kinds of frameworks. Student teachers could be encouraged to wander through the Standards, reading them in terms of the kind of performances they command, to enact these reflexively and critique their own identity work in achieving the required levels of competence.

More generally, if students are encouraged to deconstruct inclusion policies, rather than absorb and replicate their content, they may become aware of the contradictions and inconsistencies inherent in them and recognise how aporias are disavowed and closed down. Students would be alerted to the way in which policies 'write the teacher' (Cormack & Comber, 1996, p.119) in ways that are contradictory and oppositional (Honan, 2004) and which constrain teachers' actions:

> Such documents and their associated technologies, written for and about the teacher, construct authorised versions of the curriculum subject, teacher and student. These statements officially 'write' the teacher and the student - who they should be, what they are to do and say and when and how they must do or say it. (Cormack & Comber, 1996, p.119)

Deconstruction of policy texts could help to disrupt some of the assumptions about the relationships between teachers and other professionals, policies and context and may make student teachers better placed to challenge some of the pronouncements. Recognition of how they are regulated, and thereby controlled, and of the process of producing an effective teacher who is an 'elastic or infinitely flexible and ultimately dutiful figure who can unproblematically respond to new demands' (Cormack &

Comber, 1996, p.121) may make the passage towards full teacher status less of an ordeal.

From content to expression: Deterritorializing teacher education

Professional training - of teachers, health and social workers and others - takes place in highly striated spaces in which the flow of students, through the building itself, through the curriculum and in relation to the actors, is intensively regulated. Deterritorialization seeks to knock existing understandings and ways of acting into a different orbit or trajectory (Roy, 2004). Its purpose is to undo the 'processes of continuous control and instantaneous communication' (Smith, 1998, p.264). It is a performative breaking of existing codes which is also a 'making' (Howard, 1998, p.115). That is, it is an escape, but in a positive sense, so that new intensities open up:

> The result is a return to a field of forces, transversing the gaps, puncturing the holes, and opening up the new world order to a quite different and new world of the multiple. (pp.123-124)

Deterritorialization creates 'chaosmos' (Bogue, 2004, p.1), a term coined by James Joyce and which Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p.204) considered an apt account of the effects of deterritorialization, 'composed chaos, neither foreseen nor preconceived'. It precipitates new ways of thinking and acting: 'Once one ventures outside what's familiar and reassuring, once one has to invent new concepts for unknown lands, then methods and moral systems break down' (Deleuze, 1995, p.322). The potential areas for deterritorialization cannot be specified; rather it is a case of being alert to opportunities to interrupt:

> This is how it should be done: Lodge yourself on a stratum; experiment with the opportunities it offers, find an advantageous place on it, find potential movements of deterritorialization, possible lines of flight, experience them, produce flow conjunctions here and there, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment, have a small plot of new land at all times. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.161)

Deterritorialization has the potential to attack the rigid, striated - or territorialized - spaces of teacher education, replacing these with ones which are smooth and full of creative possibilities. Within these newly created spaces 'life reconstitutes its stakes, confronts new obstacles, invents new paces, switches adversaries' (Deleuze &

Guattari, 1987, p.500). These smooth spaces are depicted by Deleuze and Guattari (p.413) as 'holey space', like Swiss cheese. Crucially, deterritorialization takes us from communication - through 'order-words' (Deleuze & Parnett, 1987, p.22), imperatives for others to act - to expression.

The four strands of deterritorialization, developed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), could be undertaken as a collective task within HEIs or by individuals. The first of these, becoming foreigners in our own tongue, would involve scrutiny of the language used in lectures and materials, keeping an eye for where the language of special needs is prevalent and creating stutterings over words and expressions which have hitherto been familiar. Colleagues at my own HEI developed a game of 'bullshit bingo' in an effort to pick up and subvert jargon in their written work. A similar exercise could be usefully undertaken with the teaching materials used with students.

The refusal of essences or signifieds is an important second strand of deterritorialization. Instead of attempting, in lectures and materials, to define the professional, we could point to what professionals do, and explore 'interstanding' between professionals.

Creative subtraction involves identifying what not to do within the curriculum. Instead of responding to the latest government imperatives to insert more content by looking to see where it can be squeezed in, there could be a search for what might be removed or reduced. An invitation to lose aspects of what we currently do in the teacher education curriculum, in order to put some other things in, could be attractive. Interprofessional work could prove to be more attractive as an *instead of,* rather than an *add on.* This, of course, will not be easy as there will be opposition from those who insist that the items proposed for shedding should remain purely because they have always been there and are precious to the individuals who put them there in the first place.

The acceptance that there is no-one behind expression, the final strand of deterritorialization, is a refusal to attribute blame or responsibility for content to any individuals and to encourage the contribution of new and untried ideas. Greater use of brainstorming sessions - or thought showers, as the new nomenclature goes - could enable staff in HEIs to roam through the kind of teacher education that they really

want to do, and the kind of interprofessional relationships they wish to support, rather than what they feel constrained to do, then to ask themselves 'why not?' The ruptures provided by deterritorialization may create opportunities for more productive learning.

Rhizomic learning

Adopting the rhizome as the means for learning to be a teacher ruptures the interpretation of theory (Deleuze, 1995) and the arborescent nature of learning with clear lines of demarcation between teacher and taught and in relation to content. Such knowledge is always fractured and partial. The rhizome, instead, privileges experimentation and experience, taking the student teachers on, in Derrida's (1992) terms, an 'empirical wandering' (p.7). The rhizome allows student teachers to invent themselves as the kind of teachers they want to become and instead of absorbing, and later replicating, content, student teachers would be involved in:

> experimenting with pedagogy and recreating its own curricular place, identity, and content; expanding its syllabi and diversify its reading lists; *supplementing* educational discourse with other theories; deterritorializing theory of education from course based to interdisciplinary directions. (Gregoriou, 2002, p.231; original emphasis)

These rhizomic wanderings could help to disrupt conventional knowledge about teaching and learning. This would force the student teachers to question what they know themselves, to 'ask what determinations and intensities [they] are prepared to countenance' (Roy, 2003, p.91) and to abandon ways of working that seem unreasonable.

Student teachers' knowledge and understanding might be fashioned as a series of maps, 'entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.12). These maps do not replicate knowledge, but perform and create new knowledge. Reflexivity, which students are often demanded to practise but are rarely given guidance on how to, could be directed towards producing maps of their journeys as becoming teachers. During their placements, student teachers could be invited to produce maps of their school contexts and of their connections with other professionals.

Learning to be a teacher through the rhizome is not a journey towards a fixed end, as denoted by the standards, but wanderings along a 'moving horizon' (Deleuze, 2004, p. xix) which are documented visually. As well as creating new knowledge, these wanderings provide opportunities for student teachers to establish, in Rose's (1996) terms, new assemblages and new selves, as teachers:

> A rhizome, a burrow, yes - but not an ivory tower. A line of escape, yes - but not a refuge. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.41)

Students' wanderings need to be supported and responded to in a way which does not entrench further their novice and incompetent identity and they need to be supported within the schools in which they carry out their teaching. As Lather (1991) reminds us, the undecidable is experienced by students as an ordeal and sustained as evidence of non-mastery, and Gregoriou (2004) warns that the rhizome might come to signify a sense of loss for students and produce anxiety:

> I'm confused, how does this fit in now, how is this going to be useful in my teaching, how do all these fit together … why do we keep shifting from subject to subject … why do we keep criticizing things …? Whose book is this rhizome of anxious quests? Is it less authoritative than any other textbook? (p.238)

Yet Deleuze and Guattari (1987) contend that 'it is through loss rather than acquisition that one progresses and picks up speed' (cited in Roy, 2003, p.56). Students' 'creative stammerings' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.98), questions and searches for links, would be engaged with, rather than closed down as indicative of their failure to grasp content. It is in these spaces or schisms where complex thinking would take place and where 'a new experiment in thought could be inserted … that might help teachers get an insight into the generative possibilities of the situation' (Roy, 2003, p.2). The function of the teacher educator, in Deleuzian terms, is to create pedagogical spaces which are open and smooth, in contrast with the closed and striated spaces of conventional approaches.

There is a danger that students' wanderings may simply take them *all over the place* without any clear focus. Gregoriou (2004, pp.237-238) describes a concern expressed by a university colleague to this effect:

> I have a student who has been trying to formulate the thematic for a paper for almost a semester now. She comes early in the semester with a very tidy and

'tight' proposal. Her heart is tight too, bound by stress and confusion. We discuss different options, different ways to go, various connections and inquiries to attempt. She starts to map various directions. She sounds exhilarated … She comes back the next week with a completely different theme. She talks about ways to expand, settles down at a new thematic. I suggest a preliminary bibliography. She comes back, again excited to discover this new author … She drifts again. Is this what following a 'line of flight' means? Is this rhizomatics? Is this growth? Am I going to grade this mapping of disparate things?

This particular example relates to written work rather than to the practice of teaching, but it highlights a major difficulty: how far should students be allowed to wander before being reined in and made to focus? The answer to this possibly depends on the nerve of the educators and their capacity to respond effectively to the students' wanderings - that is by staying with them. It also requires them to have a strong resolve and to resist the pressures of the 'marketable skills and anxious college graduates searching for that educational supplement that will bestow to them a competitive advantage' (Gregoriou, 2004, p.238). Finally they need to be persuasive and assure their students that if they 'invest in encounters with ideas where novelty escapes codification, ownership and repetition' (p.238), the returns will be rich. The possibility of active experimentation being a better - or at least more affirmative - route to both the standards and to the kind of teacher they want to become could be enough of a temptation.

The students' own desires could be foregrounded as part of their identity as becoming teachers. Instead of their status representing a lack of competence, they could be encouraged to articulate their trajectory - emotional as well as in terms of their acquisition of skills - towards the kind of teacher they want to become. The narratives of experienced professionals - from health and social work as well as from education - could be a valuable resource in helping student teachers to understand the fractured, partial and embodied process of becoming a professional and the centrality of desire in this. Student teachers could be encouraged to offer and compare reflections on the intensities of their experiences and their 'percepts' and 'affects' (Deleuze, 1995, p.164), the way they come to think and live as teachers.

Collaboration and collusion

Pre-service training is an obvious place to initiate professionals into collaborative working across boundaries, by providing spaces, for example, for teachers, health professionals and social workers to learn and engage together. Continuing professional development (CPD) would enable this mutual learning and engagement to continue, with support for collaborative practices; whilst some CPD does this at present, it could be more explicitly focused on the development of interdisciplinary working practices. It is essential also that evidence of what 'good', rather than effective, collaborative practice looks like is documented and used to inform training and professional development. This involves finding out from the people who experience it what it means to them. Staff development for professionals, instead of being a content-driven attempt to skill them up in response to the latest government imperative, could provide a smooth space for them to pause, think and repair some of the damage they feel has been done to them.

Collaboration, as well as possibly improving practice, may offer teachers support in the form of rhizomic interdependency and this could be particularly valuable in relation to children and young people with behavioural problems. If these were addressed collectively, with an expectation that they are too difficult to be managed by any one teacher, there might be less of a sense that including troublesome pupils is an impossibility. The networks formed by teachers with colleagues and with other professionals could provide new smooth spaces for engagement and much needed solidarity to subvert the structures and regimes which control them and create barriers to inclusion - their own and that of children and young people in their class. This kind of collective transgression does not imply major revolt against the system, but finding creative ways of resisting pressures to do things in a certain way, making what Honan (2004, p.278) calls 'agentic choices' and making the language used within their own school contexts stammer. Stress might be a chasm to be investigated and ameliorated through creative subtraction, asking what could be removed from professionals' working lives in order to remove or reduce stress. This 'condition', instead of being a malady which reduces individuals' capacities, could become the material for

collaboration because its mammoth proportions and spread across the professions require a collective response.

Recognition, rupture and repair?

Change in the conditions within and across professions, as Roy (2003, p.147) reminds us, is unlikely to be achieved through 'grand plans' but through 'combat', 'looking out for microfissures through which life leaks: "Imperceptible rupture, not signifying breaks" opens up these possibilities as stammerings, murmurs, decodings, and disorientations'. In other words, teachers and other professionals may find ways forward in those moments of undecidability when a new thought or a new kind of experiment emerges. These are likely to be not new in the sense of never having been seen before, but 'uncanny … a thing known returning in a different form … a revenant' (Banville, 2005, p.10).

References

Allan, J. (2003) Inclusion and exclusion in the university. In T. Booth, K. Nes & M. Strømstad (Eds.), *Developing inclusive teacher education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Allan, J. (forthcoming) *Just inclusion: Putting the philosophers of difference to work.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Baker, B. (2002) The hunt for disability: The new eugenics and the normalization of school children. *Teachers College Record,* 104 (4), 663-703.

Ball, S. (1990) *Politics and policy making in education.* London: Routledge.

Ball, S. (1994) *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach.* Buckingham/Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

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

Banville, J. (2005) *The sea.* Basingstoke: Picador.

Bogue, R. (2004) Search, swim and see: Deleuze's apprenticeship in signs and pedagogy of images. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 36 (3), 327-342.

Booth, T. (2003) Views from the institution: Overcoming barriers to inclusive teacher education? In T.Booth, K.Nes & M.Strømstad (Eds.), *Developing inclusive teacher education.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Brantlinger, E. (2004) Confounding the needs and confronting the norms: An extension of Reid and Valle's essay. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 37 (6), 490-499.

Burgess, A. (2004) *Here comes everybody* In G. Deleuze (Ed.), *Difference and repetition.* London: Continuum.

Cormack, P. & Comber, B. (1996) Writing the teacher: The South Australian junior primary English teacher, 1962-1995. In B.Green & C. Beavis (Eds.), *Teaching the English subjects: Essays on English curriculum history and Australian schooling.* Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.

Critchley, S (1999) *The ethics of deconstruction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Daniels, H. (2005) *Young people at risk of social exclusion*: *Interagency working and professional learning.* Paper presented at the Participation, Inclusion and Equity Research Network, Stirling, 20 June.

Deleuze, G. (1983) *Nietzsche and philosophy.* Trans H.Tomlinson. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992) Postscript on the societies of control. Retrieved 24 October, 2006, from:http//www.n5m.org/n5m2/media/texts/deleuze.htm

Deleuze, G. (1995) *Negotiations.* Trans M.Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1998) *Essays critical and clinical.* Trans D.Smith & M.Greco. London/New York: Verso.

Deleuze, G. (2004) *Difference and repetition.* London Continuum,

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987) *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* London: The Athlone Press.

Deleuze G. & Guattari, F. (1994) *What is philosophy?* Trans H.Tomlinson & B.Habberjam. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (1987) *Dialogues.* Trans H.Tomlinson & B.Habberjam. New York: Columbia University Press.

Derrida, J. (1974) *Of grammatology.* Trans G.Spivak. New York: Columbia University Press.

Derrida, J. (1976) *Of grammatology*. Trans G.Spivak. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1990) Force of law: The mystical foundation of authority. Trans M.Quaintance. *Cardoza Law Review,* 11, 9191-1070.

Derrida, J. (1992) *The other heading: Reflections on today's Europe*. Trans P.Brault & M.Naas. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Forbes, J. (2003) *Teacher/therapist collaborations: Discourses, positionings and power relations at work*. EdD thesis, University of Stirling.

General Teaching Council for Scotland (2002a) *Standard for Full Registration*. Edinburgh: GTC.

General Teaching Council for Scotland (2002b) *Standard for Chartered Teacher*. Edinburgh: GTC.

Gregoriou, Z. (2001) Does speaking of others involve receiving the 'other'? A postcolonial reading of receptivity in Derrida's deconstruction of Timaeus. In G. Biesta & D.Egéa-Kuehne (Eds.), *Derrida & education*. London: Routledge.

Gregoriou, Z. (2002) Performing pedagogy with Deleuze: The rhizomatics of 'theory of education'. *Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference Proceedings,* New College, Oxford, pp.227-237.

Gregoriou, Z. (2004) Commencing the rhizome: Towards a minor philosophy of education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 36 (3), 233-251.

Honan, E. (2004) (Im)plausibilities: A rhizo-textual analysis of policy texts and teachers' work. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 36 (3), 267-281.

Howard, J. (1998) Subjectivity and space: Deleuze and Guattari's BwO in the new world order. In E. Kaufman & K.J.Heller (Eds.), *Deleuze and Guattari: New mappings in politics, philosophy and culture*. Minneapolis, MN/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Lather, P. (1991) *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Mahony, P. & Hextall, I. (2000) *Reconstructing teaching: Standards, performance and accountability*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Makareth, C. & Turner, T. (2002) *Joined up working*. London: Health Visitors Association.

Milne, V. (2005) Joined up working in the Scottish Executive. *Research Findings No. 17*. Retrieved on 3/5/06 from: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/10/0693747/37483.

Nietzsche, F. (1983) On the uses and disadvantages of history for life. In *Untimely meditations*. Trans R.J.Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patton, P. (2000) *Deleuze and the political*. London: Routledge.

Rajchman, J. (2001) *The Deleuze connections*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Remedios, R. & Allan, J. (2004) *Evaluation of New Community Schools in Stirling*. Report to Stirling Council Services. University of Stirling.

Rizvi, F. & Kemmis, S. (1987) *Dilemmas of reform*. Geelong, Vic.: Deakin Institute of Education.

Rose, N. (1996) *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power and personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roy, K. (2003) *Teachers in nomadic spaces: Deleuze and curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Roy, K. (2004) Overcoming nihilism: From communication to Deleuzian expression. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* (36 (3), 297-312.

Scottish Executive (2001) *A teaching profession for the 21st century: Agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Smith, D. (1998) The place of ethics in Deleuze's philosophy: Three questions of immanence. In E.Kaufman & K.J.Heller (Eds.), *Deleuze and Guattari: New mappings in politics, philosophy and culture*. Minneapolis, MN/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Smyth, J. & Shacklock, G. (1998) *Remaking teaching: Ideology, policy and practice*. London: Routledge.

Spivak, G. (1996) Explanation and culture marginalia. In D.Landry & G.MacLean (Eds.), *The Spivak reader: Selected works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. New York: Routledge.