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In the context of globalisation and globalised policy talk about the emergence of a knowledge economy, nations around the world have recognised the overwhelming significance of the quality and quantity of human capital to economic development and regeneration, to social cohesion, as well as to the international competitiveness of the (putative) national economy. In this context, education policy has become a central component of economic policy. Different nations have pursued this human capital development goal in different ways. The Anglo-American nations have tended to take a neo-liberal approach through a restructuring of the state, public/private partnerships, market reforms and choice, while other models, for example, those in the Scandinavian countries as well as those in East Asia, have taken a different policy direction with more state-centric policies, but for the same policy purposes. This improving educational achievement agenda has both qualitative and quantitative aspects, that is, there is a policy concern within the nations of the Global North for improving the quality and amount of education provided for all young people.

The evidence is overwhelming that those who do poorly at school and who do not complete a full secondary education are from socio-economically disadvantaged families. Thus improvements in educational achievement and enhancing the amount of education received by all come up against this issue of the social class/educational achievement nexus. Central to the policy agenda then has been a recognition that there is need to break the nexus between social class of origin and educational opportunities, achievements and retention at school. The achievement of equal opportunities in education, more equal outcomes and greater retention to the end of secondary schooling, however, remain intractable policy goals. In the UK, for example, a policy focus attempts to ameliorate disadvantage for those young people not in education, employment or training. The Rudd Labor government in Australia, elected in late 2007, sees socio-economic based inequalities in educational opportunities and outcomes as unacceptable on social justice grounds, but also in terms of the economic well being of the nation and the related need for better prepared human capital. In England, the Department for Education and Skills in 2004 in its Five Year Strategy document stated:

We fail our most disadvantaged children and young people - those in public care, those with complex family lives are those most at risk...Internationally our rate of child poverty is still high, as are the rates of worklessness in one-parent families, the rate of teenage pregnancies and the level of poor diet among children. The links between poor health, disadvantage and low educational outcomes are stark. (Department for Education & Skills, 2004, para. 24)
There is then a wide-spread recognition of this policy problem; the question is what can and should be done about it in relation to the broader policy purposes? The research evidence would suggest that the socio-economic experiences of families (parental educational levels, cultural practices, income, types of jobs, aspirations) and the quality of pedagogies and relationships in classrooms are the two most salient factors in school achievement.

Given our social science based knowledge of the epidemiology of educational disadvantage then and its seeming intractability through traditional policies in education, an interesting policy response in the UK to this social, educational and ultimately economic problem has been the concept of ‘joined-up government’ and ‘inter-professional agency work’, grouped in and around schools. This has been a discursive policy response, arguing the necessity of a new way of working for the policy bureaucracies and for partnerships and collaboration between a range of professionals and their practices. (In the US and in some parts of Australia, the idea of the full-service school is a related policy development.) Accompanying this discursive reframing in the UK has been a legislative one. In England, The Green Paper, Every Child Matters (HM Treasury, 2003) and the ensuing legislation, Children Act, 2004, Education and Inspections Act, 2006, reconstituted education as a children’s service, demanding the integration of education, health and social services in an attempt to improve and expand educational outcomes for all and in a move away from a one size fits all approach.

This new policy configuration sees learning and support for it in homes and communities, as well as schools, as central to the policy goals of improved educational outcomes for all, including those disadvantaged by socio-economic circumstances. In my view, in some ways this is an historical moment in the evolution of educational provision, part of the concept of lifelong learning, and as significant in its potential impact as the 1944 Education Act which ensured some secondary education for all (Lingard, Nixon & Ranson, 2008).

While a joined-up approach might result in positive synergy in addressing educational and social disadvantage, the broader policy frame of neo-liberalism adopted to varying degrees among the countries that make up the UK has resulted in more economic inequality. This joined-up policy response is a wonderful exemplification then of the ways in which policies construct the problem to which they are the proposed solution: here, education to overcome socio-economic disadvantage. The social class/education success nexus is not so entrenched in the Scandinavian countries. We need to recognise that these countries have less social inequality than is the case in the UK as demonstrated in their comparative Gini coefficients (a measure of the inequality of income/wealth distribution). Finland’s success on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), where it achieves high quality and socially just outcomes, probably reflects this comparative equality and a comprehensive government school system, where one might be able to argue that all young people in local areas go to the same school. This situation can be starkly contrasted with that in England, where one policy response to improving outcomes and overcoming educational disadvantage is to widen the
types of schools available within the government sector and to strengthen parental choice. While Scotland still has a comprehensive schooling system, there is a socio-economic based achievement gap beginning in upper primary schools and reflected as well in differential retention in the senior years of schooling (OECD, 2007).

It is this range of discursive, policy and organisational developments associated with a reconstruction of children’s services, that Joan Forbes and Cate Watson’s edited collection, *Service Integration in Schools*, seeks to address. In addressing these policy developments the collection has multiple readerships in mind and seeks to be both academic and policy relevant. That is, the collected papers seek to speak to policy makers in ways that the critiques offered might provoke some potential paths forward; the papers also speak to academics in the fields of both professional practice and policy in education and social work. The papers demonstrate that joined-up policy and professional practices will not magically appear through simple discursive exhortation. Rather, these are matters which need to be debated and discussed amongst and between relevant professionals, policy makers, academic theorists and researchers, set against recognition that a more equal society is necessary to the achievement of the policy goals of higher quality education and more educational equality for all. These goals have become almost universal ones across the globe in an age of educational multilateralism and thus the collection ought to be read by relevant professionals around the world and should have particular purchase across the UK, in Europe, in North America and in Australia and New Zealand, where the topics traversed have particular policy and practice salience.
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INTRODUCTION

The question of changing children’s services is one which countries in the United Kingdom and elsewhere are attempting to address and the issues and challenges raised by such transformations are many. The integration of services in schools, how education should now work differently – and better – with health, social care and other services to children, is a topical issue. The current children’s services integration agenda emerged fairly recently and moves to integrate services are proving to be neither easy nor straightforward. As new policy enjoiners drive changing governance, management, leadership and practices in interprofessional and interagency working a number of practical and cultural problems are being encountered by practitioners and professional groups where policy fails to work in practice. This edited collection of papers presents to the reader some such challenging instances of policy-practice disjuncture through informative critical analyses of key ideas in the children’s services research and policy discourses and by introducing to the reader a series of alternative perspectives, questions and suggestions that explore what is at stake and what is worthwhile retaining and changing in public services to children. A feature of the book is the necessary and apposite cross-disciplinary approach which it takes to the many issues and challenges in an agenda which cuts across research disciplines as much as professions and agencies.

THE RESEARCH SEMINARS AT THE UNIVERSITIES OF ABERDEEN, ULSTER AND BIRMINGHAM

This book has emerged from an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) research seminar series held at the universities of Aberdeen, Ulster and Birmingham between May 2006 and April 2007. The aim of the series of meetings was to bring together practitioners, researchers and policy makers from the different disciplines that inform policy and practice in education, health and social care, together with representatives of voluntary agencies working with/for children, professional associations, and the users of children’s public services to explore a number of important questions for practitioners and professional groups arising from the children’s services transformations agenda that is currently unfolding in the UK countries and in other places. The first seminar in the series at the
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, in May 2006: The research and policy discourses of service integration, interprofessional and interagency working mapped the research and policy discourses that are currently constructing the reformation of children’s services and how professional groups work together in schools and communities in Scotland, Northern Ireland and England. The seminar aimed to examine the professional values to which different groups subscribe and to uncover the purposes that underlie service integration. We analysed current issues concerning demarcations of practice and professional boundaries in multi-agency working and examined the effects of specific models of co-practice on professionals’ practices and identities.

In October 2006 the second of our seminars: How service integration is operating in practice in the Scotland, Northern Ireland and England and Wales policy contexts was held at the University of Ulster, Northern Ireland. This meeting explored the variety of emergent models of partnership within children’s services, drawing on examples from across the United Kingdom countries. Focusing on the relationships between children’s services, families and communities, the seminar provided a forum for researchers and practitioners to share and learn about current models of practice across the UK policy contexts, to map evolving models of implementation and to identify the implications for governance and administration arrangements.

The third seminar in the series: Leading and managing collaborative practice: The research was held at the University of Birmingham, England, in January 2007. The Birmingham seminar both built on and challenged some of the understandings from the first two seminars. It explored notions of leadership and management as constructed and conceptualised within disciplines which collaborate in multidisciplinary work. The seminar specifically examined discourses of power as these play out in professional status, gender and ethnicity within and across disciplines and how, in relation to issues of leadership and management, these subvert collaboration, co-learning and joint problem solving. A central focus in discussion concerned the management of change as professional groups and agencies move from mono-professional and single subject disciplinary practice towards integrated services underpinned by collaborative working.

In April 2007 the seminar series participants returned to Aberdeen for the fourth and final meeting in the series: Future school services, ‘global solutions’. In the final meeting we drew together issues from earlier seminars, exploring narratives of interprofessional identification and gave consideration to the institutional conditions necessary for transprofessional learning. Issues of interprofessionalism, interagency working and of children’s public services transformations in the UK countries were located within an analysis of the discourses and practices of school workforce modernisation and transformation in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia. Examining the effects of matters of professional agency and institutional cultures for working relations among professionals in future schools, the seminar questioned whether there are ‘global solutions’ that could take full account of the different historically contingent social and cultural conditions in specific institutional, regional and national contexts.
IN INTRODUCTION

In keeping with the aim of the seminars, this collection is intended for practitioners, managers and leaders, academics and policy-makers in the fields of education health and social care across the UK nations and in other countries who are interested in thoughtfully presented and challenging analyses that critique fundamental issues for all involved in recent developments in children’s services restructurings.

INTRODUCING THE CHAPTERS

Each of the four sections of the book is prefaced by a comprehensive introduction and overview of the contents of the chapters that follow and so the outline of the chapters given here is concise. Part One of the book considers the research and policy discourses of service integration, interprofessional and interagency working. This first section is introduced by Michael Cowie who takes as his starting point the notion that, at least in terms of policy, the ‘introduction of collaboration is seen as unproblematic’. Cowie then goes on to show how the chapters that follow in Part One each illustrate ways in which the nature of collaborative working is not unproblematic. In chapter one, Learning how to collaborate? Promoting young people’s health through professional partnership in schools, Janet Shucksmith, Kate Philip, Jenny Spratt and Cate Watson offer an examination of how different professional groups claim expertise on the basis of different types of knowledge. They argue that the knowledge used by others at professional boundaries challenges the previous bases of teacher professionalism, but such challenges may be viewed as openings for the fruitful reconstruction of teachers’ practices. In her chapter, Joining up working: Terms, types and tensions, Elspeth McCartney outlines, classifies and discusses a number of models of speech/language therapist and teacher co-working and goes on to contend that in practice the emphasis may need to be on ‘good enough’ models of working together. In the concluding chapter in Part One, After the break? Interrupting the discourses of interprofessional practice, Julie Allan considers the ways in which policy discourses already inscribe expectations for interprofessional practice and proceeds to uncover the effects of such policy discourses for both beginning and established teachers.

Each of the chapters in Part Two examines how service integration is operating in practice in the Scotland, Northern Ireland and England policy contexts. Roy McConkey sets the context for the three chapters that follow in this section. Noting that the opening years of the twenty-first century have seen a broadening of a previous focus on learning and teaching with the introduction of new imperatives for education and other children’s services to review how they work together, McConkey describes how each of the chapters in section two draw on experiences from Scotland, Northern Ireland and England to examine the practical issues involved in service integration and, strikingly, goes on to identify ‘a number of icebergs’ that may ‘threaten the integration agenda on its maiden voyage’.

Ian Menter’s chapter, Service integration in schools: The Scottish scene and the implications for teachers, draws in part on a study of teachers’ working time in
Scotland following the implementation of the ‘McCrone report’ and the impact of this on moves towards establishing integrated children’s services in schools. He illustrates how there is evidence of both convergence and divergence of Scottish policy and practice with parallel developments in other parts of the UK. Menter argues for greater conceptual clarity around the notion of integrated services and calls for a major research agenda, including critical discourse based analyses, to unpack and examine the discourses and practices of children’s services in Scotland and beyond.

In their chapter, *Communicating, co-ordinating and connecting: Integrated service provision in Northern Ireland*, Anne Moran, Lesley Abbott and Una O’Connor describe moves towards the integration of services in a very fluid national context of evolving child centred social and educational policy and practice developing alongside major reviews of education and overall public administration. Moran and colleagues conclude that the development of genuinely integrated partnerships amongst education, health and social services in the Northern Irish extended schools initiative is recognised as a constituent feature of both educational policy and overall public services reform.

In the final chapter in Part Two, *Every child matters: The implications for service integration in England*, Gillian Pugh examines the main recent policy thrusts driving children’s services transformations in England. Reporting the huge and ambitious nature of the ‘Every child matters: Change for children agenda’, the author reframes the question of joined-up working as a means to an end for children and not an end in itself and suggests strategies for improving integrated working amongst professionals.

Part Three of the book focuses on leading and managing collaborative practice. Deirdre Martin’s introduction to Part Three opens with the premise that leaders of integrated or ‘extended’ schools must now engage with the challenges and opportunities of moves towards integration to well position the institutions and organizations they lead for future success. Outlining for the reader the theoretical orientations of Vygotsky and Engeström in relation to learning and learning in work organisations such as integrated schools which inform the chapters by Warmington et al. and Hartley which follow, she notes that the theme which cuts across those papers and the chapter by Brown is that of ‘distributed leadership at system and multiagency levels’. Highlighting issues raised by the three chapters relating to professional discourses, practices, knowledge, skills, beliefs and identity that underlie the nature of professionalism, Martin concludes by proposing that such questions merit further study and constitute a necessary and timely research agenda for the current moment of school and service integration.

The opening chapter in this section, *Learning leadership in multiagency work for integrating services into schools* by Paul Warmington and colleagues emerges from earlier work of this group in an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) study: *Learning in and for Interagency Working. Examining the learning in practice of professionals and organisations*. Warmington and colleagues identify a need to access horizontal learning and distributed, multiagency expertise across sectors, and argue that vertical learning needs to be fostered between the
strategic and operational levels of practice. They conclude that it is through professionals learning to negotiate the intersections of vertical and horizontal learning that future practitioner learning and flexible and responsive action are promoted and supported.

The next chapter by David Brown, *Leadership and capacity in the public sector: Integrated children’s services and schools*, provides an account of the challenges to leadership arising from the recent radical reform of children’s services in England as a consequence of the wide ranging *Every Child Matters* agenda. As Executive Director of Children’s Services in Walsall, Brown explores the challenges and opportunities for leaders arising from the plethora of systemic and organizational complexities involved in such comprehensive public sector transformation. His analysis of cross agency ‘system leadership’ in the new economy of the children’s public sector leads him to conclude on a philosophical note that future leaders will need to establish their own ‘moral compass’.

In *Education policy and the ‘inter’-regnum*, David Hartley reflects critically on public services policy discourses and terminology in the current moment. Critiquing examples of the proliferation of prefixes – inter, trans, multi and so forth, he reframes the notion of ‘inter’ as a new ‘reigning philosophy’ or ‘inter’-regnum. Hartley considers how, taken together, these strands constitute a new network regime of governance that complements those of markets and hierarchies. He suggests that ‘inter’ forms of governance have emerged from previous education discourses of the market and consumer choice associated with new public management, as apposite ‘solution spaces’ in the ‘new capitalism’ work order of affinity, and as discourses and practices that are intellectually well supported by a number of theoretical strands in marketing, organisational learning and activity theory.

Part Four broadens the conceptualisation and contextualisation of the themes developed to examine future school services and explore questions of ‘global solutions’. Audrey Hendry’s introduction *Future school services, ‘global solutions’, contextualises the papers in section four of the book*. Recognising that, for some, the issues raised may seem far removed from day-to-day work of practitioners in schools, Hendry challenges readers to be open to looking differently at problems and looking in different places for solutions. She argues that it is through a wider conceptualisation and contextualisation of the issues that a clearer grasp of the challenges of integrated services and insights into best ways to now adapt and transform services to children will be gained.

In chapter ten, *Modernising and remodelling schools: Are there ‘global solutions’ to transforming the school workforce?*, Graham Butt and Helen Gunter present findings from research concerning the impact of the National Agreement for workforce modernisation, change and remodelling in England. Drawing on case study evidence from children’s services reformations in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia, Butt and Gunter unpack the background, underlying assumptions and drivers for reform and explore the processes of restructuring in England and other places. Their analysis elucidates the nature of what is important in the work of children’s professionals and points to the danger of organisational
approaches to children’s workforce remodelling and modernisation that focus on structures and management rather than on more student and practitioner focused perspectives of learning and teaching and care. At issue in ‘modernised education’, they contend, is what is at its centre – structures or students.

In her chapter, *Mythical spaces and social imaginaries: Looking for the global in the local in narratives of (inter)professional identification*, Cate Watson applies the theory of discourse of Laclau and Mouffe to explore the relationship between local personal narratives, global institutional discourses and the professional identifications they engender. She offers a microanalysis of a narrative fragment from research with beginning teachers to uncover how institutional identifications are manifested in and through narrative. Concluding that the political moment is revealed in the microanalysis of discourse, Watson calls for mappings of the ‘mythical spaces’ and ‘imaginary geographies’ of schools and argues for the construction of new imaginaries of interprofessional practice that do not seek superficial consensus, but are more firmly based on ‘contested dissensus’.

The final chapter in the book, *The conditions for inter-professional learning: The centrality of relationship*, addresses the four themes discussed in the preceding chapters: changing children’s services; possibilities for new relationships; the institution and operation of new professional norms and networks; and practitioners’ constructions of new professional identities. Jon Nixon takes as his point of departure the assumptions that institutional well being is dependent not only on structures and systems, but on institutional culture and practitioners’ relationships, and that global solutions must take full account of regional and institutional social relations and be locally grounded. Nixon highlights the need for a new alternative language to that of market-management to talk about professional practice and offers a deliberately oppositional language of ‘hope’, ‘friendship’ and ‘virtue’. The chapter and book ends by offering a number of suggestions regarding the conditions for the redefinition of professional identities and interprofessional working relations if these were constituted in terms of ‘virtuous friendship’, as they surely must be if we are to take forward seriously the notion of working together for better outcomes for children.
EDITORS’ NOTE

In a collected work like this it is perhaps inevitable that author preferences for particular spellings and use or not of the hyphen will emerge. We have decided to accommodate these differences rather than to impose a uniformity which would perhaps imply the acceptance of a 'one size fits all' philosophy that we are very far from espousing. We hope the reader will not find this approach irksome.
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Interagency networks of professionals in education, health and social work, with multiagency teams collaborating in more meaningful ways than previously found in schools are central to a new and different approach to schooling in the UK. 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. Within this structure the introduction of collaboration is frequently seen as unproblematic.

But the chapters in this section, however, illustrate that the nature of collaborative working is certainly not unproblematic. The piece by Janet Shucksmith, Kate Philip, Jennifer Spratt and Cate Watson emerges from an empirical study previously undertaken for the then 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 of children and young people. The focus of this chapter is the nature of the collaborative partnerships formed by teachers and schools with other agencies and professional groups and the extent to which teachers were prepared to collaborate and share knowledge and skills with other professionals. Based on a wide range of interviews and six detailed case studies of the experiences of 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 working 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 those in other fields and collaborate with them in integrated ways.

This chapter analyses data gained in the case studies and uses Lam’s (2000) typology of knowledge as an 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 are regarded as being 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. Their findings suggest 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 in interaction with professionals using other forms of knowledge. However, the chapter 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 response of teachers to the challenge to their professional identity may be to ‘reinvent their professionalism and practice’.

Elspeth McCartney also tries to get a better understanding of what is involved in interagency working by considering how speech and language therapists (who, as she says, have already ‘been around the block’ in terms of co-working) 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 chapter 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.

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.

As with other contributions in this collection, this chapter 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 chapter draws on the work of Derrida (1994) 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 opened to 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 ‘detransitionalized’ and that such ruptures 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 interprofessional 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 interdisciplinary working practices 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 chapters in this part of the book 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 contributions 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, the contributions here suggest 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.

Michael Cowie
Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
UK
LEARNING HOW TO COLLABORATE? PROMOTING YOUNG PEOPLE’S HEALTH THROUGH PROFESSIONAL PARTNERSHIP IN SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter emerges from an empirical study undertaken in 2004/5 for the then 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 frequently fail to see the relevance of mental health to learning, arguably their central concern. 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 chapter 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. From this perspective it appears 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.

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, no pagination)

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 (2003) 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’ (p. 8). They suggest that this may be an underestimate and moreover that the prevalence may be greater among those born more recently, implying that 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, p. 399) point out, ‘conclusive evidence on the issue is actually in exceedingly 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 (Department of Education and Science, 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 confusion and indeed 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 cooperate may cause frustration for teachers and other children. (p. 13)

Atkinson and Hornby (2002, p. 4) 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, and the presence or absence of protective/risk factors and 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, attention deficit hyperactivity 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, since 2007 all schools have been officially designated as ‘Health promoting schools’ (Schools (Health promotion and nutrition) (Scotland) Act 2007). 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 encompasses 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 more recently published 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. These two 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. 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 puts forward 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 December 2004 (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. The drive for the development of integrated children’s services has been brought together in the policy document Getting it right for every child (Scottish Executive, 2006) ‘which sets out reform of services for children in three areas – practice change, removing barriers and legislation’ (p. 2).

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 Department for Education and Science report on Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (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 by 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 well-being.

– **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 enabling the interviewer to probe more deeply into areas of interest or concern to the participants. Parents were offered the choice of group or one-to-one interviews, to allow those who felt the issue too sensitive for wider discussion to express their views in confidence. The inclusion of some group interviews also 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 technique was used to avoid 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 [Foucault, 1991]) 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embrained knowledge</td>
<td>Abstract, theoretical, linked to professional bureaucracies – external bodies define standards of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encoded knowledge</td>
<td>‘Information’, does not allow for practical knowledge, linked to ‘machine bureaucracy’ – allows standardisation and control; knowledge which fortifies professional compliance e.g., an experienced mother’s way of handling a crying child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied knowledge</td>
<td>Individual; tacit; practical e.g., the ‘craft’ aspects of classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded knowledge</td>
<td>Collective form of tacit knowledge; based on shared norms, routines e.g., the ‘craft’ aspects of classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People move between different knowledges in their practices (see Brownlie & Howson, 2006) 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 is will be significant in deciding how valid are their claims to expertise in working on mental health care. Thus if community-based workers are described as ‘specialists’ in the field, they are accorded kudos but this may be perceived as 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 such as Basil Bernstein, Jerome Bruner and others as providing examples of 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 are rarely explicitly referred to thereafter. (Perhaps we should here make a distinction between teachers’ embrained knowledge about teaching and learning and their embrained subject-specific knowledge which is particularly required by teachers in the secondary sector.)
Forms of encoded knowledge, as defined by Lam, are also evident in teachers’ practice. Recent examples might relate to government edicts concerning ‘synthetic phonics’ in the teaching of reading, and the introduction of the ‘literacy and numeracy hours’ in England. 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, and, 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 preferred 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 perhaps 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 is seems unlikely that Scottish schools in particular will be able for much longer to evade responsibility for CAMHS tier 1 activities (services provided by practitioners who are not mental health specialists working in universal services; this includes GPs, health visitors, school nurses, teachers, social workers, youth justice workers, voluntary agencies). 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 take co-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 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 are able to be full participants in an 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 regarding 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 for other staff. One of these workers commented on the uphill struggle she faced in her role:
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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 innovations
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.

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’ (p.230). 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 and so real institutional support may not be there for workers at the practice level.

This chapter offers 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, for example, in medicine, nursing health, the probation service, 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 professionalism 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 young people with mental health problems needing attention and support.
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