

Interrogating the Social Class Assumptions and Classroom Implications of Bernstein's Pedagogic Discourse of Visible and Invisible Pedagogies

Edmore Mutekwe

Vaal University of Technology, Faculty of Human Sciences, South Africa
E-mail: edmorem@vut.ac.za

KEYWORDS Classification. Codes. Control. Curriculum. Framing. Pedagogy

ABSTRACT Herein the argument that there are social class assumptions and classroom implications for Bernstein's pedagogic discourses of visible and invisible pedagogies is advanced. The paper unpacks the assumptions implicit in Bernstein's conceptual framework of visible and invisible pedagogies in relation to the educational experiences and outcomes of pupils from the middle and working class backgrounds. The paper's thesis is that Bernstein's work on pedagogic discourse offers important insights for classroom practices, for educators in their production, distribution and reproduction of official knowledge and how that knowledge is related to structurally determined power relations. The argument in this paper does not only show how Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse is concerned with the description of the production and transmission of knowledge but also how it unravels consequences for such knowledge for different social groups in society. In doing this, the paper looks at the process and content of what happens inside schools and classrooms to unmask the effects of the various rules of pedagogic discourse and how they affect the content's transmission (pedagogy) by acting selectively on pupils from the different social class backgrounds. It is for these reasons that the social class assumptions and consequences of forms of pedagogic practices, visible and invisible pedagogies are examined. The paper thus unfolds with a brief overview of Bernstein's socio-linguistic code theory and the theory of pedagogic discourse before examining the distinction between visible and invisible pedagogies and the social class assumptions implicit in each of these pedagogies.

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Bernstein's Socio-linguistic Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theories

British sociologist Basil Bernstein (1924-2000) made a significant contribution to the study of communication with his sociolinguistic theory of language codes. Within the broader category of his socio-linguistic code theory are elaborated and restricted codes (Moore 2010). The term code, in Bernstein's pedagogic discourse refers to a set of organizing principles behind the language employed by members of a particular social group. Littlejohn (2012) suggests that Bernstein's theory shows how the language people use in everyday conversation both reflects and shapes the assumptions of a certain social group. Furthermore, relationships established within the social group affect the way that group uses language, and the type of speech that is used. Atherton (2012) argues that, the construct of restricted and elaborated language codes was introduced into educational practice by Bernstein in 1971 wherein as an educator, he was interested in accounting for the relatively poor performance of working-class students in

language-based subjects, when they were achieving scores as high as their middle-class counterparts on mathematical topics. In his sociolinguistic code theory Bernstein asserts that there is a direct relationship between social class and language codes. In one of his popular works on *Class, Codes and Control*, Bernstein (2008) cogently argues that the forms of spoken language used by learners from the middle and working class backgrounds in the course of their learning initiate, generalize and reinforce special types of relationship with the environment and thus create for the individual particular forms of significance. That is to say that the way language is used within a particular societal class affects the way people assign significance and meaning to the things about which they are speaking. Littlejohn (2012: 178) agrees and states, people learn their place in the world by virtue of the language codes they employ. The code that a person uses indeed symbolizes his or her social identity (Bernstein 2008; Broadfoot 2013)

Bernstein asserts that in the context of a school or classroom the restricted code is suitable for insiders who share assumptions and understanding on the topic, or subject whereas the elaborated code does not assume that the

listener shares these assumptions or understandings, and thus the elaborated code is more explicit, more thorough, and does not require the listener to read between the lines. According to Atherton (2012), the essence of the distinction is in what the language is suited for. The restricted code works better than the elaborated code for situations in which there is a great deal of shared and taken-for-granted knowledge in the group of speakers. It is economical and rich, conveying a vast amount of meaning with a few words, each of which has a complex set of connotations and acts like an index, pointing the hearer to a lot more information which remains unsaid. Within the restricted code, speakers draw on background knowledge and shared understanding (Sadovnik 2010). This type of code creates a sense of inclusivity, a feeling of belonging to a certain group. Restricted codes can be found among friends and families and other intimately knit groups. Conversely, according to Atherton (2012), the elaborated code spells everything out, not because it is better, but because it is necessary so that everyone can understand it. It has to elaborate because the circumstances do not allow the speaker to condense. The elaborated code works well in situations where there is no prior or shared understanding (Atherton 2012). If one is saying something new to someone they have never met before, they would most certainly communicate in elaborated code.

In differentiating between restricted and elaborated codes, it is noted that elaborated code can stand on its own, it is complete and full of detail, and most overhearing a conversation would be able to understand it. However, restricted code is shorter, condensed and requires background information and prior knowledge. A person overhearing a conversation full of restricted code would be quite lost. It would be easily identifiable as an insider's conversation. According to Bernstein (2010), clearly one code is not better than another; but in explaining differential achievement in schools the use of a restricted code is assumed to be typical of learners from the working class background while the use of an elaborated code is assumed to be characteristic of those from affluent middle class backgrounds.

Given that schools tend to reward the use of an elaborated code in use by learners, middle class learners are often viewed as performing

better than their counterparts from the non-affluent working class backgrounds. It is in this sense that Bernstein's sociolinguistic code theory is assumed to offer a comprehensive account of differential learner experiences and outcomes in education (Angleton and Witty 2015) is a degree of openness that is noticed. There is both the closed-role system and the open-role system. In a closed-role system, roles are set and people are viewed in terms of these roles, as well as expected to act in accordance with their role. In an open-role system, roles are not set or simple, they are fluid and changeable (Littlejohn 2012).

There are two factors which contribute to the development of either an elaborated or restricted code within a system. They are: the nature of the socializing agencies (family, peer group, school, and work) present in a system as well as the values within the system. When the socializing agencies are well defined and structured you find a restricted code (Moore 2010). Conversely, where the agencies are malleable, an elaborated code is found. In a society which values individuality one can find elaborated codes, and in a narrower society one may find restricted codes (Littlejohn 2012). According to Bernstein (2010) the orientation towards these codes may be governed entirely by the form of the social relation, or more generally by the quality of the social structure. It also in this light that Bernstein suggests a correlation between social class and the use of either elaborated or restricted code. He argues that in the working class people are more likely to find the use of the restricted code, whereas in the middle class the use of both the restricted and elaborated codes (Hymes 2015).

His work suggests that the working class individuals have access only to restricted codes, especially the ones they learned in the socialization process, where both the values and role systems reinforce restricted codes. However, the middle class, being more geographically, socially and culturally mobile has access to both the restricted codes and elaborated codes. (Atherton 2012). The restricted code is less formal with shorter phrases interjected into the middle or end of a thought to confirm understanding. On the contrary, elaborated codes have a longer, more complicated sentence structure that uses uncommon words and thoughts. In the elaborated code there is no padding or filler, only com-

plete, well laid out thoughts that require no previous knowledge on the part of the listener. According to Bernstein (2008), a working class learner in a school thus communicates in restricted code as a result of the conditions in which he or she was raised and the socialization process. The same is true for the middle class person with the exception that they were exposed to the elaborated code as well. Both groups use restricted code at some point, for as Atherton (2012) points out, everyone uses restricted code in communication some of the time. It would be a very peculiar and cold family which did not have its own language.

The correlation between societal class and language codes shown herein explains for the poor performance in language based subjects by the working class students mentioned earlier (Bernstein 2010). Though Bernstein's sociolinguistic work on 'restricted code' and 'elaborated code' is widely known it represents only his very earliest work. This early work was the subject of considerable misunderstanding and controversy. Bernstein emphasized that *code* was not dialect and that code theory was neither a bourgeois alibi for middle-class speech nor a denigrating deficit account of working-class language. It was in this light that he developed his theory of pedagogic discourse, which is examined in the next section in this paper

According to Morais (2012), Bernstein's theory asserts that pedagogic discourse is made up of two discourses of regulative and instructional discourses. The former is a discourse of order which translates the dominant values of society and regulates pedagogy or form by which knowledge is transmitted while the latter is a discourse of competence that refers to the content or what is transmitted to learners. According to this view, the two discourses are incorporated in such a way that the regulative discourse always dominates the instructional one (Holland 2011). It in this sense that pedagogic discourse is said to be transmitted through a specific code that integrates specialised contexts such as science classroom contexts and the selection and production of appropriate texts to these contexts (Morais 2012). This implies that any textual production in a given context thus depends on the acquisition of the specific coding orientation to it. Learners should therefore have acquired the recognition and realisation rules to produce the respective legitimate text. For Bern-

stein (2008), realisation rules are principles that contain two dimensions namely selection of meanings, and respective textual production. This implies that to produce a legitimate text, the subject should be able to select the relevant meanings so as to produce the text according to those meanings. Any pedagogic practice at the school level should be the activation of a pedagogic code that in its turn, is the institutionalisation of the school's elaborated orientation through specific values of classification and framing (King 2008). These concepts are central to Bernstein pedagogic discourse, where they translate power and control relations between the categories subjects, discourses and spaces (Moore 2010). In this way, the underlying pedagogic practice is a theory or theories of instruction. Bernstein's theory has thus provided concepts to denote learning in social contexts and the interactions that occur in them that may be used to create contexts where children are active learners (Morais 2012). It discusses the interplay of the characteristics of pedagogic practices which contain the potential for a better understanding of classroom practices. In his pedagogic discourse Bernstein (2010) cogently asserts that pedagogic discourse and the principles which regulate it are dependent upon both macro and micro relations that exist between and within social, economic and political institutions. Therefore, when these relations alter, educational aims and objectives also change.

UNPACKING NOTIONS OF VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIES

Basically the concepts visible and invisible pedagogies describe generic types of classroom practices propounded by Bernstein in his pedagogic discourse. According to Bernstein (2008), where the rules of regulative and discursive order are explicit in terms of hierarchy, sequence or pace criteria, this signifies a visible pedagogy. Visible pedagogy thus describes the explicit rules of regulative and discursive order of pedagogic practices. He (Bernstein) contrasts the former from the latter (invisible) in that the latter is characterised by the rules of regulative and discursive order of pedagogic practices which are implicit (Jenkins 2009). This implies that in a classroom situation, while the visible pedagogy will always place emphasis on the performance of the learner, upon the text the he or she is

creating and the extent to which that text is meeting the criteria, the invisible pedagogy is initially invisible to the acquirer or learner who appears to fill the pedagogic space rather than the transmitter (Jenkins 2009). This demonstrates that in the case of the invisible pedagogy, the discursive rules or the rules of the order of instruction are known only to the transmitter. It is in this sense that a pedagogic practice of this nature is said to be implicit to the acquirer. Another distinction between the visible and invisible pedagogies is that in the former pedagogy, the acquirer is graded according to the extent he or she meets the criteria (Morais 2012). It puts emphasis on the external product of the learner. Thus visible pedagogies and their modalities often act to produce differences between learners in a classroom situation (Bernstein 2008). This also explains why they are regarded as stratifying practices of the social transmission of knowledge (Young 2012) and a learning consequence for both transmitters and acquirers (Moore 2010).

Bernsteinian theorists such as Moore (2010), Morais (2012) and Young (2012) contend that the view that a visible pedagogy has explicit rules of regulative and discursive order, does not necessarily mean that there are no tacit rules or messages, but implies that their meaning need to be understood in the context of a visible pedagogy. In the invisible pedagogy, the concrete present of the acquirer is said to be manifest rather than an abstracted past of the controlling discourse (Bernstein 2008). Invisible pedagogies are less concerned about producing explicit stratifying differences between acquirers because they are apparently less interested in matching the acquirer's text against an external common standard. It is also in this sense that Bernstein (2008:202) maintains that:

“The focus of invisible pedagogies is not upon a gradable performance of the acquirer but upon procedures internal to the acquirer: the cognitive, linguistic, affective and motivational, as a consequence of which a text is created and experienced”.

Drawing from the above, it follows therefore that the acquirers' procedural measures are regarded as shared by all acquirers despite the fact that their realisation in texts often creates differences between acquirers. It must thus be noted that these differences do not always signal differences in potential because all acquirers

are assessed on the grounds that they share common procedures (Bernstein 2008). This further implies that differences manifested through an invisible pedagogy need not be used as a basis for comparison between acquirers, for such differences often reveal a level of uniqueness. Therefore, whereas visible pedagogies focus upon the external gradable text, invisible pedagogies focus upon the procedures or competences which all acquirers bring to the pedagogic context. Invisible pedagogies are concerned with arranging that context to facilitate shared competences and develop realisations that are relevant to the acquirer (Bernstein 2008). No wonder in the invisible pedagogies, external non-comparable differences are produced by internal commonalities, which imply shared competences while in the case of visible pedagogies, external comparable differences are produced by internal differences in potential (Broadfoot 2013; Cohen 2011).

In a nutshell, the aforementioned imply that invisible pedagogies emphasise acquisition-competence while the visible pedagogies stress the transmission-performance relationship (Bernstein 2008; Moore 2010). Clearly these differences in emphasis between visible and invisible pedagogies have implications for the selection and the organization of what is to be acquired, the content or curriculum in the classroom or in what Bernstein describes as the messages system of schooling, namely curriculum, pedagogy and assessment (Christie 2008). This implies the recontextualizing principle adopted to create and systematize the content to be acquired as well as the context in which it is to be acquired. In the next section, the social class assumptions of these pedagogies are examined in relation to classroom practices.

UNMASKING THE SOCIAL CLASS ASSUMPTIONS OF VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIC DISCOURSES

In Bernstein's theory, the basic premise upon which the two generic models of visible and invisible pedagogies rest is that pedagogic practices are cultural relays of the distribution of power. Although the two models of pedagogic practices are apparently opposing types, both carry social class assumptions, which vary according to the pedagogic type. The social class assumptions carry consequences for those chil-

dren who are able to exploit the possibilities of the pedagogic practices (Moore 2010). The assumptions of a visible pedagogy are more likely to be met by a fraction of the middle class children whose parents' employment has a direct relation to the economic field (production, distribution and circulation of capital). On the contrary, the assumptions of an invisible pedagogy are more likely to be met by that fraction of children from the middle class who have a direct relationship not to the economic field but to what Bernstein would call the field of symbolic control and who work in specialised agencies of symbolic control usually located in the public sector (Bernstein 2010; Karabel and Halsey 1997). For both categories of children, education is crucial as a means of cultural and economic reproduction, although less likely for those children from backgrounds directly related to the economic field. Furthermore, the different theories of instruction inherent in the two pedagogical practices, visible and invisible pedagogies help to explain how modalities of the dichotomous categorisations can be viewed as liberal, conservative and radical practices (Moore 2010). According to Morais (2012) the dichotomous view of visible and invisible pedagogies can take either progressive, conservative, or radical modalities as theories of instruction. As a consequence, they can act selectively upon both the 'what' (content) and the 'how' (pedagogy) of any classroom practice (Bernstein 2008). Further to this, the different concepts can act selectively upon social class attributes of the acquirers this implies each pedagogic category will always carry its own conditions of contestation, resistance and subversion (Bernstein 2010; Moore 2010).

The social class assumptions discussed above have crucial implications for pedagogic practices particularly with regard to sequencing, pacing, classification and framing of the curriculum. The sequencing rules of a visible pedagogy are explicit and they mark the future of the child in very clear steps and stages (Bernstein 2010). For example, at matric, such learners must know certain concepts in their academic disciplines. A pupil who gets to matric without knowing such concepts will have difficulty coping with the sequencing rules and or requirements of the matric curriculum. As a consequence, if not given remedial attention, relaxed pacing rules, or reduced quantity or quality of

the content to be acquired (Bernstein 2008) such a pupil might be left behind. For Bernstein, there is another aspect of sequencing rules which should be considered, the relation between the local, the here and now, the context-dependant, and the less local, the more distant, the more context-independent meanings. In pedagogic terms, this implies the acquisition of context-tied operations, on the one hand, and on the other to operations and understanding of the principles and their application to new situations (Sadovnik 2010). In visible pedagogies, there is usually a time interval between these different levels of discourse, in the sense that the local, context-dependant, context-tied operations come in the early stage of the pedagogic practice while the understanding of the principles come later (Moore 2010).

Visible pedagogies entail a distribution of expected age-related discourses. However, It is important to note that if children cannot meet the requirements of the sequencing rules and are caught up in the strategies of the repair system (Bernstein 2008), then, these children, often those from the lower working class, are constrained by the local, context-dependant, context-tied skills, by a world of facticity. Those who can meet the requirements of the sequencing rules will eventually have access to the principles of their own discourse. Such children are more likely to be middle class and are also more likely to understand that the heart of discourse is not order but disorder, not coherence but incoherence, not clarity but ambiguity and that the heart of discourse is the possibility of new realities (Bernstein 2010). In addressing the question of why children of the dominant classes sometimes do not demonstrate the possibilities of the discourses they have acquired, it is important to note as Bernstein (2008: 205) does that their enculturation into the visible pedagogies try to, though not always successful, to ensure that its discourse is safe rather than dangerous. In this way a visible pedagogy produces what Bernstein calls deformation of the children of both the dominant and the dominated social classes. In a nutshell, one can argue that a visible pedagogy is likely to distribute different forms of consciousness consistent with the social class backgrounds of the acquirers. These different forms are products of the sequencing rules (Bernstein 2010; Angleton and Witty 2015).

According to Bernstein's (2008) notions of visible and invisible pedagogies imply that the

curriculum is received differently by learners from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. While learners who come from the middle class affluent backgrounds are often advantaged by the home background through provision of educational resources and an enabling environment, their counterparts from the working class background enter school with the disadvantage imposed on them by both material and linguistic code under privileges (Bernstein 2010). The mechanisms of schools further disadvantage working class children, who often have a weaker pace and less achievement (Moore 2010). This is because the content is likely to stress operations, local skills rather than principles and general skills. Schools with mixed catchment areas and those that practices streaming and tracking might then adopt different pedagogies and content in high and low tracks based on the social class assumptions embodied in the visible and invisible pedagogies (Bernstein 2010). It is in this sense that Moore (2010) maintains that children from working class backgrounds are doubly disadvantaged, mostly in lower tracks. On the other end, it is important to note that acquiring the analytical orientation to knowledge and language requires two sites of acquisition.

Since working class children have a narrative code and do not have a second site of acquisition they may not acquire the analytical code readily accessible to the middle class counterparts (Moore 2010). Their language may be characterized by lexical codes with one word answers, short sentences, relating individual facts, skills and operations is more common in working class schools. The middle class syntactic code, which relays principles, relationships, processes, connections may be more typical of middle class learners in schools (Clark 2015). The classification aspects, which implies the boundary maintained between different disciplines, between disciplinary knowledge and everyday knowledge and between different sections within a discipline, are likely to differ based on the learners' social class characteristics. In Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse, classification is strong when the conceptual contents are kept separate and weak when the conceptual contents are integrated. According to Bernstein what maintains the boundaries is power (Harker and May 2013)

Teachers with subject specialist identities are more likely to maintain strong classification.

According to Bernstein the focus of power is on the relations between categories and on establishing order by maintaining strong classification. The social class assumptions of visible and invisible pedagogies are also likely to impact on the framing of the curriculum. Framing basically refers to control over what is considered valid knowledge within a category of knowledge (Karabel and Halsey 1997). It is framing that establishes legitimate communication. This means that when there is strong framing the legitimacy/correctness/accuracy of the subject is clearly evident. When framing is weak, what is seen as valid knowledge criteria is implicit. Framing or control develops voice (Domingos 2014). Classification establishes the message. The aforementioned clearly shows that the school curriculum is based on social class assumptions of who the learner is. And such assumptions underlie sequencing and pacing of the curriculum. There are also assumptions made of the knowledge capacities and intellectual skills of the learner. This implies that the educators sequencing, pacing, knowledge capacities and intellectual skills assume that the student is from either a middle or working class socio-economic background (Bernstein 2008; King 2012).

EXPLORING THE IMPLICATIONS OF VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIES FOR CLASSROOM PRACTICE

Moore (2010) maintains that Bernstein's notions of visible and invisible pedagogies have important implications for educational practice particularly in diverse classroom settings. For example, he contends that visible pedagogy is explicit in acknowledging responsibility for taking up a position of authority. The invisible pedagogy also covers the inescapable authority of the teacher. Drawing on these perspectives of pedagogic practice, one can argue that the views of the two opposing pedagogies presents one further modality of pedagogic practice, bottom right, which shows a radical realization of an apparently conservative pedagogic practice. Bernstein suggests that on first sight an observer may have difficulty in distinguishing this type of pedagogy from conservative transmission pedagogy, given the explicit authority evidenced by both forms. The crucial difference, according to Bernstein is in the objective characteristics of the two pedagogies. In the former,

this is competitive and individuals producing differences between individuals, resulting in hierarchical ranking of educational content or knowledge (Bernstein 2008). In the latter, it is to produce changes in the relations between social groups through coming to an understanding of their different positions in society.

The differences in emphasis between visible and invisible pedagogies will affect both the selection and the organization of what is to be acquired, that is, the contextualisation principle adopted to create and systematize the content to be acquired and the context in which it is acquired (Moore 2010). The discussion thus far reveals that the visible pedagogy draws on social theories of learning, in which competitive concepts of innate individual abilities and talent are replaced by the concept of collective access to and participation in academically valued social practices and the discourses by which they are constituted (Moore 2010). It thus situates learning within the social and political context in which learners are themselves socially positioned. Thus it foregrounds learning as a collective endeavour rather than a neutral and individual attainment. Since, from this perspective, thinking occurs as much among as it is within individuals. It becomes less crucial for each learner to be involved in each activity since all can participate in the collective and one learner can represent the others in the learning activity. The class is still actively learning by watching and listening, and all move forward together. As different learners, over time, take their turns to represent the class, talking their way into the expertise of the community, others are involved in what Lave and Wenger (1998) would call legitimate peripheral participation though they are still part of the community of practice.

The emphasis in this type of pedagogy is on the explicit effective ordering, by the teacher of the discourse to be acquired by the learner (Bernstein 2008: 214). The students' performance of the pedagogic discourse is a sign of the effectiveness of the teaching rather than a sign of individual and innate levels of ability. It thus relies on a radically different understanding of achievement, one which changes the relationship between the teacher and the learner. A further difference between traditional and progressive pedagogies and one important for this assignment is found in the weakening of the fram-

ing regulating and communication (Bernstein 2008). From an educator's point of view, one would expect to find openness in progressive pedagogy to the introduction into the classroom of a variety of local forms of discourse, achieving cultural connectedness through the managed introduction of horizontal discourse. The above implies that there should therefore remain some space at school and classroom level for negotiation between teachers and the set curriculum, and between teachers and their particular classes (Moore 2010). The discussion in this paper thus stresses that it is this negotiation which impacts on and can transform outcomes for otherwise socially disadvantaged students (Young 2012). Bernstein's notions of visible and invisible pedagogies thus also have crucial implications for pacing expectations in the classroom in that the explicit expected rate of learning have to be met. The assumptions are that pupils would have two sites for acquisition of the knowledge and these are school and home. This usually positively affects learners from the middle class backgrounds because of the existence of such resources as space and time to do homework, which resources may not be readily available to their working class counterparts, making failure by some almost inevitable (King 2012). A critical analysis of the above views shows that Bernstein's theoretical views allow power relationships to be brought into the classroom analysis so that the concepts that illuminate significant influences in the shaping of knowledge can be examined, distinguishing rather than dichotomizing different transmission structures. At a micro level, it helps to bring into analysis the ways in which the educator influences learners through the control each educator wields over what is and is not transmitted through pedagogy, assessment and curriculum. At the macro level, it helps to illuminate the influence outside agencies can have on what, how and when content is transmitted. Therefore, any educational project using Bernstein theory can well use the three message systems (assessment, curriculum and pedagogy) to explore and illuminate discourses in educational institutions that act as the primary 'social control' agencies or classifiers (Moore 2010).

CONCLUSION

The discussion in this paper has demonstrated that Bernstein's theoretical views on pedagogic discourses make an enormous contribu-

tion to the sociology of education in general and the sociology of the curriculum in particular through his work that has influenced a generation of classroom practitioners and curriculum scholars, sociologists and linguists. As can be discerned from Bernstein's early works on language, communication codes and schooling, to his later works on pedagogic discourse, practice and educational transmissions, Bernstein produced a theory of social and educational codes and their effect on social reproduction in education. Although structuralist in its approach, Bernstein's sociological views on pedagogy drew on the essential theoretical orientations in the field of sociology and education and provided the possibility of an important synthesis. It can therefore be concluded with certainty that Bernstein's work forms the harbinger of a new synthesis, a view entirely justified by the extent to which his works have been used and continues to be used by educators especially classroom practitioners across the global divide.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given Bernstein theoretical and conceptual frameworks in the sociology of education and how they offer a systematic analysis of pedagogic discourse and practices it might be important for me to reaffirm the usefulness of Bernstein's work in educational practice by stating the following: using Bernstein's theories researchers can draw from socio-linguistic code theory and his pedagogic discourses to analyze and provide a clear language of description to illuminate ways in which power and control operate within and between educational institutions. If more educational researchers start to use his theory, the relationships between power and knowledge and its effects on ultimately classifying and distributing power relations in wider society may start to be more clearly unraveled.

REFERENCES

- Atherton H 2012. *Towards a New Education System: The Victory of the New Right*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- Angleton N, Witty H 2015. *Language for Life: The Report of the Committee of Inquiry Bullock Report*. London: HMSO.
- Bernstein B 2008. *Class, Codes and Control, Volume 1: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein B 2010. *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse: Class, Codes and Control*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein B 2008. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity Theory*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Clark U 2015. Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse: Linguistic, educational policy and practice. *English Teaching Practice and Critique*, 4(30): 32-47.
- Broadfoot P 2013. Whatever happened to inequality? Assessment policy and inequality the UK experience. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 7(2): 205-224.
- Christie P 2008. *Opening the Doors of Learning: Changing Schools in South Africa*. Cape Town: Heinemann.
- Cohen G 2011. Culture and educational achievement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 51(2): 270-285.
- Domingos H 2014. Continuity, conflict and change in state education in Angola: A study of the pedagogic projects of the Christian Democratic and the Popular Unity governments. *CORE London*, 10(2): 231-237.
- Harker R, May A 2013. Code and habitus: Comparing the accounts of Bernstein and Bourdieu. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education (London)*, 14(2): 169-178.
- Holland J 2011. Social class differences in adolescents' conception of the domestic and industrial division of labour. *CORE*, 10: 1.
- Hymes D 2015. Bernstein and poetics. In: P Atkinson, B Davies, S Delmont (Eds.) 1995: *Discourse and Reproduction: Essays in honor of Basil Bernstein*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, pp. 1-24.
- Jenkins R 2009. Politics and knowledge about language: The LINC project. In: Hasan, G Williams (Eds.): *Literacy in Society*. London: Longman, pp. 1-3.
- Jenkins C 2009. The professional middle class and the origins of progressivism: A case study of the new educational fellowship, 1920-1950. *CORE*, 14(1): 132-135.
- Karabel J, Halsey AH 1997. *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford UP.
- King R 2012. Bernstein's sociology of the school: some propositions tested. *British Journal of Sociology*, 27(4): 430-443.
- Lave J, Wenger E 1998. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlejohn R 2012. *Social Class Debates in Education*. London: Methuen.
- Moore R 2010. Differentiation, inequality and the educational process. In: R Moore (Ed.): *Education and Society: Issues and Explanations in The Sociology of Education*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 7-34.
- Morais AN 2012. Basil Bernstein at the micro level of the classroom. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(3): 559-569.
- Sadovnik A 2010. Basil Bernstein's biography. *International Bureau of Education*, XXXI(4): 687-703.
- Young MFD 2012. *The Curriculum of the Future: From the New Sociology of Education to a Critical Theory of Learning*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Paper received for publication on March 2015
Paper accepted for publication on April 2016