

The positions of primary and secondary schools in the English school field: a case of durable inequality

Coldron, J., Crawford, M., Jones, S. & Simkins, T.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Coldron, J, Crawford, M, Jones, S & Simkins, T 2015, 'The positions of primary and secondary schools in the English school field: a case of durable inequality' *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 671-687.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.972989>

DOI 10.1080/02680939.2014.972989

ISSN 0268-0939

ESSN 1464-5106

Publisher: Taylor and Francis

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of Education Policy on 31/10/2014, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/02680939.2014.972989>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Title: The positions of primary and secondary schools in the English school field: A case of durable inequality.

Authors

John Coldron, Sheffield Hallam University [j.h.coldron@shu.ac.uk]

Megan Crawford, University of Cambridge [mpc52@cam.ac.uk]

Steve Jones, Sheffield Hallam University [s.c.jones@shu.ac.uk]

Tim Simkins, Sheffield Hallam University [t.j.simkins@shu.ac.uk]

Keywords: primary schools; secondary schools; relations between schools; capital; England

Acknowledgements:

Thanks to Chris Cowan, Robin Smith and Ben Willis for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

The relative positions of primary and secondary schools in the English school field: A case of durable inequality?

Abstract

In interviews with primary headteachers it was evident that there was some tension between them and their secondary peers. We explore how this is a symptom of a durable inequality. We first describe how differences of size, composition of the workforce, pedagogy and history combine to create different institutional habituses and professional identities. We then analyse how these differences are construed as oppositional schemas – such as generalist/subject expert; informal/formal; domestic/business like; relationship oriented/task oriented - which in a complex interaction with wider discourses of gender and age, are invested with different meaning and value that tend to relegate typical primary school attributes. We further analyse how the notion of ‘the basics’ allows the primary school’s mission to be taken variously as the most important because of the need for sound foundations, or educationally simple, or as merely preparatory and show that the latter two meanings currently dominate and help position primary with less symbolic, social and material capital than secondary. We consider what implications this power divide has for understanding school positioning in local arenas which are reconfiguring as the role of local authorities is reduced. Finally we suggest some lines for further enquiry.

Introduction

The policy landscape in England is changing. The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Government was elected in 2010 and it has energetically pursued a programme to create a school system comprised primarily of ‘independent publicly-funded schools’ (DfE 2010; Woods and Simkins 2014). The intention is for the majority of schools to be academies which operate under direct funding agreements with central government freeing them from local authority (LA) control. They are autonomous in terms of curriculum and management, but operate under the same central government accountability regime of testing and inspection as those that remain under LA control. The attempt to create a ‘self-improving school system’ (Hargreaves 2010 and 2011) is leading to new forms of collaborative partnerships such as chains, federations and teaching school alliances.

As part of a project about the impact at local level of these processes we interviewed headteachers who, in various ways, occupied top positions in their local hierarchy. These were leaders of both primary and secondary schools, or federations of schools. They were personally and professionally respected and were taking leading roles locally and nationally. Their schools performed well, were graded *Good* or *Outstanding* following inspection and were popular with parents. While all of them acknowledged to us that their prestige depended on maintaining their school's performance and that this was potentially precarious, they exhibited the confidence of proven and experienced leaders.

But, we also found evidence of some discomfort on the part of the successful primary headteachers we interviewed in relation to their secondary colleagues, a sense that, as a *primary* headteacher, there was a danger of being positioned subordinate to their *secondary* peers with implications for their accrual of symbolic and material rewards. We found coincidentally, that high prestige secondary headteachers were gaining positions of considerable influence in the three LAs in our study more often than their high prestige primary peers (Coldron et al 2014).

A passage from one interview with a primary school headteacher illustrated awareness of some discomfiting aspects about current interactions with secondary colleagues. At the end of the interview, during which she had been articulate and confident talking about current policy and its implications for her and her school, she spoke explicitly about the relationship with neighbouring secondary schools as they collaborated in the planning for a new Teaching School Allianceⁱ and her words exhibited a quite different tone. We were struck by the complexity of what she was trying to say and her difficulty in expressing it.

I So is there anything else you wanted to add about, generally about what's going on, or have I given you an opportunity to talk through the main parts?

R I just think that in the (pause) the way it's been thrown out, the teaching school thing, (pause) it could have been quite detrimental to relationships. And I think we've, we've, you know, we've probably

I Between schools?

R Yeah, 'cos I think that, you know, that, that there's, there's (pause) elitism and it's not the old beacon school thing, this is about collaborative working. And, you know, a little bit of uncertainty means a little bit of land grab, and it - actually full proper head teachers who have (pause) been teachers who have grown into the role, that's, that's unfamiliar territory,

because we're not that type of people. And er and I think that the businessy type people (pause) have, have probably taken more of a leap (pause) first, because they, they are more confident perhaps, and more used to that (pause) erm (pause) that world. And (pause) I just feel now I'm feeling more confident to be able to get out there, because we have got a good story to tell and we've got a lot going on. But there is still - and probably (pause) secondary, primary, you know, I just feel that primaries (pause) - I'm finding it hard (pause). Secondary school mentality is a little bit different. And (pause) the primaries within (pause). The two primaries that I'm closest to I don't feel that, but I just think that primaries should have a voice, and should work very closely with secondaries and it's not always an open door, and it's always (pause) the big boy, and, and there's no baggage there. I just feel that, you know, we're equal players around a table. (Primary headteacher C8)

We are interested in this paper in trying to understand how and why primary headteachers might be so positioned. What are, for example, the implications of the significant differences between primary and secondary schools in England such that they may be described as different worlds, staffed by different types of people, with different mentalities or ways of thinking? While differences are noted in the considerable but largely separate literatures on the culture of secondary and primary schools little attention has been paid recently to the relationship itself, nor how the differences between the phases are in some ways defined in opposition to each other and how they might constitute unequal relations.

In an earlier provisional analysis (Coldron et al 2014) we drew on Bourdieu's relational concepts of symbolic and material capital (Bourdieu 1976 and 1990). Similarly van Zanten and Maroy (Van Zanten 2009; Maroy and van Zanten 2009) offer a useful relational analysis of the different capitals possessed by schools in local competitive arenas. We seek here to extend and deepen that mode of analysis by identifying a wider range of relevant capitals and ways in which they may be accrued. These help us to describe current relative status and an under acknowledged divide in English schooling which may be important in understanding how local contexts are being reconfigured.

But, a description of possessed capitals, and the relative positions in a social field that such possession constitutes, is in danger of being too static an analysis. It does not do justice to the way, illustrated in the words of the headteacher quoted above, in which positioning is experienced as intractably factual and at the same time amenable to being otherwise. In a figured world (Holland et al 1998) the means by which people and institutions are invested

with capital, the way in which they are brought into relation with others, are the categories, identities and meanings made available in and by that world. Individuals must work with the way in which their worlds are cognitively and affectively organised and, in social situations and interactions, improvise their responses to optimum effect (Holland et al 1998; Schatzki 2002; Tilly 1999). They may also seek to alter the way things are. To help conceptualise the dynamic nature of the mutually constituting factors of the relationship between primary and secondary we not only draw on Bourdieu's concepts of capitals and habitus, but also on Schatzki's complementary analysis of practices as sayings, doings, understandings, relatings and purposes nested in patterned physical arrangements (Schatzki 1996, 1997 and 2002; Kemmis et al 2012)..

The paper is organised as follows. We first analyse certain salient differences such as the typical size of the schools, the composition of the workforce, and the organisation for learning, to describe how they simultaneously constitute and are constituted by distinct professional identities and dispositions of teachers. We then consider the implications of the discourse of 'the basics' and how other understandings and practices associated with gender and age, found not just in education but in many social fields, intersect with secondary and primary schooling. Through this analysis we identify how these material and symbolic differences flow from and sustain schematic categorisations and meanings that currently value secondary school practices more highly than those of primary. Finally we discuss some of the implications of this durable inequality for local school landscapes in the current policy context.

Differences of size, remuneration and funding

One of the most salient differences between primary and secondary schools is size. The average size of a secondary school is around 1000 compared with the average size of a primary school which is around 200 pupils. In 2011 the average number of teachers in a secondary school was 40 with an average total of 70 staff. In primary schools the averages were 11 teachers and a total of 40 staffⁱⁱ.

Size matters because it significantly influences the practice and the habitus of teachers and directly affects the ability to accrue various forms of capital. For example the management of the larger number of individuals in secondary schools is helped by clear formalisation of rules and regulations, explicitly and publicly stated, with formal procedures for implementation

(Brady 2008). Leadership and management in the secondary school has typically been through delegation of responsibility by the headteacher to deputy heads, and other senior staff, who exercise designated responsibilities (Lee 2000; Lee et al 2000) through personal contact but also the chairing of committees and task groups, and the line management of teams - for example the administrative and office staff by the school's business manager. In addition to person to person contact, communication practice often involves business-like media such as memos, notices posted on staffroom boards, group emails, minutes, and written reports.

Competence in these formal or general practices of communication and the contributory smaller or dispersed practices (Schatzki 1996) are valued in helping things to go well. For example, looking at the notices on the board; meeting deadlines; chairs preparing for meetings; administrators managing papers, distributing minutes, and maintaining up to date circulation lists; attendees being punctual and reading agendas and minutes for meetings; being clear when issuing instructions, and energetic in pursuing responsibilities. These practices exemplify aspects of what is taken to be good professional practice in any (but particularly in large) organisation and working successfully, being professional, is partly a matter of acquiring these practices as habits and dispositions. It is in this sense of the patterning of the continual enactment of valued practices that we talk of an institutional habitus.

The same pressures of size that shape the communication practices between staff also shape those between teachers and pupils. The effective communication with and management of large numbers of children and their parents requires mastery of similarly formal and general communication practices, including data management. For example a secondary teacher will have to manage assessment data for hundreds (and their school leaders for a thousand or more) of children at different stages of progress and be ready to communicate this (to parents, pupils, governors, inspectors and others) as necessary.

The practice of the smaller primary school is typically more personal and less formal. Acker (Acker 1999) described it as 'domestic'. The working of the staff group can rely much more on direct contact when everyone necessarily rubs up daily with all colleagues. It is not as easy to maintain distance from one another as it is in a larger group and the quality of the

experience of work is more dependent on the quality of these close relations. We do not wish to draw the contrast with secondary schools too starkly or simplistically. Some of the general practices valued in the larger secondary school will also be valued in the primary school. And there are smaller teams (e.g. Year groups or subject groups) in the secondary school where similar dynamics are likely to occur. But in primary schools these factors are not further framed by a larger context with which they interact.

The management of children in the primary school differs too. Formal communication and expression of rules and regulations is less often used because how to behave is exemplified in routines and practices and the order expressed in the material organisation of the classroom where teacher and children spend the great majority of their time together. This integrated approach to pupil discipline is easier to achieve within, it may be more accurate to say it is made necessary by, the class-teacher system. Typically, thirty or so children are allocated to one teacher for all their education throughout a school year. Inevitably teachers forge close and intensive relations with 'their' children. Caring, norm setting and learning are equally foregrounded in daily classroom life. Communication with children is direct and the dual and related tasks of teaching and maintaining social order in the classroom are a matter less of charismatic performances at regular but dispersed occasions to a variety of audiences as in the secondary school and more a result of mutual trust sustained by the fairness, consistency and warmth of continuous interaction. Further, the data to be managed by a class teacher relates to only thirty or so children with whom the teacher has daily extensive and often intensive interaction. The quality as well as the quantity of primary teachers' and headteachers' knowledge of their pupils differs from that of their secondary colleagues. These interrelated differences of size, procedure, organisation and relationships mean that the typical institutional habitus of the primary school differs markedly from that of secondary.

These differences of institutional habitus exemplify, partake in, sustain and are sustained by schema, patterned meanings, ways of organising and categorising in the wider social context of schools. Describing practices as *domestic, informal, feminine, caring, pastoral, personal, women's work, relationship focused* and *soft* implicitly, nebulously contrasts them with practices that are *task-focused, tough minded, rule regulated, formal, professionally distant, and business like*. The meanings and values with which this schema is to be invested are themselves a matter of continuing contention but for many people they invest typical

secondary attributes with more value than primary and contribute to a cumulative effect on relative the relative capital possessed by the two phases.

The arrangements and practices that are associated with, or that follow from, being a large school affect the professional identity of the people who work in the school. If we take the example of a secondary headteacher, in addition to acquiring an associated habitus they will also have followed a typical trajectory. Almost without exception they will have started as a teacher, moving through successively more senior posts, to deputy and then headteacher, each step reducing the time spent in the classroom. As a headteacher they will be on a much reduced timetable or no longer teaching at all. They may still have significant interaction with pupils but more often individuals or small groups for example for disciplinary reasons. The current policy to reduce the role of the LA and encourage federations of various kinds is extending this trajectory and changing the role of some of our interviewees. As one secondary headteacher put it:

I'm stopping being a headteacher. It's more like a chief exec and then that is about managing the work across a group of schools and it's going to get larger. (Secondary headteacher).

Significantly, while emphasising that the role was different because larger, he expressed no sense of professional dissonance and was quite positive about the change.

With primary headteachers the trajectory is different and to some extent the role too. A typical primary headteacher still often teaches and leads assemblies. Even in larger primary schools the headteacher will be involved on a daily basis with their pupils albeit, like secondary heads, often singly, but it is easier for them to know all their pupils by name. In addition, because in the staff hierarchy there are fewer posts of responsibility between the class teacher and the headteacher, children more regularly reach the headteacher for admonition or reward. In this way size plays a part in leading primary headteachers typically to be involved often and intimately with pupils. There is also cultural pressure for primary headteachers to be, and to demonstrate being, close to the children and still a good teacher. One interviewee, because of her success in her own school, has-been asked to be executive head of three other schools like the secondary headteacher above. But unlike him she expressed conflicted feelings about shifting away from this primary identity.

I have very reluctantly accepted in the autumn term that I could be Executive Headteacher of two schools. Being the headteacher of old... and I shouldn't really say old, it's not old,

but I think the perceptions that many people still have about a headteacher – in front doing assemblies, in classes, meeting and greeting... I mean I try and do all of those things, but there are some things that I just... You know, I don't teach and I went into teaching to teach and, you know, that saddens me. I could do that in two schools, I could go down and do a story session, but I can't do it in four because there are more... I don't like to say strategic, but there are many more strategic things that I have to do. (Primary Headteacher)

Another, more tangible, effect of size is on the remuneration and career opportunities for teachers. In larger schools there are more opportunities for career advancement because there are more senior posts of responsibility with associated higher pay. The titles available (together with the signal of greater worth that greater remuneration sends) are forms of symbolic capital not so readily available to primary colleagues. The headteacher's salary has historically been fixed directly in proportion to the number of pupils. Primary headteachers are consequently paid less than secondary headteachers and the same as a secondary deputyⁱⁱⁱ.

Independent of the effect of size, primary schools have been less generously resourced per pupil than secondary schools throughout their history^{iv} and continues to be less generous. In 2010 most primary schools received between £3,000 and £6,000 (with an average of £4,080) per pupil, while most secondary schools received between £4,000 and £7,000 (with an average of £5,320) (Chowdry and Sibieta 2011). The reason often given for the difference is the higher cost associated with the more advanced subject curriculum of secondary schooling. This has not gone unchallenged in the past (Plowden 1967) and Chowdry and Sibieta point out (2011 p24) that a government could change the balance if, for example, it prioritised early intervention on the grounds that investing resources earlier in the educational process is likely to bring greater gains in terms of outcomes later on, or it felt it necessary to compensate smaller schools because of diseconomies of scale. As it stands, the more favourable funding of secondary schools is a signal of the relative importance placed on the phases. This extra economic capital translates into better staffing levels in secondary and better equipment and facilities^v.

The greater size and extra funding means that secondary teachers and headteachers have greater opportunity than their primary colleagues to accrue social and cultural capital outside the school. The presence of a relatively large senior management team means that a secondary headteacher can delegate responsibility more easily. This gives capacity to engage in fruitful networking beyond the school gates and thereby access to information, both helpful in times of considerable change. Greater knowledge about what is going on and the support

of other key players are assets that may be deployed to advantage in encounters with primary headteachers.

Subject expertise, generalist teaching and the basics

Differences of pedagogy and professional identity were also entrenched partly as a result of the historical distinction between elementary and secondary education. The term ‘elementary’ was not equivalent to its sometimes current use in England and other countries to distinguish the first few years of a child’s schooling usually from 5, 6 or 7 to about 11. The historical elementary schools in England were distinguished not by the age of their pupils (the elementary schools took children aged from 5 to 14) but by their social class (Simon 1969 and 1999; Lawson and Silver 1973). They were a separate and parallel system of education explicitly instituted for the working classes who, it was thought, needed only a basic education while the middle and upper classes (and a minority of elementary school pupils who earned a scholarship) progressed to a superior stage of fee charging secondary education.

When social categories are created community building and boundary maintenance occurs (Tilly 1999 and 2004). The categorical, material, practical and symbolic distinction of elementary and secondary education created communities of shared interest and solidarity. It led for example to different organisations representing the relative conditions and pay of the teaching workforce in the different sectors. It was also fertile ground for the development and adoption of distinct professional identities, educational ideals and practices.

In the early part of the twentieth century the theories and educational philosophies of thinkers such as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Tolstoy, Montessori, Dewey and Freud inspired the development of new ideas, ideals and practices that sought to provide education variously based on learning by doing and democratic principles of the self-government of pupils and that attended to the creative and affective as much as the cognitive development of the child. There was also an emphasis on the particular educational needs of very young children. The predominant pedagogic principle of secondary education remained subject teaching while in the elementary schools and the primary schools that succeeded them, the predominant practice became that of the class-teacher.

The 1944 Education Act brought an end to the elementary system. It replaced them with age defined stages – Infant (5-7), Junior (7-11), and Secondary (11-15) as part of establishing universal free secondary education in a nationally uniform system of mass education. As a

result the new primary schools lost the segregating function of the elementary system which was now to be fulfilled by *de facto* segregated Secondary Modern, Technical and Grammar schools. By the 1980s this tripartite secondary system was largely replaced by a predominantly comprehensive system. After a brief period of experimentation with middle schools this is the predominant system today^{vi}.

As a consequence of history and institutional organisation a secondary school teacher's professional identity within the place of work and with professional networks outside is strongly tied to being a subject teacher (Brady 2008). They draw on and participate in debates about the nature of their subject and how best to teach it and take responsibility to defend its role within the curriculum and its place within the school (Siskin 1991; Hargreaves 1994; Brady 2008). Their relation to the pastoral role, taking care of and accepting responsibility for the wider well being of the pupils, is emphatically not absent but is organisationally equivocal in, for example, the common formal division of responsibility for Subject Teaching (Subject Leader, Subject Teacher) and Pastoral Care (Year Leader, Form Teacher).

In contrast, as we have already noted, the predominant practice in primary schools is class-teaching where a teacher is responsible for all aspects of the education of a group of about thirty children over a school year. The primary colleagues represented by the primary headteachers we interviewed have a much weaker identity as a subject expert. They will have undertaken graduate study of a relevant subject as a requirement of initial teacher education or have developed an expertise that is recognised. These guide the allocation of explicit responsibility for overseeing a curriculum subject area across the school. But, it is given in addition to their responsibilities as a class-teacher usually with no further remuneration. In a small school even relatively inexperienced staff may be given a subject responsibility.

The predominant identity as a class teacher, in a subtle interaction with gender and the philosophies of education and theories of child development noted earlier, tends to emphasise a pastoral dimension to educational practice and meeting the holistic needs of children in their early years. A claim is made to expertise in child development, and knowing how best to teach 'children not subjects'. Process and general skills are considered as important as specific content and knowledge. And it calls for recognition of their professional skill in the important work of laying sound foundations for future learning.

The historic legacy of the expert/generalist and subject-teacher/class-teacher schemas have played, and continue to play, a part in the relative prestige of secondary and primary practitioners. Secondary teachers have legitimate grounds for claiming greater authority in matters concerning subjects. Consequently, conceiving the National Curriculum and national testing in terms of subjects and statements of policy that emphasise the importance of a teacher's subject knowledge (DCSF 2009; DfE 2013; Gove 2013) are not neutral in their effect on the relations between secondary and primary teachers. As things stand, they tend to confer greater symbolic capital on the former at the expense of the latter.

More than that, emphasising the importance of subjects constitutes grounds for questioning the competence of primary teachers. The Plowden report (Plowden 1967) had articulated the then widely held view amongst educational professionals and thinkers that learning was a matter not of fragmented rote learning within bounded subjects but of facilitating the integration of understanding through well planned experiences within a learning environment managed by a teacher. The report presented an idealised^{vii} image primary teaching as best educational practice and thereby sought to raise the status of primary professionals in relation to their secondary colleagues (Simon 1999). But the integrated approach and the class teacher system has been, and continues to be, successfully derided (Cox and Dyson 1969a, 1969b, 1970; Cox and Boysen 1975 and 1977) carefully critiqued (Alexander, Rose and Woodhead 1992; Alexander et al 2010) and officially rejected (Gove 2013). Without a successful counterargument the subject approach dominates. Together with the assumption that the more expertise a teacher has in a subject the more successful will be their pupils' learning, the conclusion follows that a primary class teacher cannot have sufficient expertise in all of the subjects needed. The accepted terms of the debate necessarily construct the class teacher system as organisationally problematic and, at worst, primary teachers as serially deficient.

Primary teachers might defend themselves against a charge of incompetence in most of the subjects of the national curriculum by claiming expertise in what are widely considered the most important, namely literacy and numeracy. In response to early criticism that there was not enough time in the primary school year to meet the requirements of each of the subjects of the national curriculum, there was a tightening of the focus on the 'core subjects' of English (reading, writing, and speaking) and Mathematics. Today attainment is tested only in

these subjects at the end of primary school (Key Stage 2)^{viii}. The other subjects were in practice relegated in importance and time spent on them drastically squeezed. This moved primary practice even further away from that idealised in Plowden and nearer to the notion of the primary school's mission as to deliver attainment in the core curriculum subjects in preparation for the secondary phase.

But primary teachers' competence in teaching these subjects has been severely questioned (Alexander 2010). So much so that the New Labour government elected in 1997 introduced the Literacy and Numeracy strategies which prescribed in great detail what and how all primary teachers should teach. And the present government felt able to impose synthetic phonics as the 'preferred' method of teaching reading (Davis 2012). In the context of primary secondary relations these interventions were highly significant. They unequivocally signalled that primary teachers cannot be trusted to teach the most important subjects. Significantly, no such prescription has been visited universally on secondary teachers. It is difficult to find relevant evidence, but we think it reasonable to suppose that these measures had the effect of reinforcing the already lower professional prestige of primary teachers in relation to their secondary colleagues.

The discourse of 'the basics' is itself problematic for primary. The term invites multiple interpretations which in any instance may be separately or jointly invoked. For example it may, with positive connotations, denote crucial cognitive, affective and moral foundations. Or, with a historical echo of the elementary school, it can be taken, more negatively to imply a contrast between the simple content and general unsophisticated skills taught in the primary school and the advanced and more complex ideas and precise subject specific concepts which are the business of the secondary school. Finally, it can be taken to imply that the purpose of the primary stage is to prepare pupils for the secondary stage.

As such the discourse of the basics is replete with resources for subordination and optimal positioning. For example, emphasising the foundational importance of the primary phase helps position effective primary teachers favourably. Emphasising a contrast between simple and complex content supports the further assumption that teaching the basics is easier and that Primary school teachers require less expertise or less advanced educational qualifications. For example it was not until 1970 that Primary school teachers were required to have a university degree. Emphasising the need for preparing pupils for secondary, casts

secondary teachers as clients, which raises the importance of their views as to what that preparation should entail and positions primary schools as fulfillers of secondary schools' needs.

Gender

Prominent features of teaching in general are that women make up the greater part of the teaching workforce and that the younger the children the more female the workforce becomes. In 2011^{ix} 71% of teachers in all government maintained schools were women and 29% were men. In nursery and primary schools taken together^x 86% were women and 14% men whereas in secondary schools 62% are women and 38% men. Regarding leadership, although in all schools those fewer men who teach are more likely than their female colleagues to become headteachers, most nursery and primary headteachers are women (71%) whereas most secondary headteachers are men (62%). When other workers in schools are included the female nature of primary schools is even starker with only 6% of these roles filled by men in nursery and primary schools but 21% in secondary. Nursery and primary schools are largely female workplaces, predominantly staffed and led by women.

Much has been written about the problematic notion of care as a natural sphere for women and its relation to teaching^{xi}. We cannot engage with this debate here but simply note that the workforce figures above reflect the pervasive popular view that teaching is more women's than men's work and that it is more women's and less men's work the younger the children. Caring is often associated with low-paid or unpaid work performed by academically less successful working-class women (Skeggs, 1997) and as Vogt puts it,

Caring within teaching also evokes connotations of (female) service, of vocation and being a 'natural teacher' rather than (male) professionalism, expertise and authority. (2002 p253)

Forrester argues that this might be changing under the pressure on primary schools to improve results and the introduction of managerial procedures such as performance management.

There appears to be a changing role for women teachers as the primary school culture shifts significantly from its association with the feminine qualities of mothering and nurturing towards a more masculine culture of management and performance. It could be argued that the discourse of 'caring', a position of femininity which teachers have embraced as part of their identity, is being confronted by more powerful managerial discourses. (Forrester 2005 p 284)

It is difficult to know how far such a significant change is taking place. But, what is evident in Forrester's paper and in our interviews with primary headteachers is resistance to, or at least a sense of dissonance associated with, such a change which itself attests to the continuing hold on primary teachers of the discourse of caring. A concern for the emotional and physical wellbeing of the child, as well as their cognitive development, continues to be an integral part of what they see as good primary practice and a primary teacher's professional identity.

Sexist discourses, practices and arrangements beyond the school invest the 'feminine' features typical of the primary school with less symbolic capital than the more 'masculine', and managerial features typical of the larger secondary school. These subtly interact with the changing identity of children as they grow older. The passage from childhood to adulthood is in all societies invested with huge significance and is maintained with deeply entrenched symbolism and practice constituting its stages and associated identities. The transition from primary to secondary school is inevitably part of the way English society conceives of and manages this passage including the age related identities of infant, child and adolescent. That secondary schools work with pupils who are older interacts with these conceptions circulating beyond and through the school about how people at different ages should be identified and treated.

Disentangling the ways in which ideas associated with differences of age contribute to the positioning of primary and secondary teachers requires a more extensive analysis than can be given here. It would need to include how the transition to secondary school is a rite of passage which signifies that the young people have begun a new phase of life and a new identity as adolescents; that this new identity is marked by differences of treatment and categorisation determining for example that disruptive behaviour may no longer be called a tantrum but rather a conscious challenge to authority, and that secondary school pupils are to be held criminally responsible for their actions. In all of this there is the nebulous sense that dealing with near adults is somehow both tougher and more prestigious and reinforces the significance of the fact that the younger the children the more their education is conducted by women.

Discussion and conclusion

This analysis suggests some further areas of research. There is a growing number of ‘all-through’ schools which take children through both their primary and secondary phases, and some through a further two years of post-secondary phase or sixth form education, in the same institution. Early indications suggest that in some cases the primary part of the school has effectively become a large department of the secondary school where the primary head is equivalent to a secondary deputy. With a continued policy emphasis on primary schools to make children ‘secondary ready’, it could be that this re-figuring of the landscape may be attractive to primary practitioners, if they can retain important aspects of their primary identity. . It would be of theoretical and practical interest to study how the factors identified here in determining differences of status are modulated in this new context. Further, a comparison of status differentials in the long standing ‘all-through’ systems^{xii} in Denmark and other Scandinavian countries would provide other contexts in which our arguments could be tested and extended.

In this analysis we have tried to show how certain distinct characteristics of primary and secondary schools are invested with different meaning and value. We have attempted to audit the implications for the accrual of certain forms of capital – symbolic, material and cultural. Their different levels of capital constitute objective differences which tend to locate primary schools as sub-ordinate to secondary schools in the social field of schooling. But relative prestige in the school field is not just determined along the primary/secondary axis. The prestige of any *particular* school will have other dimensions of capital unrelated to the primary secondary divide (Coldron et al 2014). Some of the most important of these are, for example, Ofsted grades, which are equally available to both secondary and primary schools. Consequently it is possible for a particular secondary school to be unpopular with parents, graded *Inadequate* by Ofsted, led by a headteacher who has little contact with or respect from fellow headteachers and whose intake to the school is disadvantaged and challenging while a nearby primary school may be oversubscribed, with a relatively advantaged intake, deemed *Outstanding* by Ofsted and led by a headteacher who is a National Leader of Education and an Executive of a federation of schools. The superior capital of this particular primary in relation to that secondary would not invalidate our central claim which is that English secondary schools are in general more able to accrue higher levels of certain kinds of capital than English primary schools.

Any participant in social exchange experiences the historical weight of general/abstracted meanings, meanings that they have to be aware of and to respond to. They might accept, endorse, oppose, amend, extend, or resist the schema they are subject to (Holland et al 1998). Although relative status may not be a salient aspect of all professional encounters between primary and secondary colleagues the headteacher whose quotation began this paper reflects on and articulates the experience of such moments in her recent encounters. If we reread the passage in the light of our analysis we can hear in her words the effects of habitus and symbolic and material positioning and an awareness of the complex legacy of meanings, identities, practices and dispositions associated with the primary secondary distinction. She has a sense of the predatory intentions of others (*a little bit of uncertainty means a little bit of land grab*); of the existence and possible disadvantages in these new circumstances of the habitus and identity of primary headteachers (*that's unfamiliar territory, because we're not that type of people.*). At the same time she wishes to celebrate that identity (*full proper head teachers who have been teachers*). She is aware that the identity and habitus of secondary school staff is different (*Secondary school mentality is a little bit different*) and advantageous in the new circumstances (*the businessy type people have... probably taken more of a leap first, because they...are more confident perhaps, and more used to that... world*). She feels solidarity and affinity with at least some other primary schools (*The two primaries that I'm closest to I don't feel that*) and of the reality and intractability of the existing arrangements (*I'm finding it hard.*). She implies that gender plays a part (*it's always the big boy*) while feeling the need to defend against being classed as a woman with a chip on her shoulder (*and there's no baggage there. I just feel...*). She asserts, feels the need to assert, the right of primaries to full participation in the new order because this right is not readily conceded by her secondary colleagues (*primaries should have a voice, and should work very closely with secondaries and it's not always an open door*); and that they should be accorded equal status implying that this is not always the case (*I just feel that, you know, we're equal players around a table*). She expresses a renewed determination to make the case for the distinctive and valuable contribution of primary practice (*I'm feeling more confident to be able to get out there, because we have got a good story to tell and we've got a lot going on.*)

The passage can be interpreted as a moment in the process of constructing a position that she can sustain in the face of prejudice, contradiction, and imposition. We see the creation or

identification of cognitive, affective and political resources in the form of arguments, sustainable propositions, self-encouragement, reminder of solidarities, defensible positioning. It is preparation and strategising away from the hurly burly of interaction and instant decision making so as to better improvise in negotiations. The difficulty she has in articulating reflects the effort needed to achieve understanding of the determinants of her social location in overlapping plural fields and the effort to achieve some agency in relation to them.

The forced withdrawal of the LA as the most powerful local player means that the symbolic and material differences of capital between primary and secondary have become significant aspects of the negotiations within new local elite (Coldron et al 2014). The differences of status are more often activated because relations between schools are being foregrounded through fraternities, franchises and federations. If, as our analysis has sought to establish, secondary schools and their leaders have pole position in such encounters that is a significant factor, amongst others, contributing to the re-configuration of local schooling currently taking place. Between a secondary school headteacher well positioned in the local competitive arena and the headteacher of a primary school with a poor inspection grade, serving a highly deprived community, unpopular with parents and with limited social and professional networks the difference in status and power will be immense. These material and symbolic differences in capital, position and power in the local field within and without the local elite may be important factors as new local relations between schools emerge.

References

- Acker, S. (1995) Carry on caring: the work of women teachers, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16, pp. 21–36.
- Acker, S. (1999) *The Realities of Teachers' Work: never a dull moment* (London, Cassell).
- Alexander, R. Rose, J, Woodhead, C. (1992) *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools: A discussion paper*, London: Department of Education and Science
- Alexander, R. (Ed) (2010) *Children, their World, their Education: Final report and recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review* Routledge
- Aspinwall, K. & Drummond, M. J. (1989) Socialized into primary teaching, in: H. de Lyon & F. W. Migniuolo (Eds) *Women Teachers: issues and experiences* (Buckingham, Open University Press).
- Bourdieu, P. (1976) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brady, P. (2008) Working towards a Model of Secondary School Culture *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* Issue 73
- Chowdry, H. and Sibiet, L. (2011) School funding reform: an empirical analysis of options for a national funding formula IFS Briefing Note BN123, 2011 - ifs.org.uk
- Coldron, J., Crawford, M., Jones, S., Simkins, T. (2014) The restructuring of schooling in England: The responses of well positioned headteachers. *Education Management and Leadership* (forthcoming)
- Cox and Boysen (eds.) (1975) *The Fight for Education* London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Cox and Boysen (eds.) (1977) *Black Paper 1977* London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Cox and Dyson (eds.) (1969a) *Fight for Education* London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Cox and Dyson (eds.) (1969b) *The Crisis in Education* London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Cox and Dyson (eds.) (1970) *Goodbye Mr. Short* London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Davis (2012) A Monstrous Regimen of Synthetic Phonics: Fantasies of Research-Based Teaching 'Methods' Versus Real Teaching *Journal of Philosophy of Education*
- DCSF (2009) *Independent Review of the Primary Curriculum*
- DfE (2010) *The Importance of Teaching: the Schools White Paper*. London: DfE.
- DfE (2012) School Workforce in England, November 2011
<http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001062/index.shtml>

- DfE (2013) <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/primary>
- Forrester, G. (2005): All in a day's work: primary teachers 'performing' and 'caring', *Gender and Education*, 17:3, 271-287
- Galton M, Simon B and Croll P (1980) *Inside the primary classroom* (The ORACLE Report) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Gove, M. (2013) *Michael Gove speaks about the importance of teaching* Speech to Policy Exchange 5 September 2013 <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-speaks-about-the-importance-of-teaching>
- Griffin, G. (1997) Teaching as a gendered experience, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, pp. 7–18.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in Postmodern Times* Teachers College Press
- Hargreaves, DH (2010) *Creating a Self-Improving School System*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Hargreaves, DH (2011) *Leading a Self-Improving School System*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Hargreaves, A. & Tucker, E. (1991) Teaching and guilt: exploring the feelings of teaching, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7, pp. 491–505.
- HMI (1978) *Primary education in England: a survey by HM Inspectors of Schools* London: HMSO
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D. Cain, C. (1998) *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds* Harvard University Press Cambridge Mass and London
- Jackson, B. (1964) *Streaming: an education system in miniature* Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Kemmis, S., Edwards-Graves, C., Wilkinson, J. And Hardy, I. (2012) Ecologies of Practice Ch 3 in *Practice, Learning and Change: Practice-Theory Perspectives on Professional Learning*. Eds: Paul Hager, Alison Lee and Ann Reich. Springer.
- Lawson, J. and Silver, H. (1973) *A Social History of Education in England*. Methuen and Co. Ltd, London
- Lee, V.E. (2000). School size and the organization of secondary schools. In Hallinan, M. T. (Ed.). *Handbook of the sociology of education*. New York: Kluwer.
- Lee, V.E., Smerdon, B., Alfred-Liro, C. & Brown, S.L. (2000). Inside large and small high schools: Curriculum and social relations. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 147-171.

- Maroy, C. and van Zanten, A. (2009) 'Regulation and competition among schools in six European localities'. *Sociologie de Travail*, 51S: e57-e79.
- Nias, J. (1999) Primary teaching as a culture of care, in: J. PROSSER (Ed.) *School Culture* (London, Paul Chapman).
- Noddings, N. (1992) *The Challenge to Care in Schools: an alternative approach to education* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- Oram, A. (1996) *Women Teachers and Feminist Politics 1900–1939* (Manchester, Manchester University Press).
- Plowden (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools* Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) London: HMSO
<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/plowden/plowden1-28.html>
- Schatzki, T. (1996) *Social Practice: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Schatzki, T. (1997) Practices and Actions. A Wittgensteinian Critique. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, (27) 3, 283-308.
- Schatzki, T. (2002) *The Site of the Social: A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. University Park, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Simon, B. (1999) *Education and the social Order: British Education since 1944* Lawrence and Wishart
- Simon (1969) *Studies in the History of Education: 1780-1870* Lawrence and Wishart: London
- Siskin, L.S. (1991) Departments as different worlds: Subject sub-cultures in secondary schools. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 27(2), 134-160.
- Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender* (London, Sage)
- Smeyers, P. (1999) 'Care' and wider ethical issues, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33, pp. 233–251.
- Tilly, C. (1999) *Durable Inequality* University of California Press
- Tilly c. (2004) Social Boundary Mechanisms *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 34: 211-236
- Van Zanten, A (2009) Competitive arenas and schools' logics of action: a European comparison. *Compare, Volume 39, Number 1, January 2009*, pp. 85-98 (14)
- Vogt, F. (2002) *A Caring Teacher: explorations into primary school teachers' professional identity and ethic of care* Gender and Education, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 251–264
- Walby, S. (1989) Theorising patriarchy, *Sociology*, 23, pp. 213–234.

Walkerdine, V. (1990) *Schoolgirl Fictions* Verso

Woods, P. (1990) *Teacher Skills and Strategies* (Basingstoke, Falmer Press).

Woods, P. and Simkins, T. (2014) 'Understanding the local: themes and issues in the experience of structural reform in England', *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(3) Online.

ⁱ A new school based approach to teacher education where a group of schools and other partners form an alliance to provide initial teacher education. For more details see:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/nationalcollege/index/support-for-schools/teachingschools.htm>

ⁱⁱ Figures calculated from DfE statistics at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-workforce-in-england-november-2011>

ⁱⁱⁱ According to a Times Educational Supplement survey published in March 2010 the average primary head was on £52,000; an average secondary head £73,000 and a secondary deputy £52,000.

<http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6039350>

^{iv} See Simon (1999) on Elementary schools. Plowden also documented big differences (Plowden 1967 Para 1104 p 405).

^v See Alexander (2010 Fig 3.1 p 28) which shows class sizes of 26.2 pupils in primary and 20.9 in secondary in 2008.

^{vi} There is interestingly a growth of all through schools but these are a small minority (89) at the time of writing (March 2014). <http://www.edexec.co.uk/news/2669/record-surge-in-the-number-of-%27all-through%27-schools/>

^{vii} Actual primary practice in most English primary schools was very far from this ideal vision (Jackson 1964; HMI 1978; Galton et al 1980).

^{viii} Science is also considered a core subject but is not tested at the end of Key Stage 2.

^{ix} Official figures for 2011 from the Department for Education (DfE 2012)

^x The official figures do not distinguish between Infant and Junior schools.

^{xi} See for example Acker (1995 and 1999); Aspinwall and Drummond (1989); Griffin (1997); Hargreaves and Tucker (1991); Nias (1999); Noddings (1992); Oram (1996); Skeggs (1997); Smeyers (1999); Vogt (2002); Walby (1989); Walkerdine (1990).

^{xii} The Danish Folkeskole is a comprehensive school covering both primary and lower secondary education for children from 7 to 16/17-years-old.