

# Conditions for workplace learning in professional work

## Discrepancies between occupational and organisational values

Karolina Parding

*Department of Human Work Sciences, Luleå University of Technology,  
Luleå, Sweden, and*

Anna Berg-Jansson

*Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden*

### Abstract

**Purpose** – This paper aims to examine and discuss learning conditions for teachers, in the context of choice and decentralisation reforms.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This article is based on analyses of 30 interviews with Swedish upper secondary teachers focusing on their experiences of their conditions for learning.

**Findings** – This paper shows how teachers at upper secondary level identify their subjects as the most important to learn more within. Secondly, we also show that spatial and temporal aspects of organisation of work seem to influence the conditions for subject learning, where the interviewees in many ways contrast their own view to how they describe their work being organised.

**Research limitations/implications** – Our findings may have currency for other professional groups with similar governance-contexts, and teachers in other similar governance-contexts.

**Practical implications** – These findings indicate the need to further develop workplace learning strategies founded upon the understanding of schools as workplaces, taking occupational values into account. Furthermore, these strategies should be seen as a core Human Resource Management issue, as they can potentially enhance the work environment, thus increasing the profession's attractiveness.

**Originality/value** – We show that spatial and temporal aspects of organisation of work seem to influence the conditions for the sought after subject learning, and that the teachers and the school management seem to identify with different and clashing ideals in terms of what, when, how and with whom to learn.

**Keywords** Teachers, Learning, Discrepant values, Spatial organization of work, Temporal organisation of work

**Paper type** Research paper

© Karolina Parding and Anna Berg-Jansson. Published in *Journal of Workplace Learning*. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

This research was supported by FORTE; The Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare, dnr 2013-0177. The authors would also like to acknowledge doctoral candidate Therese Sehlstedt for contributing in parts of data collection, parts of the data transcription and compiling parts of the data. The authors are also immensely grateful to Associate Professor Susan McGrath-Champ, Sydney University, and Dr Johanna Ringarp, Stockholm University, for comments on the manuscript. Moreover, the authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for very valuable comments, which have helped improve the manuscript.



---

## Introduction

As an example of welfare-sector professionals situated in changing governance contexts, teachers in Sweden work in a context that is characterised by decentralisation, as well as choice, privatisation, marketisation and competition. Similar trends can be found in the Nordic context and elsewhere, such as Taiwan and Australia (Kamp, 2016; Huang, 2016; Parding *et al.*, 2017a). These governance changes can be assumed to influence teachers' working conditions, including conditions for learning and development[1]. This paper aims to examine and discuss how conditions for learning are experienced, in the context of the current decentralisation reforms in Sweden. The research questions are:

- RQ1. What learning, content-wise, do the teachers identify needing?
- RQ2. How are the conditions for learning described, in relation to the organisation of work, in terms of temporal and spatial aspects?
- RQ3. How do current conditions and desired conditions match? and
- RQ4. How can we understand these findings?

Indeed, it is well known that one essential aspect of professional work is continuously developing competence (Billett *et al.*, 2014, p. xviii), and that one key aspect of professional work is that the professions drive their own knowledge development (Freidson, 2001). But at the same time, with new public management influencing public sector services, including education, the priority of interpretation can be said to have shifted, at least partly, from the professionals to those in management positions (Evetts, 2011; Bejerot *et al.*, 2015). Regarding the effects of the Swedish education system's decentralisation, in an Official Report of the Swedish Government (SOU, 2014:5), it is argued that the teaching profession's scope for influencing conditions for learning has diminished, as this responsibility has moved from the national level to local municipalities around the country. In the SOU, this is described as problematic, as teachers' learning fills an important function in that teachers should be able to keep their knowledge base and that the profession in the long run have the power over what it means to be a teacher (SOU, 2014:5, p. 141). By focusing on learning conditions amongst a group of welfare-sector professionals, this paper highlights an issue that has been given only limited attention in profession studies (Dellgran, 2015).

In this paper we examine and discuss teachers' conditions for learning, in the context of two governance reforms, namely, the municipalisation reform (Proposition, 1990/91:18; Proposition, 1989/90:41) and the school choice reform (SOU, 1991/92:95; SOU, 1992/93:230). The municipalisation reform means that the national government is responsible for curricula and subject syllabi. However, each of Sweden's some 290 local municipalities has budgetary responsibility for its schools, in addition to responsibility for employment. This means that working conditions, including conditions for learning, have now devolved to the local municipal level, opening up for condition differentiation between employers. The school choice reform further amplified this differentiation by introducing even more employing organisations. So, previously the state had the sole responsibility and legitimacy to decide on conditions for learning, in practice perhaps mostly so in terms of formal learning, that is regarding courses and conferences. With the decentralisation reforms described above, each employer can now decide on how to cater for learning for their staff, opening up for differentiation in conditions. While we do not examine the reforms as such, nor make comparisons, in terms of before and after, or better or worse, the reforms rather make up the contextual frame within which our study is situated.

This paper's practical significance lies in highlighting one of the work-environment aspects that is problematic in the teaching profession today. In fact, it has been claimed that

increased participation in what they call “teacher professional development” can result in lower teacher turnover (Smith and Rowley, 2005), which is of special relevance in times when it is difficult to attract students to become teachers, and there is a real and substantial shortage of teachers in Sweden today (SNAE, 2017). From several parties, it has been stressed that a central factor characterising successful education systems is a professional and highly qualified teaching body taking an active part in teaching development (SOU, 2014:5). At the same time, according to the union (NUT, 2013b; NUT, 2016), approximately 50 per cent of Swedish teachers in physical education, modern languages and mathematics are not given the opportunities to learn what they identify needing within their subjects. Moreover, it has been found that the share of teachers claiming to partake in learning activities is lower in Sweden than the mean in the approximately 45 nations participating in the Teaching and Learning Survey’s (TALIS) (SNAE, 2014). In addition, teachers’ working conditions are reported as bad and deteriorating; repeated work environment reports show that teachers identify continuous work intensification, resulting in high stress levels (NUT, 2013a; TCO, 2013; Arbetsmiljöverket [Swedish Work Environment Authority], 2014, p. 4). It is highly important to come to grips with this problematic situation. As Karasek and Theorell (1990) found in their seminal work environment research, good learning conditions can buffer against a bad work environment. As an example, in their literature review, Lancaster and Di Milia (2015, p. 442), concluded that “organisations that develop their learning capability reportedly benefit from increased job performance, employee self-efficacy, customer satisfaction and profitability”. In line with this, our point of departure is that if and when teachers are given the opportunity to learn continuously, on issues of relevance and use, the job satisfaction and the quality of the services’ provided can be expected to improve.

In addressing these matters we; first, present previous research on teachers’ learning, in relation to organisation of work, using literature from the education field, the workplace learning field as well as the sociology of professions. Next, we outline the qualitative interview study forming this paper’s empirical basis. Subsequently, we present our findings of how the interviewees depicted their conditions for learning. Lastly, our discussion argues that, as workplaces, schools still largely appear to be organised in ways that actually constrain useful learning. We also discuss the results in relation to the decentralization reforms; conditions being experienced differently in different workplace contexts as a sign of differentiation. Whilst differences would always have been present to some extent, possibly, the decentralization reforms may exacerbate differentiation.

### **Previous research and theoretical framework**

We combine three theoretical fields, each dealing with learning and conditions for learning in different ways; education, workplace learning and sociology of professions. Even though the education and workplace learning fields do overlap, they have only rarely been combined (Hoekstra *et al.*, 2009), which is an issue that this article addresses. Moreover, using the sociology of professions as the analytical lens for the interviewees’ reported learning conditions, we problematise the dissonance between what the literature says about what teachers want to learn and how work needs to be organised to enable this. The literature overview is not intended to comprehensively cover all previous research, but rather to highlight different strands of thought that are relevant to this paper.

Previously, the education literature on teachers’ learning and development focused on formal learning taking place outside of everyday work, and considered teachers as passive content receivers (Havnes and Smeby, 2014; Webster-Wright, 2009; Opfer and Pedder, 2011). The focus then shifted towards learning and development in everyday work, highlighting the importance of work organisation in enabling learning to be given time and space to take

place. The terms “professional learning” and “continuous professional learning” are sometimes used to signal this shift in perspective (Bryan, 2011; Timperley, 2011). However, it should be noted that there are still research and practices focusing on delivering content, rather than on organising integrated learning processes, as Webster-Wright (2009), and Havnes and Smeby (2014) point out. In terms of organising for learning, it is argued that it is important for teachers to play a role in designing and choosing what and how to learn, as this provides better payoff (Rowley and Smith, 2005). However, Lom and Sullenger (2011) claim that only limited attention has been paid to what teachers themselves think is important to know and learn, how they would like to engage in this learning process and what they already do in this regard. Apart from being engaged in their own learning, the literature emphasises colleagues’ importance for useful learning (Webster-Wright, 2009; Cheetham and Chivers, 2001). In fact, studies indicate that, at the upper-secondary level, teachers identify their subject colleagues as essential for everyday learning, emphasising the importance of their physical proximity to subject colleagues (Parding and Abrahamsson, 2010; Jansson and Parding, 2011). As Hunzicker (2011, p. 178) argues, for learning activities to be useful to teachers, they must be “supportive, job-embedded, instructionally focused, collaborative and ongoing”. To summarise, in the education literature a shift from focusing on organising learning and development in form of courses delivered outside of everyday work, to an emphasis on learning and development as a process can be identified. Teachers are seen as actively developing competence in every day work, even though external courses can make up parts, can be identified. For this to happen, work needs to be organised in such a way that learning is given time and place.

In the workplace learning literature, the organisation of work is also in focus. It is claimed that how work is organised can either enable or constrain workplace learning (Ellström and Kock, 2008; Ellström, 2005; Ellström *et al.*, 2008). Learning can be “encouraged or obstructed by the design of the organization” (Ellström and Kock, 2008, p. 17), where the aspects of task orientation, job content perception, work planning and organisation, leadership and organisational and individual readiness to learn are described as making up important conditions for workplace learning (Ellström *et al.*, 2008). It should also be noted here that less qualified occupational groups are often the focus within the workplace learning field, which possibly mirrors the emphasis on individual interest in and motivation for learning. However, Fenwick (2013) focuses on professional groups in relation to learning, arguing that professionals’ learning conditions must be seen in the light of the three major transitions in which they are situated:

- (1) regulation, governance and accountability;
- (2) new work structures; and
- (3) knowledge development.

From Fenwick’s argument, it can be concluded that these three systemic issues must be considered while studying conditions for professionals’ learning. However, these three transitions can take different shapes depending on context, such as regional or even local workplace levels. Based on this line of argument, we argue that it is important to take specific contexts into consideration when examining conditions for professionals’ learning (Parding *et al.*, 2017a; Parding *et al.*, 2017b).

We can understand why the line of arguments brought forward in the education and the workplace learning fields are not always what we see in practice assisted by the sociology of professions. In the sociology of professions, there has been a focus on clashes between various ideals for how to organise, plan, carry out and follow up work (Freidson, 2001; Evetts, 2006a; Evetts, 2006b). Indeed, in our own previous studies, we found that teachers

may have a certain view of what is relevant to learn and how work should be organised to enable this, whereas the organisation (or the management) may have quite a different view (Parding, 2007; Parding and Abrahamsson, 2010; Jansson and Parding, 2011). We have identified how professionals enjoy teaching but remain unsatisfied with the way their work is organised, in addition to the conditions surrounding their work, as these conditions constrain the learning that they themselves identify as necessary; as a result, learning gaps were spotted (Parding, 2007; Parding and Abrahamsson, 2010; Jansson and Parding, 2011). This can be described in terms of how the different logics of professions, bureaucracy and the market operate (Evetts, 2006a; Freidson, 2001), where the profession's logic did not seem to have interpretation priority over what learning was prioritised, and consequently, how work should be organised to enable this learning. In short, the logic of the profession is a governance ideal based on professionals controlling their own work via a profession-specific knowledge base, collegiality and profession specific ethics. Ground for control is trust and responsibility, and tacit knowledge is emphasised (Evetts, 2006a). The logic of the bureaucracy on the other hand is based on bureaucracy, where rules, regulations and standardisation are central, and documented knowledge is emphasised (Evetts, 2006a). Here we see two ideals with contrasting views.

By combining education, workplace learning and sociology of professions literature, in relation to work and conditions for learning, we illustrate the importance of viewing learning as taking place within the everyday work, which in turn stress a focus on how work is organised temporally and spatially – to allow for integrated learning in everyday work. We also explain what different actors (professionals and employers) base their ideals on, which helps us understand tensions between profession and organisation.

### Method

This article builds on a larger research project of upper-secondary teachers in Sweden, in which the focus is on examining teachers' working conditions in terms of their relation to current education sector decentralisation and choice agendas. The project includes both quantitative and qualitative empirical data. For this paper's purposes, we examine teachers' experiences with conditions for learning within their specific local employing contexts, analysing 30 interviews with upper-secondary teachers. As the larger study examines working conditions in the context of school choice reform, our school selection was strategic. To a large extent, previous research has focussed on the most heavily competition-laden areas. Therefore, we wanted to situate our study in a region where the most common "market types" could be found [2]. The interviews included teachers from eight schools representing three different market types, including teachers from both the public and non-public sectors. In the small local centre (SLC), there was only one school such as a public school. The small regional centre (SRC) contained both public and non-public schools. We selected two public and two non-public schools. In the large local centre (LLC), we aimed for the same quota. However, we were only able to find one non-public school that would participate in the study, and we therefore ended up with three schools in total. At each school, we asked to interview four teachers and the principal, and with some variation, that was the final outcome. The interviews were semi-structured, as we asked interviewees about their working conditions, including conditions for learning. The interviews lasted approximately 1 h each; some were individual, and some were carried out in pairs, as it suited the interviewees. All interviews were taped and transcribed verbatim.

While a point of entry in our study was examining if and how public and non-public workplace contexts differ, a much more complex picture emerged. In asking about learning conditions and searching for differences between public and non-public employers, what emerged was a strong sense of subject focus, along with descriptions of how the

---

organisation of work, in form of spatial and temporal aspects, enabled or constrained the sought after learning within one's subject. The interview study was led by the first author, who was responsible for designing the interview guide, and also carried out the lion part of the interviews. In addition, the second author and a doctoral student, also took part in conducting interviews, transcribing interviews and compiling what the interviews said about conditions for learning. After this initial compilation, the authors have re-read and analysed the interviews. The analysis follows the steps of coding and analysing qualitative interviews described by Gibbs (2007), running from descriptive codes to thematic and finally analytical levels.

It should also be noted that the study was conducted taking the ethical guidelines of information, consent, confidentiality and usage into account. The generalisations made from this qualitative study are analytical. Thus, our findings have potential value for other professional groups with similar circumstances, as well as teachers in similar governance contexts.

## Findings

In this section, we describe the interviewees' views on their learning conditions.

### *Content in learning*

The interviewees unanimously describe their respective subject as the focus of what they identify wanting and needing to learn more about. This goes for both formal as well as informal learning activities. However, there seems to be substantial variation in whether the interviewees feel that their employing organisations meet their subject focus needs in terms of conditions for attending formal courses and conditions for more informal learning. It should also be noted that the results show no clear-cut divider between market types or sectors. Across the board, however, interviewees emphasise subject-focus as the most desired and useful focus for both formal and informal learning. One example of this is when a participant says, "We like the subject [learning and development], we are kind of 'snowed in' on that, on subject learning and development" (LLC, public). A concrete example of how one learns within the subject is described by an interviewee who shares offices with subject colleagues:

I think that we, in our office, there we almost daily share and exchange in form of have you tried this, or showing each other things, we give each other lots and lots of tips (LLC, public).

In fact, one interviewee emphasises the need for subject colleagues for being a functioning teacher. "The power to develop one's subject, to be a well-functioning teacher in that respect, that force one finds with the subject colleagues" (SRC, public). The subject focus can be explained by the fact that teachers at upper-secondary level are subject specialised, and thus they find that it is the subject colleagues that they have most to share with and most to learn with and from.

However, much of the current formal learning and development activities – in the form of courses, for instance – seemed to be based on a "one size fits all" approach, including generic content, such as information technology (IT) issues. As one interviewee phrased it, "On the other hand [contrasted to subject focus], learning and development activities when it comes to computers or using smart-boards, that we have had" (SRC, public). However, there are also examples of interviewees who find that they can attend subject specific external formal courses. For instance, one public school teacher in a SLC school with good resources says that his school allowed travel to Stockholm for a yearly subject-related conference, which he called "the biggest learning and development factor" (LLC, public). Others express they wish

they could attend subject specific formal courses and conferences, but do not have those opportunities.

By and large, despite some exceptions, the overall picture is there being too few (formal) courses, whether delivered in-house or externally, focusing on sought after subject-specific matters. In terms of the sought after informal subject learning, two key aspects of organisation of work – time and space – emerged as central, as we will describe below.

*Organisation of work – temporal and spatial aspects as enabling or constraining*

Organisation of work can include a number of different aspects. In analysing our interviews, the concepts of temporal and spatial aspects of organisation of work emerged as essential in understanding how the interviewees experience their conditions for learning. It should be noted that the analysis does not reveal any clear-cut divide between market types or sectors. In fact, there are different experiences even within some schools.

*The temporal aspect of organisation of work* deals with having the time to talk to subject colleagues, on a spontaneous basis; to have spontaneous conversations arising out of a practical need. It seems the interviewees learn – and want to learn – on a situational basis; a need-basis. These kinds of conversations can be termed collegial learning, informal learning and can be linked to the idea of workplace learning. A couple of examples that illustrate this is the following:

The idea is that we should learn from each other, have pedagogical discussions, that I can say that I did this and that and it went well. To share. I think that it will become more and more of that. But, we need to be given the conditions timewise (LLC, public).

Another example is an interviewee who describes that the school had introduced “lesson study”, where teachers sit in on each other’s classes, and give feedback. This seems appreciated, however, it could have given more “and I think that is because we were not given enough time for it” (LLC, public). The temporal aspect can also deal with having breaks during the day at the same time as one’s subject colleagues, and be in form of work being organised in such a way that there is time to attend an external formal course; where a substitute teacher covers for instance. When asked about obstacles for attending a course or such, finding someone who can cover, either among the regular staff or taking in a temp is described as an obstacle “Yes, and especially so in a small school” says an interviewee in a non-public school (SRC). Moreover, as work is described as very intense, the issue of intensity of work can also be seen as a temporal aspect; more time was desired to have collegial conversations when needed in everyday work.

The temporal aspect ties in with *the spatial aspect of organisation of work*. Having subject colleagues close by during the day, whether sharing offices or such like, opens up for those needs-based spontaneous subject based collegial conversations. It can also be about sharing staff rooms, or even have a proper staff room where one can talk without risking students to over-hear, which is exemplified in the following way:

Can I just add something about our offices, we are six people in one office, and students are knocking on the door and wants to talk to us, and these days we have glass doors and walls too, [. . .]. we have no free zone, we share bathrooms, café and lunch hall with the students (SRC, public).

This is experienced as problematic in terms of finding time and place for undisturbed conversations, for sharing and learning not the least. Moreover, the spatial aspect can also be described in terms of work-teams based on subject allowing for subject colleagues being given the opportunity to learn from each other, both in formal meetings and outside of the formal meetings. Interestingly, there seem to be various designs for how work stations for instance were spatially organised, even within schools. The findings represent everything

from subject-based shared offices, programme-based shared offices (teachers from different subjects sharing the same group(s) of students), ad-hoc solutions where teachers are given a desk when there is one free, and hybrids of these. In some instances, it seems that the interviewees are unsure of the basis for where their desk is placed, with responses ranging from, “It’s a bit mixed, there is no super clear principle” (SRC, public), to “random” (LLC, public) to “we are organised in subject teams” (LLC, public). This illustrates the different ways in which workstations are organised spatially. It seemed clear that the teachers organised based on subject are satisfied, and some express a worry that the school may be about to reorganise into programme-base, which they do not want.

The pattern in how work is organised both spatially and temporally is rather incongruous. Different conditions and designs are apparent even within schools. Even though there are interviewees who seem fairly satisfied with their learning conditions, what became clear was that it does not seem like the logic of the profession has priority of interpretation in terms of what learning should focus on, and how work should be organised to meet these needs. By and large, formal learning activities – in form of courses or conferences – seem to be organised by the school management and, in some cases, at a municipal level, while, for the most part, the interviewees are not part of setting that agenda. Interestingly, some interviewees express wanting a more integrated learning and development design than they currently have, with an emphasis on not only individual needs, but on what the workplace or organisation needs. As one participant expresses:

It is a bit like professional learning and development. It is a bit difficult to talk about one without talking about the other, and development of work can perhaps only happen together with colleagues.

An interviewee in a non-public school said (SRC). Another expression of this is:

I think it is better to learn at work, that it becomes something that takes place over time, and that one has the time to digest and think about, it is easier to take it on board in one’s teaching and think about it, instead of going away for a course [...] (SRC, non-public).

This quote can be seen as an illustrative example of how interviewees share the workplace learning approach to how to organise for learning. A last example is an interviewee who has changed views on learning and development:

Previously I thought about it as going away for courses or such, but I have become more and more critical to that kind of activities, because for an individual it can be super interesting to attend a talk, but the implementation of that into the daily work, it is most often a huge question mark. I think the best development and learning that one can pursue is driven by the teachers, together, at a school. It is some form of collegial learning.

For this to happen the interviewee concludes, there needs to be time set aside’ (SRC, public).

## Discussion and conclusions

This paper’s contribution lies mainly in showing how the interviewees – teachers at upper-secondary level – identify their subjects as the most important to learn more within. Second, we also show that spatial and temporal aspects of organisation of work seem to influence the conditions for subject learning, where the interviewees in many ways contrast their own view to how they describe their work being organised. These findings are supported by [Lohman \(2006\)](#) who examined informal learning among teachers and found that lack of time, lack of proximity to colleagues’ work areas and insufficient funds were organisational factors that constrained learning, and [Hoekstra \*et al.\* \(2009\)](#) who argued that time and proximity to teacher colleagues (especially subject colleagues) enable informal workplace learning. Moreover, our findings mirror our own previous research ([Parding, 2007](#);



---

Abrahamsson and Parding, 2010), in terms of subject focus and organisation of work. Lastly, our findings also illustrate conditions being experienced differently both between and within workplaces, which can be seen as an expression of a differentiated education sector in which local workplace characteristics shape the learning and development conditions, as we have discussed elsewhere, where we find that geographical conditions, budgetary conditions along with workplace size and age seem to influence the conditions for learning and development (Parding and Berg-Jansson, 2016; Parding *et al.*, 2017b).

Based on the empirical results we argue that teachers still seem to be in somewhat of an underdog position *vis-à-vis* the organisations in which they work. Viewing the findings from the sociology of professions perspective, it seems that, at least to a certain extent, employing organisations have one view on how to organise for learning, which partly clashes with the teachers' views, and which at least partly reflects an obsolete view of learning as taking place outside of everyday work in the form of courses, often with generic content. Indeed, formal learning activities are easier to "count" in numbers; showing hours or days spent on learning and development (Eraut *et al.*, 2000), and generic content is less costly as all teachers can attend the same activity. This can be linked to the different logics, where the logic of the profession and the logic of the organisation are based on clashing assumptions of how to plan for, carry out and follow up work, including how to organise work as to enable learning (Evetts, 2006a; Evetts, 2006b; Lundström and Parding, 2011; Parding and Lundström, 2011). As an example, the previously presented education literature (Bryan, 2011; Hunzicker, 2011; Timperley, 2011; Webster-Wright, 2009), as well as the workplace learning literature (Ellström and Kock, 2008; Ellström *et al.*, 2008), emphasises on-the-job learning, even though formal courses may also be included, and departs from both individuals' and organisations' actual operational needs. However, our findings indicate that the interviewees do not seem to have the priority of interpretation when it comes to learning in relation to spatial and temporal aspects of organisation of work, that is, what should be learnt, when, how and with whom. We follow Webster-Wright's (2009, p. 712) argument in this regard, in which she stated, "there has been a discourse that sees professionals as deficient and in need of developing, rather than on professionals as engaged in self-directed learning." This line of argument also aligns with Freidson's (2001) idea of that professions should drive their own knowledge development.

We argue that conditions for teachers' learning can and perhaps should be seen as an essential human resource management (HRM) issue, a view shared by Evers *et al.* (2011). With improved learning conditions, the work environment could improve, and the profession's attractiveness could rise, which would assist in addressing the current work environment issues. By applying the perspective of workplace learning, both the individuals' and the organisations' needs are taken into account, and thus contribute to workplace development. Indeed, the workplace development concept clearly signals how individuals and workplaces need to develop hand-in-hand (Alasoini, 2011). Evers *et al.* (2011), in examining "professional development" for Dutch school teachers, found that schools' HRM departments and HRD managers needed to offer ample choices and organisational facilities for their teachers to participate in learning activities, including traditional formal training activities, but also create social networking opportunities, for example. They also found that intra- and extra-organisational social networks enhanced occupational expertise. This shows how employing organisations need to take responsibility for enabling workplace learning, a perspective that is supported by Tang and Choi (2009), who emphasise resources, time and structural conditions as enablers. How work is organised, not the least temporally and spatially, and what logic has the priority of interpretation certainly impact on professionals' learning conditions.

Finally, there are studies pointing at that privatisation, including choice, marketisation and competition, can negatively influence teachers (Tang and Choi, 2009) by for example

decreasing their willingness to share with colleagues (Silins *et al.*, 2002). With a differentiated labour market for teachers in which each employer decides how to organise work, including conditions for learning, it would be of relevance for further research to more closely study collegial sharing and learning, in relation to these governance changes – for instance by focusing on whether and how market types, including level of competition, impact.

## Notes

1. By learning and development, we refer the learning taking place within ordinary daily operations that is learning integrated in regular work activities often on a more informal basis, even though external courses, often on a formal basis, may constitute parts of this. This description goes hand-in-hand with how workplace learning is defined. Workplace learning can be described as intentional, in that it goes hand-in-hand with organisational development, it is also supposedly affecting both employees, employers and “customers” positively (Parding, 2013; Ellström and Kock, 2009).
2. The Swedish National Agency for Education/Skolverket (SNAE) (2011, 2012) identified six types of school markets (city areas, large regional centres, small regional centres, large local centres, small local centres and municipal centres); we selected three (small regional centre, large local centre and small local centre). These market types are based on the local school market’s size in terms of number of students and other regional characteristics [Swedish National Agency for Education/Skolverket (SNAE), 2011, 2012].

## References

- Alasoini, T. (2011), “Workplace development as part of broad-based innovation policy: exploiting and exploring three types of knowledge”, *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 23-43.
- Arbetsmiljöverket [Swedish Work Environment Authority] (2014), *Arbetsorsakade besvär 2014: Arbetsmiljöstatistisk rapport 2014:4 [Work-Related Disorders 2014. Work Environment Report 2014:4]*, Arbetsmiljöverket, Stockholm.
- Bejerot, E., Forsberg Kannkunnen, T. and Hasselblad, H. (2015), “Två decennier av new public management: Arbetsmiljön i skola och sjukvård” [two decades of new public management: Work environment in schools and health care], *Arbetsmarknad Och Arbetsliv [Labour Market and Working Life]*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 23-41.
- Billett, S., Harteis, C. and Gruber, H. (2014), “Introduction”, in Billett, S., Harteis, C. and Gruber, H. (Eds), *International Handbook in Professional and Practice-Based Learning*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 17-21.
- Bryan, C. (2011), “Professional development during a period of change: a small-scale case study exploring the effect of context on practice in a South African rural school”, *Professional Development in Education*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 131-141.
- Cheetham, G. and Chivers, G. (2001), “How professionals learn in practice: an investigation of informal learning amongst people working in professions”, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 247-292.
- Dellgran, P. (2015), “Människobehandlande professioner [Human service professions]”, in Johansson, S., Dellgran, P. and Höjer, S. (Eds), *Människobehandlande Organisationer. Villkor För Ledning, Styrning Och Professionellt Vårdsarbete [Human Service Organisations. Conditions for Management, Governance and Welfare Professional Work]*, Natur & Kultur, Stockholm, pp. 166-193.
- Ellström, E., Ekholm, B. and Ellström, P.-E. (2008), “Two types of learning environment: enabling and constraining”, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 84-97.
- Ellström, P.-E. and Kock, H. (2008), “Competence development in the workplace: concepts, strategies and effects”, *Asia Pacific Education Review*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 5-20.

- Ellström, P.-E. and Kock, H. (2009), "Competence development in the workplace: concepts, strategies, and effects", in Illeris, K. (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Competence Development. Developing Skill and Capabilities*, Routledge, London, pp. 34-54.
- Eraut, M., Alderton, J., Cole, G. and Senker, P. (2000), "Development of knowledge and skills at work", in Coffield, F. (Ed.), *Differing Visions of a Learning Society*, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 231-262.
- Evers, A.T., van der Heijden, B.I.J.M., Kreijns, K. and Gerrichhauzen, J.T.G. (2011), "Organisational factors and teachers' professional development in Dutch secondary schools", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 24-44.
- Evetts, J. (2006a), "Organizational and occupational professionalism: the challenge of new public management", paper presented at XVI World Congress of Sociology, 23-29 July, Durban.
- Evetts, J. (2006b), "Introduction: trust and professionalism: challenges and occupational changes", *Current Sociology*, Vol. 54 No. 4, pp. 515-531.
- Evetts, J. (2011), "A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities", *Current Sociology*, Vol. 59 No. 4, pp. 406-422.
- Fenwick, T. (2013), "Understanding transitions in professional practice and learning: towards new questions for research", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 352-367.
- Freidson, E. (2001), *Professionalism: The Third Logic*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Gibbs, G. (2007), *Analysing Qualitative Data*, Sage, London.
- Havnes, A. and Smeby, J.-C. (2014), "Professional development and the professions", in Billett, S., Harteis, C. and Gruber, H. (Eds), *International Handbook of Research in Professional and Practice-Based Learning*, Springer, Dordrecht, NL, pp. 915-954.
- Hoekstra, A., Korthagen, F., Brekelmans, M., Beijaard, D. and Imants, J. (2009), "Experienced teachers' informal workplace learning and perceptions of workplace conditions", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 276-298.
- Huang, B.R. (2016), "Transformation and framework of teacher professional development in Taiwan", *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 4 No. 7, pp. 926-942.
- Hunzicker, J. (2011), "Effective professional development for teachers: a checklist", *Professional Development in Education*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 177-179.
- Jansson, A. and Parding, K. (2011), "Changed governance of public sector organizations = challenged conditions for intra-professional relations?", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 177-186.
- Kamp, A. (2016), "Welfare professions in transition", *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 1-6.
- Karasek, R. and Theorell, T. (1990), *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*, Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Lancaster, S. and Di Milia, L. (2015), "Developing a supportive learning environment in a newly formed organisation", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 442-456.
- Lohman, M.C. (2006), "Factors influencing teachers' engagement in informal learning activities", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 141-156.
- Lom, E. and Sullenger, K. (2011), "Informal spaces in collaborations: exploring the edges/boundaries of professional development", *Professional Development in Education*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 55-74.
- Lundström, U. and Parding, K. (2011), "Teachers' experiences with school choice – clashing logics in the Swedish education system", *Education Research International*, Vol. 2011, pp. 1-10.
- National Union of Teachers/Lärarnas Riksförbund (NUT) (2013a), *Lärarnas riksförbunds arbetsmiljörapport [The National Union of Teachers' (NUT) Work Environment Report]*, NUT, Stockholm.
- National Union of Teachers/Lärarnas Riksförbund (NUT) (2013b), *Det räcker inte att rulla en boll: En rapport om idrottslärares arbetsvillkor [Rolling a Ball is not Enough: A Report on Physical Education Teachers and their Working Conditions]*, NUT, Stockholm.

- National Union of Teachers/Lärarnas Riksförbund (NUT) (2016), *Språk – så mycket mer än engelska: En rapport om moderna språk [Languages – so much more than English: A Report on Modern Languages]*, NUT, Stockholm.
- Opfer, V.D. and Pedder, D. (2011), “Conceptualizing teacher professional learning”, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 81 No. 3, pp. 376-407.
- Parding, K. (2007), “Upper secondary teachers’ creation of discretionary power – the tension between profession and organization”, Doctoral thesis, Luleå universitetstryckeri, Luleå.
- Parding, K. (2013), “Förord [Preface]”, in Florén, A.K. and Wallin, G. (Eds), *Handbok I Arbetsplatslärande – Vad, Hur och Varför Det är viktigt*, [Handbook in Workplace Learning – what, how and why it is important], Stockholm, Åtta, p. 45.
- Parding, K. and Abrahamsson, L. (2010), “Learning gaps in a learning organization – professionals’ values versus management values”, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 292-305.
- Parding, K. and Berg-Jansson, A. (2016), “Teachers’ working conditions amid Swedish school choice reform, avenues for further research”, *Professions and Professionalism*, Vol. 6 No. 1, available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/pp.1416>
- Parding, K. and Lundström, U. (2011), “Lärares upplevelser av friskolereformen – effekter av marknadsiseringen av den svenska gymnasieskolan”, *Tidskriften Arbetsmarknad Och Arbetsliv*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 59-79.
- Parding, K., McGrath-Champ, S. and Stacey, M. (2017a), “Teachers, school choice and competition: lock-in effects within and between sectors”, *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 113-128, doi: [10.1177/1478210316688355](https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316688355).
- Parding, K., Berg-Jansson, A., Sehlstedt, T., McGrath-Champ, S. and Fitzgerald, S. (2017b), “Differentiation as a consequence of choice and decentralisation reforms – conditions for teachers’ competence development”, *Professions and Professionalism*, Vol. 7 No. 2, p. e1855, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/pp.1855>
- Proposition (1989/90:41), “Om kommunalt huvudmannaskap för lärare, skolledare, biträdande skolledare och syofunktionärer. [On municipal responsibility over teachers, school leaders, deputy school leaders, and student advisors]”.
- Proposition. (1990/91:18), “Om ansvaret för skolan. [On the responsibility for the education sector]”.
- Silins, H., Zarins, S. and Mulford, B. (2002), “What characteristics and processes define a school as a learning organisation? is this a useful concept to apply to schools?”, *International Education Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 24-32.
- Smith, T.M. and Rowley, K.J. (2005), “Enhancing commitment or tightening control: the function of teacher professional development in an era of accountability”, *Educational Policy*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 126-154.
- Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees (TCO) (2013), “TCO granskar: Stressbarometer 2013#05/13 [TCO Review: Stress Barometer 2013#05/13]”, Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees, Stockholm.
- Swedish Government Recent Official Report/Statens offentliga utredningar (SOU) (1991/92:95), *Om valfrihet och fristående skolor [On Choice and Independent Schools]*, Ministry of Education and Research, Stockholm.
- Swedish Government Recent Official Report/Statens offentliga utredningar (SOU) (1992/93:230), *Valfrihet skolan [Choice in Schools]*, Ministry of Education and Research, Stockholm.
- Swedish Government Recent Official Report/Statens offentliga utredningar (SOU) (2014:5), *Staten får inte abdikera – om kommunaliseringen [The State Must Not Abdicate – About Municipalisation]*, Ministry of Education and Research, Stockholm.
- Swedish National Agency for Education/Skolverket (SNAE) (2011), *Skolmarknadens Geografi. Om Gymnasieelevers Pendling På Lokala Och Regionala Skolmarknader [the Geography of the School Market. On Upper Secondary Students’ Commuting on Local and Regional School Markets]*, Swedish National Agency for Education, Stockholm.

- Swedish National Agency for Education/Skolverket (SNAE) (2012), *Mapping the School Market. Synthesis of the Swedish National Agency for Education's School Market Projects*, Swedish National Agency for Education, Stockholm.
- Swedish National Agency for Education/Skolverket (SNAE) (2014), *TALIS 2013. En studie av undervisnings- och lärmiljöer i årskurs 7-9. Rapport 408 [A study of teaching and learning environments in year 7-9. Report 408]*, SNAE, Stockholm.
- Swedish National Agency for Education/Skolverket (SNAE) (2017), *Skolverkets lägesbedömning 2017. Rapport 455. The SNAE status Report 2017*, Swedish National Agency for Education, Stockholm.
- Tang, S.Y.F. and Choi, P.L. (2009), "Teachers' professional lives and continuing professional development in changing times", *Educational Review*, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Timperley, H. (2011), *Realizing the Power of Professional Learning (Expanding Educational Horizons)*, Open University Press, Berkshire, England McGraw-Hill Education, available at: [web.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.ltu.se/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/ZTAwMHh3d19fMzgyNDgxX19BTg2?sid=5ccefadf-25cb-40c8-8d23-f1f6750db199@sessionmgr101&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1\(150317\)](http://web.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.ltu.se/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/ZTAwMHh3d19fMzgyNDgxX19BTg2?sid=5ccefadf-25cb-40c8-8d23-f1f6750db199@sessionmgr101&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1(150317))
- Webster-Wright, A. (2009), "Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional development", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 79 No. 2, pp. 702-739.

### Further reading

- Brante, T. (2011), "Professions as science based occupations", *Professions & Professionalism*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 4-20.
- Muzio, D., Brock, D.M. and Suddaby, R. (2013), "Professions and institutional change: towards an institutionalist sociology of the professions", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 699-721.
- Svensson, L.G. (2008), "Profesjon og organisasjon [Profession and organization]", in Molander, A. and Terum, L.-I. (Eds), *Profesjonsstudier [Studies on the Professions]*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Wennergren, A.-C. (2016), "Teachers as learners – with a little help from a critical friend", *Educational Action Research*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 260-279.

### About the authors

Karolina Parding, Associate Professor, holds a position at Luleå University of Technology. Her main research interest is working conditions, including conditions for learning for welfare sector professional groups such as teachers. She has previously published in journals such as Scandinavian journal of educational research, Professions and professionalism and International journal of public sector management. Karolina Parding is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: [karolina.parding@ltu.se](mailto:karolina.parding@ltu.se)

Dr Anna Berg-Jansson holds a position at Luleå University of Technology. She studies organisation and governance of work, focusing on the nursing profession. She has published in journals such as International journal of public sector management, Intensive & critical care nursing, and Professions & professionalism.