Introduction

Basil Bernstein was one of the most influential and widely discussed theorists in the sociology of knowledge. His theoretical models, however, were not always favourably received. Some described his writing as impenetrable with little applicability to the everyday world of schooling. Some accused him of producing ‘white, male, middle class grand narratives’ which constituted disadvantaged students as the deficit ‘Other’. Such readings are not surprising. They are part of the research game. No matter how meticulously we work to create precise texts, we have all been subjected to this game of re-interpretation.

In this paper, I offer a highly supportive reading of Bernstein’s work. My reading is informed by my experience of working with Basil Bernstein first as a postgraduate student, and later when he generously offered research advice on a number of Australian Research Council funded projects. There are three significant points that I want to make about this research experience. First, Bernstein insisted on the importance of making explicit the models and theories used to: define a research problem, produce data, analyse and interpret data, and write up this data. Second, Bernstein was aware of the dangers of authorising educational research through recourse to personal voice or authentic experience. He maintained this position in the face of the intense vilification of his early work on restricted and elaborated speech codes (see Halliday, 1995). Third, Bernstein was a passionate supporter of the rights of disadvantaged students. As is evident in his studies, and that of the doctoral students he supervised, his research project for over forty years was concerned with understanding the (re)production of social inequality through schooling.

A number of theorists in education have attempted to grapple with issues of knowledge, schooling and inequality. Notably, the new sociology of education (NSOE) in the seventies ‘took as its focus the problematic nature of knowledge and the manner of its transmission, acquisition, and evaluation in schools’ (Bernstein, 1990: 116). However, as Maton (2000) and Moore and Muller (1999) clearly argued the NSOE produced a sociology of knowers and knowing rather than sociological analyses of the macro and micro structuring of knowledge. The NSOE, as well as subsequent waves or revisions of this sociological project, such as cultural reproduction/resistance theories, critical pedagogy and poststructural education theories, produced a plethora of studies on the relations of disadvantaged groups to official school knowledge. However, this research corpus did not adequately specify the distinctive features of the privileging texts of schooling institutions. In other words, there was an absence of explicit rules/criteria within this research corpus that would enable the generation of descriptions of school knowledge: “its mode of construction, mode of representation, mode of presentation, and acquisition” (Bernstein, 1990: 176). This was despite the professed intentions of the NSOE. Basil Bernstein systematically took up the initial challenge of the NSOE via modelling the macro and micro structuring of knowledge: official, pedagogic and local. Throughout his research career, Bernstein (1995: 392) remained preoccupied “with devices of transmission, relays of the symbolic, modalities of practice, and the construction and change of forms of consciousness.” Consequently, his theoretical project is of enormous significance to an analysis of the production and reproduction of knowledge via official schooling institutions and virtual learning environments in a global knowledge society (Castells, 2000).

My objective in this paper is to explore Bernstein’s concept of the pedagogic device. Specifically, I explicate the dimensions and complexity of the pedagogic device as a model for analysing the processes by which discipline or domain specific expert knowledge is converted or pedagogised to constitute school knowledge (classroom curricula, teacher-
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student talk, online learning). I propose that such theoretical models are crucial to educational research during a period variously described as the knowledge society (Leadbeater, 1999) or informational society (Castells, 2000) - new times characterised not only by the increasing importance of knowledge to the economy, but also an increase in social inequalities (Leadbeater, 1999). The two defining characteristics of the global knowledge economy are the increased knowledge intensity of the processes of creation, production and distribution of goods and services, and the fact that economic processes are becoming increasingly integrated via electronic interconnectivity on a global basis (Castells, 2000). Rather than becoming obsolete, as some predicted, schooling institutions perform an increasingly significant role in the differential distribution of knowledge and information resources during these times. In addition, alternative, informal and virtual learning communities play a crucial role in the (re)production of the intellectual, moral and social human resources for the knowledge/informational society.

Societies such as those of Western Europe and their off-shoots only ever invent a few devices or instruments for the pedagogic socialisation of whole populations in terms of knowledge acquisition (Hunter, 1994). It should not be surprising then that ‘[t]he most outstanding feature of educational principles and practices is their overwhelming and staggering uniformity independent of the dominant ideology of specific nation states (Bernstein, 2000; 1996). Through his theory of the pedagogic device, Bernstein attempted to explain the rules or principles generating this stability or uniformity across national education systems. In addition, he modelled how change may be instigated in the ordering and disordering principles of the pedagogising of knowledge.

**Rules of the Pedagogic Device**

Bernstein (1990, 1996, 2000) described the ordering and disordering principles of the pedagogising of knowledge as the pedagogic device. He suggested that this device constituted the relay or ensemble of rules or procedures via which knowledge (intellectual, practical, expressive, official or local knowledge) is converted into pedagogic communication. Such pedagogic communication acts on meaning potential, that is, the potential knowledge that is available to be transmitted and acquired. The pedagogic device provides the generative principles of the privileging texts of school knowledge through three interrelated rules: distributive, recontextualizing, and evaluative. These rules are hierarchically related, in that the recontextualizing rules are derived from the distributive rules, and the evaluative rules are derived from the recontextualizing rules. Thus, there is a necessary interrelationship between these rules, and there are also power relationships between them. First, the function of the distributive rules is to regulate the power relationships between social groups by distributing different forms of knowledge, and thus constituting different orientations to meaning or pedagogic identities. Second, recontextualizing rules regulate the formation of specific pedagogic discourse. These are rules for ‘delocating a discourse, for relocating it, for refocusing it’ (Bernstein 1996: 47). Through recontextualization a discourse is moved from its original site of production to another site where it is altered as it is related to other discourses. The recontextualized discourse no longer resembles the original because it has been pedagogised or converted into pedagogic discourse. Third, evaluative rules constitute specific pedagogic practices. In general terms, evaluative rules are concerned with recognising what counts as valid realisations of instructional (curricular content) and regulative (social conduct, character and manner) texts.

**Fields of the Pedagogic Device**

Agents, often working within strongly insulated agencies or institutions (e.g., curriculum authorities, education departments, teacher education organizations, schools) may contest, maintain, and/or challenge the ordering/disordering principles of the pedagogic device. These agencies make up the fields of the pedagogic device. Bernstein’s concept of field is similar to
that proposed by Bourdieu (1992: 17), namely, a social space of conflict and competition, an arena ‘in which participants vie to establish monopoly over the species of capital effective in it .... and the power to decree the hierarchy and “conversion rates” between all forms of authority in the field of power’. In the course of struggles, the very shape and social divisions of the field becomes a central stake, because alterations to the relative worth and distribution of resources equate to modifications of the structure of the field (i.e., the social division of labour and the social relations within the field). In general terms, Bernstein’s (1996; 2001) concept of resources is similar to Bourdieu’s (1997, 1992) concept of capital, and refers to the accumulated labour in which inheres the individual’s capacity to produce profits in a particular field. That labour may be economic (a potential for profit in the field of production), informational (a potential for profit in the field of symbolic control), or social (a potential for profit in social networks). Acquisition of informational capital or resources entails the accumulation of a labour of self-formation, a labour of inculcation and transformation through a long process of pedagogic socialization (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Bernstein, 2001). Informational capital/resources may exist in: (1) embodied form, that is, in the orientations of the mind and dispositions or demeanours of the body, (2) institutional form, for example, educational qualifications, and (3) objectified form such as books, online resources (Bourdieu, 1997).

Bernstein (2001, 1990) identified three main fields of the pedagogic device, namely, the field of production, recontextualization, and reproduction. These fields are hierarchically related, in that, recontextualization of knowledge cannot take place without the original production of knowledge, and reproduction cannot take place without recontextualization. Thus the production of new knowledge continues to take place mainly in institutions of higher education and private research organizations - the latter often off-shoots of the former (Bernstein, 2000; Castells, 2000). By contrast, the recontextualization of knowledge is largely undertaken in state departments of education and training, curriculum authorities, specialist education journals, and teacher education institutions. Reproduction, that is the pedagogic inculcation of knowledge, usually takes place in primary, secondary and tertiary schooling institutions. Moreover, the boundaries insulating these fields, that is, the fields of production, recontextualization and reproduction are relatively strong. In turn, strong insulation constitutes specialist identities of agents, agencies and discourses within each field, and weaker identifications between fields. A number of empirical studies have shown how Bernstein’s theory could describe macro, mezzo and micro levels of analyses, as well as relations between these levels. For example, Singh (1995) analysed the production and translation of computing as a pedagogic text within and between the different fields of the education bureaucracy. More recently, Tyler (2001) has demonstrated the applicability of Bernstein’s theory of the pedagogic device to hypertext, online or virtual learning environments (see also Kress, Jewitt & Tsatsarelis, 2000).

**Field of Production of Knowledge**

In all societies, Bernstein (2000: 29) argued, there is a ‘fundamental similarity in the very structuring of meaning’. This similarity refers to a particular order of meanings, that is, the form that abstract meanings take in all societies. The form that the abstraction takes ‘postulates and relates two worlds’ – the material (everyday, mundane) world and the immaterial (transcendental) world.

The form that these meanings takes must be a form with an indirect relation between meanings and a specific material base. And the reason for this is very clear: if meanings have a direct relation to a material base, these meanings are wholly consumed by the context. ... They lack the power of relation outside a context because they are totally consumed by that context (Bernstein, 2001: 30).

The terms common/mundane (horizontal discourses) and esoteric/sacred (vertical discourses) were formulated by Bernstein (2000) to describe the two types of knowledge that relate the material and immaterial worlds. Mundane knowledge refers to the meanings that arise
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‘directly out of bodily encounters with the world, with other people, with reality. It is a world of flux and of particulars, and it is driven by ‘crude thought’ by the most practical and direct wisdom: proverbs, prudence, street lore’ (Muller & Taylor, 1995: 263). By contrast, esoteric knowledge is constituted by ‘arbitrary conceptual relations, a symbolic order constructed by an accretion of ‘collective representations’, that are the ‘work of the community' in contrast to the work of continuously changing experiential particulars’ (Muller & Taylor, 1995: 263). Esoteric knowledge is thus the disciplinary knowledge constituted in scientific research communities, literary and artistic organizations (see also Castells, 2000). According to Muller & Taylor (1995: 264):

the principle of meaningful organisation of the sacred depends on the arbitrary system of connections established by the communal canon. … arbitrary connections are the engine of scientific knowledge since they allow inquirers to break with the naturalising logic of the everyday, allowing them "to bind together things which sensation leaves apart from one another" (Durkheim, 1915).

Of significance is the strength of the insulation demarcating the categories of esoteric and mundane knowledge, as well as the form of the knowledge generated within these categories. The content of the two categories of knowledge is not significant. This is because the content of the categories changes historically and culturally. ‘What is actually esoteric in one period can become mundane in another’ (Bernstein, 2000: 29).

In recent times, there has been an exponential growth in the volume and complexity of esoteric knowledge (vertical discourse) in practically every field of human endeavour (Ungar, 2000). This growth in knowledge, and knowledge related industries, has enormous implications for educators. First, specialist expert knowledge is encoded in highly complex symbolic forms and must be decoded or translated (pedagogised) in order to be accessible to those outside the specialist domains. At the same time, knowledge producers do not have the time or resources to convert or translate new knowledge into a form accessible to non-specialist consumers. Thus, the pedagogising of knowledge is increasingly undertaken within agencies of recontextualization. This has implications for ‘what’ knowledge is available to be converted into pedagogic communication, ‘who’ (social division of agencies and agents) will undertake the work of pedagogising knowledge, and ‘how’ this knowledge is transformed into pedagogic forms. Second, the volume and complexity of knowledge have escalated the entry and acquisition costs to every specialist knowledge domain. Universal or public access to State sponsored education does not imply universal acquisition of knowledge. Indeed, the recent surge in private tutoring, out-of-school education, virtual learning communities, and extra-curricular activities reflects the market demands of consumers struggling to maintain their field position in the knowledge stakes. Third, the growth of specialised knowledge has led to a paradoxical decrease in the ‘degree of knowledge grasp’ (Ungar, 2000). While the capacity of the human intellect to grasp new knowledge is limited, the volume of knowledge available for processing continues to rise exponentially. Fourth, there has been a loss of public trust in institutions and expert knowledge to solve human problems. Despite this loss of legitimacy or certainty, there is an increased demand for more rather than less knowledge growth in order to arbitrate the growing uncertainty and complexity of everyday life (Muller, 2000). However, the production of more knowledge does not lead to uncertainty reduction. Rather, it leads to heightened social indeterminacy as the production and circulation of knowledge expands possibilities for self-determination, and at the same time leads to greater social complexity.

Field of Recontextualisation: Official and Pedagogic

Between the primary and secondary fields of knowledge production and reproduction is the field of recontextualization. This field is comprised of two sub-fields, namely, the official recontextualizing field (ORF) and the pedagogic recontextualizing field (PRF). The ORF includes the ‘specialized departments and sub-agencies of the State and local educational authorities together with their research and system of inspectors’ (Bernstein, 1990: 192). The
PRF is comprised of: (1) university departments of education, together with their research; and (2) ‘specialized media of education, weeklies, journals, and publishing houses together with their readers and advisers’ (Bernstein, 1990: 192). The PRF may also ‘extend to fields not specialized in educational discourse and its practices, but which are able to exert influence both on the State and its various arrangements and/or upon special sites, agents and practices within education’ (Bernstein, 1990: 192).

The pedagogic recontextualizing field may be strongly classified internally, producing sub-fields specialized to levels of the educational system, curricula, groups of pupils. It is useful to distinguish agencies of pedagogic reproduction which, within broad limits, can determine their own recontextualizing independent of the State (the private sector) and agencies which although funded by the State may have a relatively larger measure of control over their own recontextualizing (until recently the universities) (Bernstein, 1990: 198).

Agents within the pedagogic recontextualizing field struggle to control the set of rules or procedures for constructing pedagogic texts and practices. Bernstein uses the term pedagogic discourse to describe the rules or principles for generating different pedagogic texts/practices. Thus, pedagogic discourse is a ‘recontextualizing principle which selectively appropriates, relocates, refocuses, and relates other discourses to constitute its own order and orderings’ (Bernstein, 1990: 184). Pedagogic discourse is the set of rules for embedding and relating two discourses, namely, a discourse of competence (discipline specific knowledge) into a discourse of social order. The term instructional discourse refers to the rules generating the ‘trained capacities and lifestyles’ (competences) to be distributed to the school population (Hunter, 1994: 95). The term regulative discourse refers to the rules generating the order within the instructional discourse, that is, the arbitrary internal order for the transmission of these competences. All pedagogic discourse creates a moral regulation of the social relations of transmission and acquisition, that is, the rules of appropriate conduct, character and manner in the classroom. Moreover, the moral order of the classroom is constituted prior to, and is a necessary condition for the transmission of instructional discourses.

These two elements of pedagogic discourse, the instructional and the regulative are the direct outcome of the modern school’s bureaucratic organisation and its pastoral pedagogy. On the one hand, it was through the education ‘bureau’ that ‘States conceptualised and organised that massive and ongoing program of pacification, discipline and training responsible for the political and social capacities of the modern citizen’ (Hunter, 1994: 60). A non-violent, tolerant and pragmatic sphere of political deliberation was created by forcefully separating the public comportment of the citizen from the private persona of the ‘man of conscience’ and by subordinating absolutes to government objectives. On the other hand, ‘it was Christian pastoralism that disseminated the comportment of the self-reflective person and that it did so via a pedagogy of moral “subjectification” which remains at the heart of modern schooling’ (Hunter, 1994: 60-61). Thus, the instructional and regulative discourses of schooling operate in different ethical and political registers at the same time – to satisfy the demands of conscience and the objectives of government.

Agents within the PRF select and organise, according to the principles or rules of specific pedagogic discourses, texts from a number of knowledge bases or domains, such as subject knowledge, teaching knowledge, content knowledge of learners and knowledge of self (Turner-Bisset, 1999). In so doing, they attempt to regulate what it means to take up and enact discipline specific pedagogic identities, such as teacher and student of sociology or mathematics.

Conflict and struggle is widespread in the PRF, particularly if this field is strongly insulated from the ORF. Strong insulation means that agents within the PRF have some autonomy over the construction of pedagogic discourses and practices. In other words, agents of
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recontextualisation struggle for control over the pedagogic discourses that regulate the production of pedagogic contexts, the relations between agents in these contexts, and the texts produced by these agents at the macro levels of state policy formation (ORF) and micro levels of classroom interactions (see Singh, 2001b). The stakes are massive in this struggle, for the group that appropriates and controls the pedagogic device exercises power in relation to the distribution, recontextualization and evaluation of complex knowledge forms (competence embedded in conscience). Thus, this group exercises control over a ruler and distributor of consciousness, identity and desire (Bernstein, 1996).

Bernstein has suggested that these struggles over the pedagogic device are attempts to control the production and distribution of different pedagogic models (i.e., the rules for the relation, selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluation of valid school knowledge). Moreover, these struggles over the construction and dissemination of pedagogic models are between different fractions of the middle class. Thus debates over critical or genre approaches to pedagogy (Macken-Horarik, 1998; Martin, 1999), and visible or invisible pedagogies (Cazden, 1995; Delpit, 1997; Rose, 1999) are illustrative of the struggles over the production and dissemination of different pedagogic models within the PRF. Crucially, these are struggles over theories of instruction, that is, models of the: pedagogic subject (students), transmitter (teacher, textbooks, computer), pedagogic context (classroom and curricula organization) and communicative pedagogic competence (modes of teacher and student talk). Bernstein (1990: 189) suggested that changes in the theory of instruction may have ‘consequences for the ordering of pedagogic discourse and for the ordering of pedagogic practice.’

**Field of Reproduction: Schooling Institutions**

Privileged and privileging pedagogic texts created in the field of recontextualization, such as curricular schemes and textbooks, are transformed again as they appropriated by teachers and converted into modes of common or shared classroom knowledge in interactions with students (Delamont, 1986; Edwards & Mercer, 1995). Bernstein (1996, 2000) argued that it is crucial to distinguish between the two text transformations that occur. The first is the conversion of knowledge appropriated from the field of production within the official and pedagogic recontextualizing field. The second is the adaptation of this pedagogised knowledge by teachers and students in the recontextualizing field of the school/classroom. In the process of constructing modes of classroom knowledge, teachers may recontextualize discourses from the family/community/peer groups of students for purposes of social control, in order to make the regulative and moral discourses of the school/classroom more effective (see Singh, 2001a, b). ‘Conversely, the family/community/peer relations can exert their own influence upon the recontextualizing field of the school and in this way affect the latter’s practice’ (Bernstein, 1990: 199; see also Aggleton, 1987).

The pedagogic or social relations of the classroom are constituted in the first instance by the social division of labour in terms of knowledge construction, dissemination and acquisition. Any social division of labour has two dimensions, horizontal and vertical.

The horizontal dimension refers to specialized categories sharing memberships of a common set, for example, school subjects in a given course, pupils, workers sharing a common status. The vertical dimension refers to the rank position of a category within a set and the ranking relation between sets. Power may be necessary to enter a set and is always necessary to change hierarchical positions within and between sets (Bernstein, 1990: 22).

In terms of the management of classroom knowledge, teachers usually appropriate a higher position in the vertical or hierarchical division of labour than students. Moreover, groups or sets of students may be recruited as peer tutors and thus take up a position temporarily equivalent or slightly subordinate to that of the classroom teacher (see Singh, 1995). Thus the social division of labour is comprised of categories of agents (teachers, students), as well as
categories of discourses (subjects of history, geography), and institutional contexts (science laboratory, small group lesson).

Power relations are realised in the principle of classification, that is, the strength of the insulation between categories of agents, discourses and institutional contexts. Thus, symbolic categories of agents (e.g., different grades of students), curriculum content (textbooks, lesson plans), and institutional contexts (e.g., grade one class, remedial class) are constituted through the generative relations of power. In other words, ‘power relations … create boundaries, legitimize boundaries, reproduce boundaries, between different categories of groups, gender, class, race, different categories of discourse, different categories of agents. Thus, ‘power relations always operate to produce dislocations, to produce punctuations in social space’ (Bernstein 1996: 19). In this way, power relations establish legitimate relations of social order.

Despite legitimating relations of social order, power relations are never static or stable. Rather, they are challenged, contested and negotiated in the relations of pedagogic communication. In addition, power relations are internalised via pedagogic communication or the social relations of control between teacher and students. Relations of symbolic control or the principles of framing refer to ‘who’ (different categories of agents) exercises control ‘where’ (temporal and spatial relations), in relation to ‘what’ pedagogic discourses (rules or principles for generating texts). Thus principles of control carry power relations within the school (e.g., within and between different groups of teachers, students). Principles of control also carry power relations between institutions, for example, the movement of discourses between the school and family/community/peer groups via parents, community members, and students.

Bernstein uses the term specialized interactional practices to refer to legitimate relations of classroom communication, that is, whole class teacher monologue, triadic dialogue (teacher question-student response-teacher evaluation), and seatwork activities. The specialized interactional practices of the classroom are constituted by two communication principles:

1) Interactional: This principle regulates the selection, organization, sequencing, criteria, and pacing of communication (oral/written/visual) together with the position, posture, and dress of communicants.

2) Locational: This principle regulates physical location and the form of its realization (i.e., range of objects, their attributes, their relation to each other, and the space in which they are constituted) (Bernstein, 1990: 34)

Recognition rules are constructed during the course of specialized communication (classroom discussions, school assembly, online learning), via the principle of classification, as students make inferences about ‘what meanings may legitimately be put together, what referential relations are privileged/privileging’ (Bernstein, 1990: 29). For example, students make inferences and thus acquire recognition rules from classroom interactions by recognising the strength of the boundaries between categories of discourses (what can be spoken), agents (who can speak it), and institutional spaces (where it can be spoken). By considering the way in which categories of meaning are demarcated, students are able to create rules for distinguishing the meanings that are legitimate in a specific context – who can say, what, where, when and how (see Dooley, 2001).

However, students may possess recognition rules, that is, be able to recognise what legitimate meanings may be put together without knowing how to construct pedagogic texts, that is, legitimately express or construct these meanings. Rules for realizing meanings enable students to produce legitimate texts within the parameters established by specific pedagogic discourses (see Dooley, 2001). Students learn realisation rules by working out the procedures or principles of pedagogic communication - what can spoken, how, when, and where (Bernstein 2000). Thus realization rules are derived from the framing principle, that is, the
relations of symbol control. Teachers can assist students acquire realization rules for producing texts by continuous evaluation, that is, identifying what is absent in the text (you forgot to say please and thankyou), as well as what is present (you said thank you very nicely).

What is internalised? ‘The subject acquires classification and framing principles, which create for the subject, and legitimise, the speciality of his or her voice and message’ (Bernstein, 1990: 41). The concept of voice here refers to the rules or principles for generating meanings, message refers to the range of possible meanings that may be realized, or the rules or principles of realization. Change internal and external to the individual pedagogic subject is possible due to the contradictions, conflicts and tensions within and between multiple discourses. Change is possible via the social relations of pedagogic communication.

A number of empirical studies, based on Bernstein’s theoretical concepts, have explored the differential distribution of the privileged/privileging texts of education. These studies have focussed on differences in the distribution and acquisition of knowledge on the basis of gender attributes (see Chisholm, 1995), social class attributes (see Singh, 2001b; Morais, Neves, & Fontinhas, 1999; Pedro, 1981), and/or cultural/indigenous attributes (Rose, 1999). Moreover, a number of empirical studies have utilised Bernstein’s theory of pedagogic discourse to examine the content and form of classroom talk (see Chouliaraki, 1996; Christie, 2001; Iedema, 1996).

Conclusion
In this paper, I delineated the various components of Bernstein’s theory of the pedagogic device. In addition, I drew attention to the many detailed and substantive empirical studies that have utilised components of this theoretical model. I argued that Bernstein was one of the few theorists in the NSOE who modelled the structuring of knowledge: official, pedagogic and local at macro, micro and inter macro-micro levels. Such theorisations are crucial to understanding the processes of production and reproduction of knowledge/symbolic resources in a global knowledge society. This is a society characterised by the global growth and interconnectivity of knowledge intensive industries. It is also characterised by growing social inequalities between the knowledge rich and poor.

Importantly Bernstein (2001) described these new times as a ‘totally pedagogised society’ (TPS). He distinguished between the current TPS and that of the medieval period during which Religion played a totally pedagogising role and function. In these new times, the pedagogising of life, that is, the formation of a social system where agents make themselves available for re-education, re-trainability for the duration of life becomes the new set of technologies or ensemble of rules for managing whole populations under economic conditions of short-termism. Different pedagogic models such as life-long learning and learning innovation constitute and legitimise the TPS. It is therefore timely for sociologists of education to research the structuring of knowledge within these pedagogic models. The foundations of such a research project were established by Basil Bernstein during forty years of investigation.
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1 Knowledge is defined as: ‘a set of organised statements of facts or ideas, presenting a reasoned judgement or an experimental result, which is transmitted to others through some communication medium in some systematic form’ (Bell cited in Castells, 2000: 17). ‘Information is data that have been organized and communicated’ (Porat cited in Castells, 2000: 17). Bernstein (2000) explored the
principles generating different forms of knowledge (horizontal and vertical) within vertical discourse (esoteric knowledge). He defined vertical discourse as ‘a coherent, explicit and systematically principled structure, hierarchically organised as in the sciences’, or ‘a series of specialised languages with specialised modes of interrogation and specialised criteria for the production and circulation of texts as in the social sciences and humanities’ (Bernstein, 2000: 157).

These are secondary institutions of pedagogic socialisation, the first being the family or home.

Pastoral pedagogy emerged from the historic efforts of reformed Protestant and Catholic churches to Christianise lay populations, through a dedicated transfer of spiritual discipline into the routines of daily life. ‘This Christian pedagogy was indeed designed to secure the soul's salvation, in the form of the self-reflective and self-perfecting moral personality. Yet it consisted of an ensemble of quite ‘material’ ethical practices and techniques transmitted through the institutional organisation of a new type of school’ (Hunter, 1994: 51).
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