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Abstract

Over recent decades, education in England has been subject to increasing government intervention, with a parallel impact on teacher education itself: the ‘quality assurance’, monitoring and surveillance that has become part of the culture of schooling is also present in teacher education.

Moreover, government drives to increase the role of schools in initial teacher education and a turn to a more technical view of teaching, based on a series of identified competences and skills, has had an impact on teacher educators working in higher education institutions.

Alongside addressing the impact of change on this aspect of their role, teacher educators based in higher education have also had to contend with recent pressures to engage with ‘research and knowledge exchange’, and move more towards traditional academic research roles. However, the majority of teacher educators working in universities in England enter this role on the basis of their ‘recent and relevant experience’ in schools, rather than any academic attributes. They have rarely had a research background or training.

This thesis explores the impact of these developments on a small group of teacher educators based in one institution, focusing on their narratives of change and their response to managerial shifts and their repositioning in the institution. Viewing their accounts through the lens of Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain’s (1998) work on ‘Figured Worlds’, it explores the way they talk about their changing roles, their perceptions of the extent of their professional agency, and their narratives of self in the context of change.

The analysis suggests that, within the context of the wider political, economic and managerial changes that have an impact on their environment, teacher educators are subject to powerful neoliberal discourses that require them to re-position themselves, individually and as a group; they achieve this with varying degrees of success, albeit at some cost. Underpinning their stories is a deep sense of loss of professional agency and identity. The thesis argues that fundamental changes in values of the meaning of teaching and teacher education undermine teacher educators’ agency, despite their attempts to resist and adapt to change.
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Introduction

‘It is not the strongest of the species that survives, nor the most intelligent that survives. It is the one that is most adaptable to change,’ Megginson (1963: 4)

Prologue

Once upon a time, there was a princess, not young and certainly not beautiful [but you can’t have it all, and this is a doctoral thesis]. She lived in a palace. Her job there was to tend one of the flower gardens. Her garden was full of beautiful flowers; each one was different: different colours, different petals, different heights but she loved each one and encouraged it to grow. At the edges of her palace, there were some big high towers, lived in by giant people who watched the princess and her flowers. There were other princes and princesses in the palace and they each had their own gardens. Sometimes the head gardener asked her to go and help her friends with their gardens, which took her away from her own garden, but she did not mind. But, as well as the princes and princesses, there were some witches and wizards in this garden. They listened very carefully to the giants in the towers and they told the princess that she had to stop growing different flowers; they must all be the same colour and shape because what really mattered was that these flowers grew very tall. Now, the princess, as any good gardener knew, that, if you really only wanted tall flowers, the way to do this was to grow them in the dark. They did grow yellow and spindly but they were tall. The princess was very sad about this. Each day she got sadder and sadder and the witches and wizards got more and more spiteful; sometimes they even made her cry.

Then, one day, along came a knight, in shining armour. The knight saw how sad the princess was because she could not help her flowers grow properly. The knight said ‘Come away from here, come to my castle; it is nearby and we have lots of gardens and flowers there and you can talk to the other gardeners.’ So the princess climbed up on to the knight’s horse and rode off to the castle.

The castle was wonderful; so wonderful, in fact, that the princess thought she might have died and gone to heaven. They gave her a new gown to wear, there were lots of lovely flowers and the other princesses and princes were all really kind, even the head gardeners, and there were no wizards or witches to be seen. Some of the gardeners had really good
ideas about helping flowers to grow and they shared these with the princess. They even gave her some gardening books to read about different ways of growing flowers. Sometimes the princes and princesses picked some of their flowers and took them out into the world outside the castle and people liked these flowers and wanted to grow some of their own, so the princes and princesses helped them. The castle was a happy place. There were other gardens and animals there and everyone enjoyed themselves.

But this is not a ‘happily ever after’ kind of story, I am afraid. Like her old palace, there were some towers, at the corners of the castle. They were quite small but an odd thing began to happen. Sometimes, when she was not looking, it seemed as if these towers were getting taller. When she next looked at them, she swore that they were growing, even faster than her flowers. She asked the other princes and princesses whether they had noticed this, too, and they said that they had. It was all very strange. As the towers grew, the giants who lived in them grew, too, and their voices grew louder and louder. At the same time, the princes and princess noticed that the water in the moat, instead of being still and calm, seemed to be flowing in one direction, and this current made the water lap against the walls, higher and higher. One day, whilst looking after her flowers, the princess noticed that some of them were growing thorns and these started to scratch her, catching at her gown as she went by. She began to get very scared…what with the big voices in the towers and the plants with thorns… maybe this castle was not as perfect as she had thought.

Then an even odder thing happened. The head gardeners explained that things were going to change. It was no longer enough to grow flowers; the princes and princesses had to grow vegetables, as well. They were quite surprised at this but they said that they would try their best, as they did know about growing plants. The head gardeners told them that they had to take the vegetables that they grew out to the market to sell, each week. They must grow the best vegetables so that everyone came to their market stall and they must charge a lot of money for these vegetables, so that they could plant more flowers and win prizes.

As if this wasn’t enough, the princes and princesses were told that they would have to start keeping chickens to lay eggs as well. Now this was very strange, because, in the past, there had always been people who looked after the chickens, and they had done this very well.
The chickens had laid wonderful eggs, some of them golden. But now, everyone had to do this job. Now, it is quite easy to grow flowers or to raise chickens, if you are used to doing this, but some of the princes and princesses wondered why they all had to do everything and they worried that they might not be very good at keeping chickens, but they would try.

They were kept very busy trying. Day by day, as they kept trying, the princess noticed that the other princes and princesses were not looking as bright and shiny as they once were. In an evening, as the sun went down, sometimes they would gather to talk and remember the old ways and they were sad.

The princess was worried but what could she do? She began to ask the other princes and princesses about their stories and how they had got to this castle and they shared these with her. She listened to these carefully because she really wanted to help them to make this story and their stories have a happy ending, but could not work out a way to do this....

**Background**

Like the princess in the fairy tale, I found that my own role, as a teacher educator in higher education was changing. Looking back, I suppose I was one of those people who, almost ‘fell into teacher training almost by accident’, recognised by Mayer, Mitchell, Santoro & White (2011). I had been a member of a school’s senior management team, a subject leader and a school mentor for trainees and was given an opportunity to develop the latter further, working in a local university. Once there, I relished my new teaching role and enjoyed what was then known as Research and Scholarly Activity as this gave me time to read around my subject area, to attend conferences and thence to completing my own Masters. However, I had not really seen myself as either an academic or a researcher on any scale.

I had become increasingly aware of government recommendations that initial teacher education move away from the academic model of university- based initial teacher education that I had previously enjoyed as a student, towards a school-based apprenticeship model. For me, this has personal resonance in that I had previously trained as a nurse, under what was very much an apprenticeship model, which, at that time, I
believe served me well as a practitioner. Somewhat later in life, I then undertook a Bachelor of Education degree, at that time very much an educative model. Both experiences have contributed to what Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain (1998) term my ‘history-in-person’ and hence inform my perspectives. I realise that I have changed between these two episodes, becoming older and gaining further life experience, but I still feel that the educative model is more appropriate for a teacher. Teachers are concerned with preparation for the future and possibilities rather than simply meeting the needs in the here and now. Theory formed little part of my nurse training, beyond basic instruction. I welcomed the opportunity to read about different ideas and beliefs during my initial teacher education. It seemed that, unlike the nursing, there were a number of ways to enact the role of teacher, as a professional. This knowledge and understanding was brought to bear on my teaching in higher education but it seemed that new skills, knowledge and understanding were going to be needed.

The teacher educators in my institution were informed that they were required to engage in Research and Knowledge Exchange (RKE) activities. At a meeting where this was introduced I asked where our current teaching fitted within this. The departmental manager leading the meeting advocated that we: ‘Forget the fluffy stuff.’ Formerly, the role of the teacher educator working in higher education had been largely to do with teaching classes of students. Now, she urged, we had to set aside our enjoyment of such things and enter into the ‘real world’. I struggled to see how education, one of the most important factors in improving life chances, could be seen as ‘fluffy’ and I was angered by this apparent dismissal of all that teacher educators did. I began to consider what it was we had to ‘forget’ and what it was we were being asked to do in this changing context.

Part of my role at the time was concerned with providing Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for teachers though I had not seen this as Knowledge Exchange work. Subsequently, I became involved in working with a local company on a Knowledge Exchange Partnership (KTP). This felt qualitatively different to what I had done before as did the level of research required for my doctoral studies. I was meeting all three
requirements but I was becoming increasingly confused about who I was within this. My thesis represents my attempt to understand this process and my own role rather better.

This thesis is, in essence, the stories of a group of people in a particular place, at a particular time and of how they co-constructed their own identities and forged a world within this place at a time of change. One of my interviewees talked of a colleague, who, when told what I was going to interview her about, said: ‘Well, I am really glad that someone is asking about it. It’s about time someone did.’ It seemed to me, as I began to gather the stories, that these were stories that people needed to tell. Whilst aiming to render these stories respectfully I acknowledge that, within this, the story that I am really telling is my own.

The details of the stories are specific and unique, but like the traditional fairy story genre, borrowed above, there are parallels with the experiences of others: nothing is unique.

Fullan (2001: 52) notes that ‘change is a process not an event’ so that the view, actors and context are ever changing. However, I hope to try to pin some of this process down, at various points, in order to examine the stages of this ongoing journey, whilst recognising that there is no set final destination.

**My thesis**

I argue that the changes within universities and schools, as well as the more specific changes in the context of initial teacher education, have led to major changes in the perceived role of teacher educators, which are underpinned by changes in values. In parallel with the well-documented impact of the neoliberal agenda on school teachers’ professional identities, the status of teacher educators’ knowledge and skills is experienced by many as having been devalued in a process of technisation of both teaching and teacher education. In teacher education, the pressure for role change in the sense of the development of skills and activities, which are radically different from their former role, has increased a sense of devaluation.

Hence, my thesis is entitled:
Changing times, changing values: An exploration of the positionality and agency of teacher educators working in higher education

Given the changes that teacher educators were encountering in their working environment, this thesis explores how these were experienced and perceived by teacher educators. My research questions are:

1. How do teacher educators describe their repositioning in higher education?
2. To what extent do they describe themselves as having professional agency?
3. How do teacher educators self-author in the changing context of higher education?

I consider the challenges that individuals coming into Higher Education from schools perceive that they face and what factors help and support them in adapting to their new role in this different context. Alongside this group, I reflect on how those with more experience of being teacher educators within a higher education institution responded to perceived changes. My aim was to find out how they felt about the changes and whether this changed their self-identity, roles and practice.

Contribution to knowledge
The study considers how much agency the individuals interviewed perceived that they had in their professional roles and whether this had an impact on what they did or felt. It is hoped that this study will add to the literature on self-identity and professional development, on role change and on working in Higher Education. I will also be adding to the theoretical dimension of this area, in terms of my application of Figured Worlds theory and to theory building, in terms of positionality.

The structure of this thesis
Chapter One: ‘The context of my study’ sets the scene. I identify key components in the changes in education that have led to a re-configuration of the role of teacher educators working in higher education institutions.

Chapter Two: ‘Change and Initial Teacher Education’ begins with an exploration of the origins and development of initial teacher education in England, with recognition of the
strands that form the backdrop to contemporary debates about initial teacher education. The balance between the academic and practical elements and between university and school based elements has alternated over time. Increasing legislation and government control have played a significant part in the changes to initial teacher education. The advent and adoption of a neoliberal ideology has further influenced education and research. I examine the role of initial teacher education within the wider policy reforms, with reference to current debates on whether we are to train or educate teachers, where this should be located and what the content of courses should be. In the final section of this chapter, I consider how values are implicated in the changes that teacher educators continue to encounter in their professional roles, arguing that these changes have devalued what teacher educators have conventionally offered. I discuss the effects of changes in values within a culture of performativity, compliance and managerialism in higher education and the impact that this has had on the positioning of teacher educators as they have sought to preserve a degree of professional identity, autonomy and agency. From my reading, my initial research questions were as follows:

How did teacher educators experience change in their roles as teacher educators?

How did teacher educators experience and respond to the demands for a shift into a more standard academic profile?

In Chapter Three: ‘Methodology,’ I show how Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain’s work on agency and identity (1998), often referred to as ‘Figured Worlds’, provided me with a lens through which I was able to explore the changes in roles for teacher educators working in higher education. I consider the implications of their constructs of figured worlds, positionality and space of authoring within my research context and the choice of narrative enquiry as a research methodology. I address the research design, reflecting on the place of interviewing as a method and the attendant ethical issues. Employing this framework refocused the enquiry so that the final research questions became:

1. How do teacher educators describe their repositioning in higher education?
2. To what extent do they describe themselves as having professional agency?

Chapters Four, Five and Six focus on the narratives of seven teacher educators, looking through the lens of figured worlds to examine their self-authoring and positional identities.

Chapter Four begins with a reflection on the ‘figured world’ of the teacher educator.

The chapter, ‘Analysis One: Looking back on change in teacher education - An old-timer’s story’ focuses on the story of ‘an old-timer’ and her attempt to fit in with the figured world as she now experiences this. Her history-in-person offers her a rich and nuanced perspective on the changes she has experienced over the past twenty-four years. She is able to stand back and reflect on a world now gone. She discusses how prevailing discourses have had an impact on how she and others are positioned within the contemporary figured world, perceiving that values have changed. There is evidence that she is managing to retain some agency within this but this is not without personal cost.

Chapter Five: ‘Analysis Two: Working with Changing Values’ comprises of the stories of three teacher educators who have worked in the same institution for several years. These individuals, too, saw a need to adjust to changes in expectations within their workplace. Their stories are all different but, within each, there is reference to changes in values that had led to changes in how they were positioned. This had an impact on how they saw themselves and how much agency they perceived they had.

In Chapter Six: ‘Analysis Three: Embracing Academia’, the stories are those of a group of teachers moving into the HE sector. Unlike the other participants, they had a clear sense of the university’s mission and anticipated how they would enact their roles within the new context. However, their stories reflect the difficulties they had in coming to terms with the reality, as they sought to resource their own agency and develop in their new roles.

Chapter 7 comprises a discussion of my findings, as I revisit my research questions, and my conclusions. I also review the research process itself and identify the lessons that I have
learnt through carrying out this study. I reflect on my contribution to knowledge and the implications for my own practice and for that of others.
1 The context of my study

Initial teacher education departments occupy a discrete zone between the university and the school. However, the boundaries are fluid and teacher educators are subject to the prevailing discourses of both. Each educational provider is also subject to policies originating from central government policy and the wider discourses in society.

1.1.1 Neoliberalism in higher education

Change is a feature of contemporary society. Some of the changes appear driven by a prevailing neoliberal agenda that extols the virtue of competition in a global market place. Competition introduces not just winners and losers, but also measurement to determine success in the market and there has been an increased focus on ‘hard data’ (aided by readily available technological tools) as a basis for comparisons. This has led to an emphasis on measuring what can be measured, in essence, performativity. Alongside this, global economic recessions have led to questions about ‘value for money’ and to various governments questioning the cost to the public purse of institutions, including universities. Institutions now have to be accountable for what they do. In higher education, this has resulted in a focus on student retention, outcomes and employability. Edmond and Berry (2014) argue that focusing on employability leads to a focus on technical competences and skills. The emphasis on performativity and accountability has also led to the emergence of a managerial culture, replacing the former collaborative and collegiate ethos of many institutions including universities.

Cowen (2010) depicts the contemporary university as being in crisis, due to government policies around performativity and the aggressive intervention in the definition of university knowledge, the insistence on a certain kind of product and careful measures of productivity. He claims that this results in a culture of management and a process of attenuation in the pedagogic, personnel and research relationships of universities.

1.1.2 Research and Knowledge Exchange

Although research takes place in a range of contexts beyond the university, Collini (2012) points out that much of this relates to commercial profit and is limited in scope, whereas, traditionally, universities have been able to pursue open-ended enquiries. Leathwood and
Read (2013), whilst recognising the significance of research as a key purpose in higher education, assert that the culture of performativity has had an impact upon research policy. Once seen as a collaborative enterprise in which institutions may have worked together in the pursuance of knowledge, competition between institutions has now come to the fore. Collini (2012) maintains that the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and its predecessor, the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) have led to the abandonment of collaborative enterprise in the pursuit of knowledge.

As institutions compete, the academics working within them are held accountable for producing and publishing the research at the level required. This culture has had an impact on the individual and the institution. Thomas and Davies suggest that, from some perspectives, we have all become ‘ideal neo-liberal subjects—enterprising selves bidding for external research funds...’ (2005:67). Meanwhile, Collini contrasts the traditional view of the university as a cloistered and contemplative place of intellectual enquiry with the current climate in higher education, describing the latter thus: ‘...the distracted, numbers-swamped, audit-crazed, grant-chasing life of most contemporary academic departments’ (2012:19).

Alongside the traditions of teaching and research, White, Roberts, Rees and Read (2014:57) note: ‘...the more recent requirement to actively engage with third stream funding has moved steadily up the agenda.’ Deem, Hillyard and Reed (2007) identify consultancy and entrepreneurial endeavour as compulsory elements with which all universities and academics are now required to engage. Knowledge exchange has assumed a higher profile.

However, this drive has now extended beyond ‘third stream’ income to embrace entire institutions. Universities have become businesses. Requirements to make a profit under a business model have resulted in changes in the culture. Collini (2012) maintains that changes in governance mean that universities now closely resemble well-run commercial companies in which a particular conception of efficiency has been imposed. Within drives for efficiency, quality assurance and managerialism have become integral elements in higher education.
1.1.3 Quality Assurance and managerialism
Saarinen (2010) considers the discourses around overall quality in higher education, contending that it is now accepted that quality and performance are measured. Within this, she notes that, despite the resistance of academics, political discussion shifted to technical implementation. She asserts that the dominant values are those of: ‘control, competition and regulation’ (2010:56) whilst questioning whether quality assurance is about seeking improvement or merely about accountability.

Meanwhile, Findlow (2008) describes higher education as becoming programmatised. This, she claims, requires academic innovators who adopt the language and procedures of a management-audit culture and whose driving values are efficiency, transparency and standardisation, and as somewhat discordant with those of conventional academics. Morley (2003) notes that this new managerialism is reducing academics’ ability to question and critique, as everything needs to be justified and accountable. She describes: ‘external third parties lurking in the background’ (2003:74), and claims that this can have an impact on the quality of the relationships between students and teachers, a relationship at the centre of what being a teacher means and the heart of professional identity.

1.1.4 Students
New Labour’s ‘widening participation agenda’ led to different groups of students entering higher education, often the first members of their family to do so (Leathwood & O’Connell, 2003). Following reforms of higher education in 1992, the numbers of students entering higher education increased overall, (Morley 2003), and the momentum has continued. Students may bring different cultural capital with them, with different expectations. These expectations are sometimes in tension with the university aim of producing autonomous learners. This has implications for how tutors work with students (Pokorny & Pokorny, 2005).

Within the changes to universities that reflect a neoliberal agenda, students are conceived of differently. Morley (2003) records that the introduction of tuition fees in Britain has raised the influence of students and their families as stakeholders. The student voice, expressed through surveys, is ever more powerful. Edmond and Berry (2014) claim that
neo-liberal discourses require that students, as consumers, get ‘value for money’. Ensuring this becomes a key factor in the marketisation of the institution and the competition between institutions. The introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (2016) is likely to become an added component in this competition

1.1.5 Initial teacher education

Alongside the changes in the universities, there have also been specific changes in initial teacher education departments in higher education institutions that reflect a changing view on how teachers should be educated. Robinson records that, from the 1990s onwards, there has been a shift away from the hegemony of university-based models, (2006). Since 1992, initial teacher education has been subject to numerous legislative and policy changes that have increasingly valued school-based practical training. This has led to an increasing amount of time spent in schools and an emphasis on technical skills in teacher education. Currently, under the ‘School Direct’ programme, some schools select applicants and manage training arrangements, with only a minimum number of sessions in the university. The recent white paper: Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice now suggests that accreditation of teachers becomes the responsibility of schools, too, (DBSI, 2016).

Moreover, underlying moves to a greater involvement of schools in teacher education, the academic element of study has been supplanted by a greater emphasis on practical skills, to ensure that new teachers are ‘classroom ready’. Teacher education has fallen victim to a technical rationalist model, predicated on a simplistic notion of ‘what works,’ (Biesta, 2007).

Finlay (2008:4) points out that:

In Schon’s view, technical-rationality failed to resolve the dilemma of ‘rigour versus relevance’ confronting professionals. Schon’s argument, since taken up by others (e.g. Fish and Coles, 1998), was as follows: Professional practice is complex, unpredictable and messy. In order to cope, professionals have to be able to do more than follow set procedures. They draw on both practical experience and theory as they think on their feet and improvise.
However, theory has been displaced and the skills of critical enquiry and reflection that have been associated with exposure to theories have become a less significant part of initial teacher education (Hodson, Smith & Brown, 2012). Without exposure to theory, teaching becomes an un-examined practice and professionals lose their autonomy. The wisdom of the teacher (Biesta, 2013) and her capacity to make professional judgements on behalf of her pupils is diminished.

1.1.6 Schools

Policy changes and the prevailing political agenda have also had an impact on the schools in which the trainees will work. Changes to the curriculum, assessment and examinations proceed at a pace, with little lead in time for teachers to prepare. Most recently, in the white paper *Education Excellence Everywhere* (DfE, 2016), proposals were made for all schools to become academies, as part of multi-academy trusts, thus effectively moving any element of control from the local education authorities. Academies are not required to follow the National Curriculum, something that was a cornerstone of the major educational reforms initiated by Callaghan’s Ruskin College speech (1976). Able to negotiate their own contracts with teaching staff, albeit with recognition of the requirements of the Conditions of Service for School Teachers in England and Wales, the 'Burgundy Book' (LGA, 2000), the trusts have a significant amount of power. Whitty (2006), however, asserts that such autonomy is underpinned by central government control.

It is against this background of changes that my study takes place.
2 Literature review: change and initial teacher education

In this literature review, I begin by examining the development of teacher education in England, considering the part that government policy has played within this process. I then turn to some of the contemporary issues that face initial teacher education institutions and the teacher educators who work in them, particularly those issues that have required teacher educators to re-think their roles and professional identities.

These changes have occurred within the context of a prevailing neoliberal agenda, and its associated emphasis on performativity, accountability and managerialism, and marketisation, which has had an impact on all higher education institutions. This has had a specific impact on teacher education, leading to the renewal of debates about the purpose of teacher education and new discussion about where it might be best accomplished. At the same time, and as part of these overall changes, as academics, teacher educators have also to contend with demands that they engage in research and knowledge exchange, generating income and producing research outputs of the highest standard. Hence, the role of the teacher educator has become multi-faceted in comparison with the past.

2.1.1 Changing times: a brief history of ITE

Understanding the current situation requires a brief overview of the history of teacher education and the part played by government legislation in its development. This history is complex. Rather than present this in strict chronological order, I have elected to present this as a series of strands, in which I trace the historical emergence of themes that form the backdrop to contemporary debates about the purpose and practice of initial teacher education.

2.1.2 Practical or academic? Moves between schools and universities in initial teacher education

Historically, initial teacher education was quite varied. Robinson (2006:21) records that: ‘…prior to any organised form of teacher education, teachers serving the middle classes were generally clergymen with Oxbridge degrees whilst those serving the lower classes merely had to be literate and numerate….’ She asserts that it was the advent of mass organised elementary schooling for children of the working classes that created a demand for new
teachers (ibid). Led by religious societies, religious colleges became sites of initial teacher education (Gardner, in Furlong & Smith, 1996). Robinson (2006:21) records that, during the 1820s, 1830s and 1840s, a formalised network of denominational teacher training colleges emerged to meet new demands. Alongside these colleges, Murray and Passy (2014) trace the origin of the majority of primary initial teacher education in England to the pupil-teacher apprenticeship schemes operating in the elementary schools of the Victorian era. Robinson (2006) asserts that this was a pragmatic government solution to the lack of suitably educated candidates for the college courses. Herein lies an early illustration of the tensions that still beset teacher education around the value of the academic and the practical elements and where and how teachers should be trained.

Nevertheless, there was criticism of the quality of education offered under the pupil-teacher system, leading to demands for reform. A new system evolved within which pupil teachers were required to spend half their time in specially designated centres, where they would receive academic and professional training (Robinson, 2006). Subsequently, the Cross Commission’s report 1888 (cited in Gillard, 2011) recommended that there should be a more systematic and academic route to educate teachers and advocated that teachers should be trained in universities. Opinions vary as to the drivers in this process. Sykes (in Roth, 1999) claims that the need for teacher training and certification arose out of a desire to guarantee a common standard to ensure the state’s interest in having an educated citizenry and with a need to protect the public. Eraut (1994) argues that moves to certify teachers were also about protecting them, as professionals, and that the profession itself had a stake in the process.

There were now two routes for teacher training. The old residential teacher training colleges continued to train teachers whilst the introduction of the Elementary Education Code of 1890 led to the first involvement of universities in teacher training with the establishment of day colleges, linked to higher education institutions (Gardner, in Furlong & Smith, 1996). Gardner records that these colleges enjoyed relative autonomy in terms of syllabus and examinations, although the academic element of courses was set under the auspices of the parent university. The 1902 Education Act paved the way for further reform.
and sealed the movement to university-based teacher training. The pupil-teacher system was abolished in the early years of the twentieth century as the stance that teachers should be educated to an academic level considered appropriate for professionals prevailed. However, there was not universal agreement about this. Robinson (2006) claims that, during the interwar period, there was considerable debate about the balance of theory and practice. Nonetheless, the McNair report (Board of Education, 1944) recommended that uncertified routes into teaching were abolished and that all teacher training be under the supervision of universities, either within their own education departments or within associated training colleges. Various institutes of education offered a three-year undergraduate route and a one-year course for postgraduates, a forerunner of the modern Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

Things remained relatively unchanged in both routes until the 1960’s when, as Murray and Passy (2014) report, there was a dramatic expansion of the teacher training sector. In part, this related to the increase in the birth rate and subsequent demand for school places. The prime minister at the time, Harold Macmillan, also called for a review of the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain in the light of national needs and resources. Under the chair of Lord Robbins, the committee were required to advise Her Majesty’s Government on the long-term development of higher education. The committee called for an expansion across the sector. Under the Robbins report, (Committee on Higher Education, 1963) research and teaching were seen as complementary and teacher training colleges were renamed as ‘Colleges of Education.’ These could offer a four-year Bachelor of Education degree alongside the existing courses. The majority of time by students on such courses was spent within higher education institutions, although school based practice was also a key element. Lawn and Furlong (2009:541) claim that:

The Robbins report was probably the UK’s last full expression of liberal higher education, University education was seen in more than just instrumental terms; knowledge was an end in itself. The subsequent ‘search for degree worthiness’ in teacher education courses meant that the ‘foundation’ disciplines of philosophy, sociology, psychology and history of education came to the fore, dominating both teacher education and educational research in the UK and much of the English-speaking world.
The content and structure of teacher education was principally a matter for universities and colleges themselves (Wilkin, 1996), cited in Furlong, Barton, Miles, Whiting & Whitty, 2000). Biesta (2011:178), however, cites Tibbs who claimed that it was ‘...the development of four-year Bachelor of Education degrees in education that provided the context for the attention to the structure and form of and rationale for the study of education.’

Teacher education courses continued to became more academic in nature, with a gathering emphasis on scholarship, research and theory as education strove to be considered a ‘proper’ academic discipline. Education, conceived of as being based on the disciplines of philosophy, history, sociology and psychology, was still trying to find its own discrete and distinct place as a subject in the English-speaking world during the second half of the twentieth century (Bieta, 2011).

However, because of the focus on academic studies in initial teacher education, Gardner (in Furlong & Smith, 1996) asserts that there was criticism that the students were becoming distanced from classroom practice. This divergence led to concerns about the separation of theory from practice. Taylor (2008) reports that teacher education came to attract systematic professional, public and political attention and criticism. Head teachers and local education authorities demanded that would-be teachers needed better preparation for the realities of classroom life (Murray and Passy, 2014; Taylor 2008). In 1970, the Secretary of State for Education, Edward Short, called for attention to: ‘...the extent to which students were introduced to practical teaching problems such as classroom organisation....’ (Short, 1970, cited in Taylor 2008:293). Subsequently, the government changed and it was Margaret Thatcher, then Secretary of Education, who appointed the committee for the inquiry to review teacher training, led by Lord James of Rusholme. The James report (Department for Education and Science, 1972:67) claimed that:

Much of the theoretical study of education is irrelevant to students who have had, as yet, too little practical experience of children or teaching, and the inclusion of this theoretical study is often at the expense of adequate practical preparation for their first teaching assignments.

Taylor records that, though many of the proposals of the report were not implemented, it served to focus attention on the organisation of teacher education and led to: ‘stronger
and more structured contributions from serving teachers to the initial training of their future colleagues’ (2008:93). The nature and proportion of these contributions was to increase over time. Furlong and Lawn record that, since 1984, government policies have increasingly emphasised the practical elements in teacher education (2010). Ultimately, this move to the practical has led to the increased involvement of schools in teacher education from the partnership approaches advocated in the 1990s to schools running their own teacher training schemes. The funding of teacher education has changed significantly, too. The advent of School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITTs) in 1993 saw government funding for teacher education going straight into schools for the first time (Barton, Barrett, Whitty, Miles & Furlong, 1994). Moreover, Taylor argues that the emphasis on the practical elements has had particular implications for university teacher education departments ever since, leading to: ‘...a lack of time in which to offer even a more modest introduction to the forms of thought...which underlie educational principles and practice in initial teacher training’ (2008:305).

Alongside the vacillation between an academic training in universities and a more practically based training in schools, education has become subject to increasing government control.

2.1.3 Control of the curriculum

Government legislation has led to an increase in control of educational content and an associated focus on raising standards. Though initially the control of content was most obvious in the school sector, there were implications for the education of those who were to teach in them.

Like the original teacher training colleges, primary schools were in the past relatively autonomous and free to follow their own curriculum. However, following on from James (1972), educational reform on a grand scale took place during the 1970s and 1980s. Prime Minister James Callaghan made what was considered a landmark speech at Ruskin College in 1976, in which he claimed that educational standards were not high enough to meet the requirements of an increasingly complex world. He argued that schools were failing to produce a workforce for industry and business and parents were concerned about the
informal methods that, he claimed, held sway at the time (Callaghan, 1976). In fact, the use of these methods was not universal. Walkerdine (1984 cited in Murray and Passy, 2014), recorded a far more varied picture. Nonetheless, Callaghan utilised this argument to support the entry of politicians into the ‘Secret garden’ of the school. He asserted that: ‘Politicians have the democratic right to meddle in education’ because of the immense amount of public money that was spent on this area and the fact that, as democratically elected representatives of the people and on behalf of other interested stakeholders, they had a need and right to intervene. From this point on, government took an increasingly active role in directing what education should be about. Furlong et al (2000) assert that the central government stance was that the more they controlled content, the less space there would be for what they depicted as ‘left wing dominated dogma.’ However, other ideologies were also implicated, not least those around those of competition in a free market, associated with neoliberalism.

A major turning point was the Education Reform Act (1988), which included a raft of measures designed to bring in government control, beginning with the creation of a National Curriculum (1988) which specified what was to be taught. Children were to be tested on this content in a system of compulsory national tests, scheduled to take place at various points in their schooling. Test results were to be released into the public domain, via what became known as ‘league tables’. This introduced a new element of competition between schools and was an indicator of the developing hold of neoliberal culture in which such metrics were to become increasingly significant (Whitty, 2006). Results were seen as key in attracting parents, who were no longer obliged to send their children to the nearest local schools. Parents became ‘consumers’, whilst schools became the ‘producers’ in a marketplace of free choice (Bowe, Ball & Gewirtz, 1994). In turn, the number of pupils on roll had significant implications for funding. The Education Reform Act also introduced ‘Local Management of Schools’ whereby, for the first time, schools gained control of their own budgets. Funds could now be used to buy extra facilities, including more teachers, thereby increasing their marketability. For Ball (1998:126), marketisation became a: ‘master narrative in education and social policy.’
The National Curriculum and its associated accountability mechanisms took away school autonomy and ultimately paved the way for increasing state control and direct intervention in primary schooling, characterised by the plethora of documentation and increasingly specified curriculum content from the mid-1990s onwards. Specification of curriculum content was extended to initial teacher education with the publication of Circular 4/98 (DfE 1998), though this was later abandoned in favour of a focus on trainees meeting a series of standards (Whitty, 2006). Citing Alexander (2010) on the continuing congruence between the curriculum of primary schools and the primary teacher education curriculum, McNamara, Murray and Phillips (2017) maintain that moves to align teacher ITT with the primary curriculum served to advance the government reform agenda further.

Moreover, McNamara et al (2017) assert that the assumption that all pre-service students are ‘classroom ready’ on completion of their courses reflects a particular view of teaching related to the acquisition of up-to-date and relevant knowledge of school policies, curricula, pedagogies, assessment methods and behaviour management. This reflects what Furlong and Lawn (2010) identify as a ‘turn to the practical’, a more technical view of teaching. The discourse of relevance identified by Maguire and Weiner (2010, cited in McNamara et al, 2017) permeates both the Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (DfE, 2015) and the Framework of Core Content for Initial Teacher Training, often referred to as the ‘Munday’ report (DfE, 2016). The Carter review places an emphasis on the importance of trainees being able to demonstrate subject knowledge, suggesting that this should be tracked, audited and addressed. The framework, produced by an independent working group, chaired by Stephen Munday, identifies a minimal but mandatory core content. Whilst this suggests some degree of agency for providers, the framework advocates that compliance with its requirements be scrutinised during inspections. The next section traces the origins, development and significance of the inspection of teachers.

2.1.4 Inspection and the role of Ofsted
Under the requirements of the 1902 Education Act, Her Majesty’s Inspectors (HMIs) and Local Authority representatives had inspected schools with a brief to offer advice and support. HMIs were required to report to the Secretary of State for Education. However,
part of the move to greater regulation of schools was the creation of an inspection service with a rather different remit of addressing standards. The Office for Standards in Education and Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) service was established in 1992. Campbell and Husbands (2000) assert that there are fundamental differences between the ‘technicist model’ of inspection underlying Ofsted initial teacher training procedures and the ‘informed connoisseurship’ model hitherto deployed by members of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate. In consequence, they assert, there are unresolved tensions between the expressed aspiration for improvement through inspection and the use of inspection to police compliance. Furthermore, Thrupp (1998) asserts that there is a punitive element to the inspection process, based on the politics of blame, whereby, no matter what the intake or context, schools are held directly responsible for students’ achievements and failures. Hence, inspections are underpinned by accountability and performativity.

Inspection reports, rather than going to the Secretary of State for Education, are now accessible within the public domain. Thus, these can be a factor for parents making decisions about where to send their children. In contrast with the previous Inspectorate, Ofsted is an evaluative body, awarding grades to schools. The focus of these grades has varied over time, but has encompassed judgements of individual teachers, the effectiveness of school management teams, and the value for money that the school is perceived to offer. Initially, there were five grades, ranging from excellent to poor. However, over time, the language and categories have changed: ‘requires improvement’ replacing ‘satisfactory’ and ‘inadequate’ replacing ‘poor’. Failing schools, judged as ‘requiring improvement’ are required to take action in order to improve. If they do not, or are judged as ‘inadequate’, central government reserves the right to remove the local management, including the school’s governors.

Like schools, initial teacher training institutions became subject to regular Ofsted inspections from 1996 onwards. Inspections originally focused on the quality of teaching the students received and on leadership and management. In the most recent iteration of the Ofsted Handbook (Ofsted, 2015), the focus is on how well prepared students are to teach, which has implications for course content. The inspection takes place in two stages,
looking at how the students teach in schools, whilst they are on training and then returning to look at these students as newly qualified teachers, thus the emphasis is very much on the practical element. Under Munday’s (DfE, 2016) recommendations for the core content of initial teacher education, Ofsted inspectors will consider how far providers have complied with the core standards.

The outcome of inspections influence the number of places that the National College for Teaching and Leadership allocate each year to providers. The Universities UK report on *The Impact of Initial Teacher Training Reforms on English Higher Education Institutions* (2014) argues that the system, in which there are annual fluctuations in the number of places granted by the NCTL, makes any strategic longer term planning impossible. This fluctuation engenders insecurities in those who teach in them. Furthermore, as inspection reports are in the public domain, as with schools, they can influence applicants’ choice of providers. Competition between providers is fierce. Moreover, university departments require the recruitment of sufficient numbers of students on their courses in order to meet the fees targets that are offset against expenditure. Allen, Belfield, Greaves, Sharp and Walker (2014:2) record that the most expensive element of initial teacher training relates to the classroom observation of trainees. For university teacher educators, visiting student teachers whilst on school placements effectively equates to one-to-one teaching, with a correspondingly expensive staff-student ratio. Thus, teacher education is a relatively expensive business for universities. In times of economic recession and the related decline in university funding, the cost of initial teacher education has led to a focus on the economic viability of courses and on student outcomes. Hence, teacher educators are under external pressure to achieve results from Ofsted and internal pressure from their own parent institutions to meet the needs of an increasing number of learners in the system. Moreover, other legislation and mechanisms of control have also had an impact on the degree of autonomy and agency that they have.

### 2.1.5 Increasing legislation and control of teacher education and teaching

Legislation has continued at a rapid rate as various groups have been set up to oversee the context and content of initial teacher education. McNamara et al (2017) claim that 1984
was a watershed for the sector as it became subject to increasing control and regulation and to concomitant monitoring and an associated increase in accountability. The Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) was established to approve, manage and certify providers in line with government specification of course content. In 1994, this was replaced by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), whose remit had widened to include the funding of the provision of teacher training in England, a devolvement of the responsibility previously held by central government. Following on recommendations that initial teacher education should be eighty per cent school-based, the TTA was also required to regulate the framework of partnerships between schools and HEIs and to draw up new standards for the training of teachers (Robinson, 2006).

In the same year, initial teacher education was formally re-designated as initial teacher training (ITT), and ‘students’ became ‘trainees’. Though both terms had been in use for some time, McNamara et al (2017:5) argue that the formality of the new nomenclature: ‘augured a profound ideological shift’ in which trainees and those who taught them would be configured in very different ways. However, in terms of consistency, I will use the term ‘ITT’ from this point onwards.

The General Teaching Council for England (GTC) was established by the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 as the professional body for teaching in England. The GTC had two remits both related to standards: to contribute to improving standards of teaching and the quality of learning, and to maintain and improve standards of professional conduct among teachers, in the interests of the public. It was required to set up and maintain the register of teachers in England, became the awarding body for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), and was also required to regulate the profession via a Code of Conduct and Practice.

The TTA became the Training and Development Agency for schools (TDA) in 2005, with wider responsibilities for the training and development of the entire school work force and for the attendant remodelling of the work force. The stated aim of the remodelling exercise was to free teachers from a range of tasks not judged central to their core purpose and role. However, there were other consequences, with the potential to devalue the role of the teacher. Whitty (2006:9) notes that the associated re-affirmation of the role of teaching
assistants and their greater involvement in learning support, led to: ‘...blurring [of] the distinction between teachers and teaching assistants.’

With the successive rebranding of these agencies, there were apparent moves away from the direct control of central government as the responsibilities of each new configuration of these departments increased. Ball, however, claims that one of the key tenets of neoliberalism is to allow greater autonomy, whilst demanding greater accountability (1998). Whilst Whitty (2006:4) contends that what appears to offer greater autonomy in education often leads to different mechanisms of control:

Governments are generally unwilling to relinquish control over the outcomes that schools should achieve...This is operationalised through the range of targets and performance indicators, and associated league tables that have grown up around ‘marketised’ systems. Although justified in terms of providing information for the ‘consumer’ and greater public accountability, these indicators also enable government to scrutinise and direct providers.

Thus, each new agency was accountable for its results, leading to increasing requirements of evidence from schools and teacher training providers.

In 2010, the political picture changed. The former Labour government was replaced by a coalition between the Tory party and the Liberal Democrats. Inevitably, this led to a further change in titles and responsibilities. The Schools White Paper, The Importance of Teaching (DfE, 2010) set out the education reform agenda for the next decade. This sought to:

Increase the autonomy of schools whilst retaining high levels of accountability by:

1) accelerating the academisation programme and launching the free schools programme;
2) prescribing more rigorous knowledge-based curriculum, assessment and qualifications frameworks;
3) refocusing inspection on teaching and learning and performance outcomes.

Raise the quality of teaching, giving schools an increasing role in ITT by:

1) raising the quality of new entrants;
2) developing a national network of teaching schools to take a lead in the initial and continuing development of teachers and system and subject leaders, and school improvement;

3) increasing the role of schools in training and the amount of time spent by trainees in the classroom, focusing particularly on the core skills of teaching reading and mathematics, and managing behavior.

Ensure a more equal and progressive distribution of resources...’ (summarised in McNamara et al, 2017: 9)

For those involved in ITT, there were clear messages about the increasing contribution of schools to ITT, the place of knowledge within the curriculum and the importance of performance outcomes. Performance was at the forefront in the introduction of the Standards for Qualified Teachers (DfE, 2011), adding a further layer of externally imposed regulation for the profession. Teachers in training are required to work towards these expectations. The first section of the Standards requires that teachers must demonstrate that they:

- Set high expectations that inspire, motivate and challenge their pupils
- Promote good progress and outcomes by their pupils
- Demonstrate good subject and curriculum knowledge
- Plan and teach well-structured lessons
- Adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all their pupils
- Make accurate and productive use of assessment
- Manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment
- Fulfil wider professional responsibilities

The second section of the Standards relates to personal and professional conduct and defines the behaviour and attitudes that set the required standard for conduct throughout teachers’ careers.

In 2012, the GTC was abolished, following government criticism that it had done little to ‘raise the standards’ that had been central to its remit (Shepherd, 2010, citing Michael
Gove, in the Guardian, 3rd June, 2010). Responsibilities were devolved to the Teaching Agency that replaced the TDA in the same year. Established as an executive agency of the Department for Education, this made the links between government and agencies explicit once more. Subsequently, the TA merged with the National College for School Leadership to become the National College for Teaching and Leadership Teaching (NCTL) in 2013. Thus, there had been many changes in those who oversaw education over a relatively short period of time. As the remit of the departments had changed, what was required from those in the field had increased.

Jones (2010:344) reflects on the impact of what she terms ‘a period of ‘turmoil.’ During this, she says:

> There have been too many initiatives, short-term responses to media scares and policy shifts which have not only eroded the public’s perception of educationalists, but, more significantly, have shaped the performance of teachers themselves. They have become ... twisted, bent and formed to satisfy others, meanwhile ... floating amongst all this turmoil is each individual’s hopes, desires and aspirations.

Moreover, Whitty (2006:1) notes:

> Contemporary educational reform...has resulted in a period of significant change for teachers and ... raised new questions ... about how we should understand the role of the teacher and who has a right to be involved in decisions about education ... with the involvement of a wider range of stakeholders.

The apparently relentless desire for reform continues. The next section examines the impact of more contemporary reforms in education.

### 2.1.6 Changing times: where next?

Schools in England continue to undergo a process of change as national government has simultaneously centralised and decentralised control on different levels, most recently decentralising local school control via the freedoms now afforded to Academies and free schools:

> Academies are publicly funded independent schools that are exempt from key regulations, including the National Curriculum (although they must offer a broad and balanced curriculum), teachers’ pay and conditions of service. (McNamara et al 2017:10).
Run by self-governing non-profit charitable trusts, Academies may receive additional support from personal or corporate sponsors. Some have an official faith designation and academy trusts may operate in chains, as multi-academy trusts. The majority of secondary schools are now Academies and, in the most recent white paper, *Educational Excellence Everywhere* (DfE, 2016) there is increasing government pressure for all schools to become Academies. Schools judged as underperforming by Ofsted are put under the control of Academy Trusts. This process has served to increase the spread and influence of Academies, in line with government expectations, (*Educational Excellence Everywhere*, DfE, 2016). The former involvement of local authorities has all but vanished. The new providers are seen as offering consumer choice in a free market but also raise the possibility of business interests becoming involved in education.

Likewise, routes into teacher education remain in a process of change. The first years of the 21st century saw the rise of school based teacher training for post-graduates. The Articled and Licensed teacher schemes, the first of the employment-based routes into teaching, were superseded by School Direct and School Centred Initial Teaching Training (Universities UK, 2014). Though the Carter review of initial teacher training (2015) supports diverse routes into the profession, other publications suggest that school based routes are privileged. The government white paper, ‘*Higher Education Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice*’ (DBSI, 2016) recommends that schools be able to accredit teachers, as they are conceived as being in the best position to judge competence in the workplace. This is indicative of the drive to move ITT out of higher education. There are practical implications that may be behind such moves, alongside those relating to pedagogy. Locating teacher training totally within schools would cut the costs of running university education departments. In the light of restricted spending, post economic recession, this is expedient on economic grounds. However, such moves foreground a view of initial teacher education as being concerned with practical skills that can be learnt ‘on the job’.

The white paper, *Educational Excellence Everywhere* (DfE, 2016:16) indicates that, by 2020, the school led system will be in control of teacher training. Furthermore, the white paper
asserts that the current Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), normally granted by the DfE following recommendation by the university training provider, sets the bar on standards too low. In the relentless drive for higher standards, the paper advocates that QTS be replaced by a: ‘stronger, more challenging accreditation based on teachers’ effectiveness in the classroom, as judged by great schools’ (DfE, 2016:28). Hence, the university’s role becomes diminished. Moreover, this raises questions as to whether those employed in universities are perceived as having the capacity to judge teacher effectiveness. However, the white paper claims that there is still a place for higher education institutions, suggesting that: ‘The best universities become centres of excellence in ITT, drawing upon their world leading subject knowledge and research,’ (2016:34). In parallel with the situation in schools, bidding to become centres of excellence can lead to providers being in competition with each other such that ultimately, only certain universities would be involved in ITT. *Educational Excellence Everywhere* (DfE, 2016) offers the best universities guaranteed allocations of student numbers over several years, though this may be scant consolation for a loss of autonomy.

As it is, several universities have made the decision to opt out of involvement in ITT already, seeing this as overburdened with regulations and not without risk in terms of investment, given the emphasis on school based training and the increased powers delegated to schools. David Bell, writing in the Guardian newspaper in January 2015, reports that:

> Many other universities are finding it hard to retain staff without job security. Coupled with the other financial pressures in higher education, some of my fellow vice-chancellors are now closing courses down.

As part of the drive for quality, all academics in higher education, including teacher educators, are now subject to grading under the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). Introduced by the government, this was as a way of:

- Informing students’ choices about what and where to study
- Raising esteem for teaching
- Recognising and rewarding excellent teaching
Better meeting the needs of employers, business, industry and the professions

(Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016)

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) were charged with leading the implementation of the framework. The TEF leads to the award of a bronze, silver or gold rating, associated with what is termed ‘fee uplifts’. The awards are based on individual providers’ metrics and performance against the assessment criteria, (HEFCE, 2016). The association of quality assurance and performativity resonates with profit motives and neoliberalism.

The TEF sits alongside the existing Research Excellence Framework (REF), another system of assessing quality that involves a grading of universities in terms of the quality of internationally published research and its impact. HEFCE (2014), reporting on the impact of the REF, point out that: ‘The Research Excellence Framework was the first exercise to assess the impact of research outside of academia.’ Impact is defined as: ‘an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia.’ However, others see a more direct relationship between the REF and the lives of academics. Altbach (2014) claims that:

Publication in high status refereed journals has become a major criterion of academic success in the competitive environment of global higher education. Appearing in internationally circulated journals published in English is especially prestigious. Universities are engaged in a global arms race of publication; and academics are the shock troops of the struggle.

Reinforcing the current emphasis on metrics, he argues that this is because:

Research productivity is easier to measure than other kinds of academic work – teaching has been mentioned, and community engagement and such important functions as university-industry linkages are also difficult to define and quantify. Thus, research is not only the gold standard, but almost the only semi-reliable variable.

Delanty (2001:9) identifies four kinds of knowledge produced by the post-modern university, namely research, education, professional training and intellectual enquiry and critique. Teacher educators have always concerned themselves with education and professional training. In their oft-repeated aim to produce ‘reflective practitioners’, as
advocated in Schon’s seminal text (1983), they have also exhorted the value of critical
enquiry and have, in some cases, engaged in researching their own practice.

Beyond this, however, institutions now require teacher educators to see themselves not
merely as practitioner researchers, but as academic, published researchers, participating
in the REF. McNamara et al (2017:26) maintain that:

University demands for research performativity, particularly leading up to the
Research Excellence Framework (REF) of 2014, were manifested in increasingly
differentiated forms of research engagement by teacher educators. These demands
often co-existed uneasily with the increasing emphasis on practice and the
development of school-led ITT.

Menter, Hulme, Murray, Campbell, Hextall, Jones, Mahony, Procter and Wall (2010) assert
that the traditions of scholarship and practitioner engagement in small-scale research in
teacher education are different in nature to the level of research assessed within the REF.

However, should teacher educators engage in this level of research, there are still barriers.
Currently, research into teaching and teacher education is under-represented in the REF,
(Menter et al 2010). Earlier battles about its place as an academic subject in its own right
are still very much present. Cochran-Smith (2005) asserts that, conventionally, research
into teaching lacks academic rigour. Menter et al (2010) contend that such research is often
under-theorised and that it is not underpinned by research methodology. Moreover, much
of it is based on localised reflection that does not generalise across contexts.

As universities are required to compete for funding sources more generally, ‘knowledge
exchange’ has become increasingly prominent. The College of Arts, Humanities and Social
Science at Edinburgh University definition of knowledge exchange (KE) as: ‘...a process
which brings together academic staff, users of research and wider groups and communities
to exchange ideas, evidence and expertise.’ Olssen and Peters (2005:313) record that:

Universities are seen as a key driver in the knowledge economy and as a consequence,
higher education institutions have been encouraged to develop links with industry and
business in a series of new venture partnerships.
Morley (2003:68) notes that, beyond the teaching and research, there is now an imperative for those working in HEIs to be innovative and entrepreneurial in order to add value to their organisation. Similarly, Deem, Hillyard and Reed (2007) see entrepreneurial endeavour as becoming increasingly important. Harden and Crosby (2000) assert that the role portfolio of the academic is now extended because of the increasing emphasis on the business model and the associated culture of entrepreneurship. This can provide both new opportunities for teacher educators but can also challenge the value of what they do.

Thus, the pace of change in education and ITT has become ever more rapid over recent years due to increased government involvement and a neoliberal ideology that puts the notion of the competitive marketplace to the fore. The role of the teacher educator is complex and new demands have increased this complexity.

McNamara et al (2017:26) note that:

The divergent pressures of the “turn to the practical” (Hoyle quoted in Furlong and Lawn, 2011, p.8), the intensification caused by school-led ITT routes, and increasing imperatives for research performativity seem to be producing further change in teacher educators’ identities.

The next section considers the impact of these multiple changes on the professional identities of teacher educators.

2.2 Understanding the impact of change on teacher educator roles and identities

As professionals working in the context of Higher Education, teacher educators have been particularly affected by a number of powerful discourses that seek to change their roles and working practices. Furthermore, McNamara et al (2017:27) note that:

Compounding this reshaping of professional identities were the attacks on teacher educators coming from policy-makers, the media and stakeholders within other sectors of education in the years when Michael Gove was the Secretary of State for Education (2010–2013).
It is against the background of these discourses that they must forge and sustain their professional identities. Examining the interplay of discourses, Furlong et al (2000) argue that there have been four identifiable voices in the policy debate on initial teacher education, namely neoliberalism, neo-conservatism, the voice of teacher education professionals themselves, and the technocratic or managerial voice. In the next section, I focus first on the impact of the neoliberal agenda and its links with managerialism, moving on to a discussion of the impact of other discourses and debates that contest the place, purpose and relevance of teacher education in the 21st century. The chapter closes with a discussion of values in ITT. It is not just roles that have changed, but also the values that underpin these roles. As a result, what teacher educators offer, and the knowledge, wisdom, understanding and expertise that they possess, has become devalued.

2.2.1 Neoliberalism, performativity and accountability

Education in England operates within a prevailing neoliberal agenda. Central to the neoliberal position is the claim that market forces are both an efficient and a fair means of allocating resources and more responsive to felt needs of individuals, thereby promoting individual self-reliance and diversity (Furlong et al, 2000). However, with diversity comes competition, and winners and losers, differentiated and compared by means of measurements and ‘hard data’. Judgements against fixed, pre-set standards and the performativity which this implies require an audience and accountability to others, evidenced by: ‘... an emphasis on measured outputs, strategic planning, performance indicators and quality assurance measures’ (Olssen and Peters, 2005:313).

Moreover, as Whitty (2006:1) notes: ‘Devolution and competition, alongside increasing central prescription and performativity demands, have become global trends in education policy.’

During the second half of the twentieth century, globalisation led governments to become aware of the need to compete on an international basis. The impact of this on education was reflected in the Robbins report’s (1963) call for a highly educated workforce, in order to compete on an international economic stage. Furlong (2012:28) notes that teacher education is now a major area of government policy in many countries and that: ‘One of
the key factors driving this change has been the growing significance of globalisation, “imagined” by most countries as necessitating the pursuit of neoliberal policies.’

However, Ball (1998:124) asserts that this is based on a simplistic formula:

Social markets/institutional devolution = raising standards (of educational performance) = increased international competitiveness.

This, he asserts, belies the reality that this is driven by ideology rather than pragmatics. Whatever the motive, the declared need for a skilled workforce fuelled a drive to increase the number of students entering higher education. The overall expansion of the higher education sector, related to the widening participation agenda (Leathwood & O’Connell, 2003) and the transformation of former polytechnics to university status in 1992 saw the development of a marketplace in which providers competed for students under ‘relentless political and financial pressure to take on more and more students’ (Collini, 2012:31).

This had implications for the treatment of students and, ultimately on those who worked with them. Morley describes a culture of ‘massification’, within which: ‘...students are no longer constructed as scholars to be handcrafted, but rather as entities in an industrial process’ (2003:130). Teacher training was not immune to the implementation of such systems and structures, nor to the emergence of an educational market place in which students aspiring to join the teaching profession were positioned as consumers. In turn, this has led to a change in demands and expectations on those who teach them.

The neoliberal view is that, in order to improve the quality of initial teacher training (and hence teaching quality in schools), the market must be opened up to more providers (Furlong et al, 2000). However, apparently open competition can mask underlying central control. Murray and Passy claim that, because of greater numbers of providers, ITT for all sectors of schooling has become increasingly politicised and re-positioned as an effective mechanism to transform both schools and the teaching profession. They note that:

ITT in England is undergoing a period of upheaval; the former simple pattern of routes into teaching is now far more complex and is underpinned by the neoliberal concepts of competition, ‘the market’ and ‘consumer choice’ (2014:496).
These changes shifted the balance of power away from universities, who are not only competing against each other, but with other providers, including School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) and, most recently School Direct (Brown, Rowley & Smith, 2015:5).

The use of metrics is a central tenet of neoliberalism as ‘hard data’ related to performance enables direct comparisons and the identification of those successful in the market place. Mockler argues that, as neoliberal tendencies become further entrenched, there is a lack of appreciation and understanding of complexity and uncertainty within education policy. She asserts that:

...the notion, embedded in much education policy, that ‘what works’ is ‘what counts’ privileges that which is simple and easy to measure over the more complex and untidy dimensions of this very human enterprise. (2011:518)

Ball, meanwhile, (2003:220) notes that: ‘The teacher, researcher, academic are subject to a myriad of judgements, measures, competition and targets. Information is collected continuously, recorded and published.’ In higher education, the results of internal student surveys are scrutinised by those in the higher tiers of institutional management, and rating tables are published internally. Moreover, the results of external surveys such as the National Student Surveys (NSS) are seen as highly significant in attracting new students.

The National Student Survey, an annual survey conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of the UK higher education funding bodies, is designed to assess undergraduate students’ opinions of the quality of their experience. The survey relates to workload, work placements, course delivery, physical environment, welfare resources, facilities and intellectual motivation, (HEFCE, 2017). Once qualified, the NCTL survey a sample of newly qualified teachers. ‘The Newly Qualified Teacher survey’ (NCTL, 2016) invites participants to assess the quality of their initial teacher training with reference to general teaching skills (as identified in the Teachers’ Standards), career development and progression, subject teaching and teaching pupils with specific/ differing needs.

Inevitably, the focus of these surveys tends to be on trainees’ perceptions of immediate and short- term benefits of their training. However, these metrics are seen as significant by management, leading to pressure on teacher educators to focus on elements likely to result
in higher survey scores. Perryman (2009) argues that schools have learnt to perform for Ofsted inspections. In a similar way, surveillance by management, via the metrics of the surveys, can lead to teacher educators seeing what they do as a performance for stakeholders, including both students and managers. Lyotard (1984) first used the term ‘performativity’, reflecting on the post-modern condition. His analysis, presents performativity as a technological criterion, as the most efficient relationship or ratio between input and output. Ball (2003:216) defines performativity thus:

Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change - based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic).

The performances of individuals or organisations serve as measures of productivity or output, and teachers may find their values challenged in internal struggles between demands.

Performativity is, in a sense, written into all teacher training, in that teacher educators are required to ensure that students achieve the Professional Standards for Teachers (DfE, 2011). Despite critiques such as Carnell’s (2007) finding that, what inhibits teachers’ effectiveness is, in fact, the ‘performativity culture’, these processes are deemed to improve provision in initial teacher training. Pressures on all teachers, regardless of sector, have changed as accountability has become linked to a target and performance-oriented system (Ball, 2003). Performance implies an audience as well as actors, as Foucault’s (1995) work shows. Reflecting on the nature of power, the arrangement of space and the body and discipline, his analysis has particular relevance for education and has been taken up by a number of commentators, including Ball (2003) and others. For Foucault, power is an integral part of all relationships, rendering individuals as subjects. The increasing level of control that has been applied to schools and teacher education enforces practitioner compliance.

Foucault’s (1995) metaphor of an all-seeing ‘Panopticon’ is a significant part of this process, implying continual surveillance of a specific population to determine exactly what each is doing at a given time. Perhaps most sinisterly, he claims that, over time, individuals assume
this overseeing role themselves, and thus are constantly conscious of and monitor their own performance against a given requirement. Thus, we police ourselves, not against our own moral judgement, self-belief and self-esteem but against powerful discourses such as those represented by Ofsted. Recognising the power of performativity to control what we do and how we think about what we do when we align with these discourses, Morley, concerned about the impact of: ‘external third parties lurking in the background’ notes that we have: ‘...internalised the performative culture to such an extent that we now regulate and define ourselves in relation to dominant performance indicators’ (2003:74).

Within universities, there are significant issues related to the mechanistic notion of input to output, emblematic of a culture of performativity described by Lyotard (1984). Student retention is a significant concern in higher education (Crosling, Thomas & Heagney, 2008). Institution progression and completion rates are measured by the Higher Education Funding Councils and universities are penalised financially for low rates of student retention. Monetary withdrawal or reward, as with the TEF and REF discussed above, are of the highest significance in the businesses that universities have become. Crosling et al (2008) also note that, in an increasingly competitive market, the reputation of an institution is reflected in the quality of its graduates. Balancing the relative merits of retention and quality outcomes can mean keeping students less likely to secure higher grades to ensure that retention rates are high. However, concern with numbers cuts across the moral responsibilities that teacher educators have to pupils in schools, in ensuring that, as far as possible, children get good teachers. At the same time, teacher educators have a moral responsibility and duty of care for their own students (Earwaker, 1992). Offering advice, genuinely based on the needs of the individual, may be inconsistent with the wider agenda and a focus on outcomes as numbers.

Performativity is assisted by the mechanism of accountability. While, as Poulson (1996) notes, accountability can (or did) refer to the professional interpretation of accountability in terms of the responsibility of teachers to themselves as professionals, to their colleagues, their pupils and their parents and to wider society, accountability as the mechanism of ‘raising standards’ is somewhat different. Past notions of individual and collegiate
professionalism are rather different to those encapsulated by the externally driven targets agenda and the emphasis on competition within the marketplace, underling how divorced from the current agenda individuals might feel. Brown and Fisher’s study (cited in McNamara et al, 2017:26) notes that experienced teacher educators are adjusting to changing work conditions and roles but they can feel ‘displaced.’

Shore and Wright (1999, cited by Morley, 2003:56) argue that: ‘... a particularly disabling model of accountability has emerged, one that elides it with policing, reductive inspectable templates and disciplinary mechanisms linked to neoliberal governmentality...’ Accountability, then, may be a more ambiguous term than a neoliberal agenda implies. Biesta (2004) records that ‘accountability’ has come to be associated with two very distinct concepts. The first, perhaps more aligned with the general perception of the term, sees accountability as akin to responsibility. Biesta argues that this has been overshadowed by a second concept of accountability, however, which is more associated with a technical-managerial meaning and, hence, with performativity. Literally, this definition has its roots in the duty to present auditable accounts, originally financial documentation. However, this has extended to include the need for an organisation to present auditable accounts of all its activities. Biesta claims that, within this conceptualisation, accountability has become an end in itself, rather than a means to address the action. He believes that, at the heart of accountability, there should be a reconfiguration of relationships between teachers and learners as a means of moving forwards towards something better, rather than measurement against predetermined grades.

Teacher educators have accountability for both the concepts identified by Biesta (2004) for their students. The first is associated with a responsibility for developing students’ capacity to think independently and to reflect critically on the world as it is, with the promise of change in the future, for them and for their pupils. However, the system in which they work is predicated on the second type of accountability, in which they are required to demonstrate their capabilities and competence within the Ofsted framework (Ofsted, 2015) in terms of recruitment, trainee outcomes, programme content, partnership and quality assurance. The adoption of the TEF has increased this accountability.
Moreover, teacher educators are required to pay significant attention to and are increasingly reliant upon the data generated by the various student surveys. Academics are regularly required to review data about student performance and progression, including academic outcomes and the data around retention and completion rates. None of this, in itself, is particularly contentious. However, reliance on data and the emphasis on inspections and student surveys within the sector is part of a culture of performativity that has a major impact on both schools and higher education institutions. Olssen & Peters, (2005:313) assert that:

The traditional professional culture of open intellectual enquiry and debate has been replaced with an institutional stress on performativity, as evidenced by the emergence of an emphasis on measured outputs: on strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits.

Within the drive to ensure that students have a good educational experience, as measured by student satisfaction rates, there are tensions for teacher educators. Ball (2003:221) recognises that there is: ‘...a potential splitting between teachers’ own judgements about “good practice” and students’ “needs” and the rigours of performance.’ For Ball, there are always contradictions: ‘Are we doing this because it is important, because we believe in it, because it is worthwhile? Or is it being done ultimately because it will be measured and compared?’ (2003:220). Collini (2012:184) argues that the proposition that ‘Students are best placed to make the judgements about what they should get from participating in higher education’ is false. Want and need, he claims, are two different things:

Children may be best placed to judge what they want from the sweetshop, but they are not in the best place to judge what they should get from their schooling. University students are, of course, no longer children but nor are they customers in a perfect market. (author’s italics)

However, neoliberalism conceptualises quality purely in relation to performativity and results. Whitty (2006:4) notes: ‘... assessment regimes provide a wealth of performance data for managers at all levels of the system.’ This can lead to an associated culture of managerialism and quality assurance to support neoliberal discourses.
In a culture based on performance, with hard data used to measure success and individuals held accountable, ‘performance management’ has been adopted on a wide scale. Formal performance management, introduced into schools in 2007, is becoming increasingly associated with the ‘payment by results’ that the earliest teachers may have recognised. In 2013, the Department of Education published a revised School Teachers Pay and Conditions document, which, for the first time, linked teachers’ progression to their performance. As with many of the other changes, the various teacher unions protested at this move, to no avail. Universities have yet to embrace such formal measures for teacher educators, though the TEF may pave the way to introduce this.

Under this culture, Ball argues that the work of the manager revolves around instilling the attitude and culture within which workers feel themselves accountable and at the same time committed or personally invested in the organisation (2003:219). He likens this to Foucault’s claim that the task of the manager is to produce employees who are ‘capable yet docile’ (Foucault, 1979, cited in Ball 2003:219). Here, ‘capable’ has resonance with the standards-led model of teacher training whilst ‘docile’ implies an unthinking and passive process of being led. In either case, there appears to be very little space for the reflection and individual thinking indicative of the professional. Moreover, Morley (2003) argues that the current managerialism, situated totally within a performative culture, is reducing academics’ ability to question and critique. As one of the four kinds of knowledge that Delanty (2001:9) claims are produced by the post-modern university, this is a significant loss and is indicative of the far-reaching consequences of neoliberalism.

McNamara et al (2017:8) conclude that, over time:

ITT had been subject to an increasing level of centralisation, monitoring and accountability, engendering a technical rationalist approach to education outcomes and processes which had restricted the nature of professional engagement and created a ‘culture of compliance’.

The next section reflects on how this culture of compliance has influenced research.
2.2.2 Educational research within a neoliberal context

The development of the Research Assessment Exercise and its successor, the REF, led to competition between institutions for research funding, measured by impact and the quality of outputs (Collini, 2012; Watson, 2003). This process has ramifications for teacher educators working in higher education where engaging in ‘REFable’ research becomes a potential part of their portfolio of roles, particularly within the context of changes in the nature and extent of university involvement in ITT.

Furthermore, teacher educators are affected by changes in the nature of educational research itself and its impact on the curriculum they deliver. As Lyotard pointed out in 1984, research should not be about the production of knowledge synonymous with the culture of performativity, but, rather, about the sharing of ideas. Within the culture of performativity, he argues, knowledge has become a commodity to be sold at the market place, like any other, rather than being a joint pursuit, shared between parties. This has an impact on the nature of the research itself. Collini (2012) asserts there is a tension between academics doing what they are asked to do in terms of competitive research and pursuing intellectual enquiry for its own sake.

The impact of this shift is most evident in education in terms of a move towards ‘evidence-based’ research and large-scale trials based on a medical model (Farnsworth & Solomon, 2013), noted by Ball (2003) as the growth of a ‘what works’ agenda within educational research. This is epitomised by Goldacre’s case for evidence-based research as the basis for true professional independence:

By collecting better evidence about what works best, and establishing a culture where this evidence is used as a matter of routine, we can improve outcomes for children, and increase professional independence. The opportunity to make informed decisions about what works best, using good quality evidence, represents a truer form of professional independence than any senior figure barking out their opinions. (Goldacre, 2013:7)

Moreover, there are particular issues for teacher educators involved in research relating to the content of ITT itself. Beauchamp, Clarke, Hulme and Murray (2015) note the contested value of research in teacher education. Thus, the Educational Excellence Everywhere (DfE,
2016) document made clear recommendations for the strengthening of ITT content to include more subject knowledge but also less ‘un-evidenced’ material. As Biesta (2007) argues, a strong push for evidence-based practice where the agenda and methodology is centrally set and consistent with a culture of performativity is based upon positivistic assumptions, rather than open enquiry. I discuss the wider implications of these developments in the next section.

2.3 The role of ITT within new policy agendas

The nature of ITT has always been debated. As Robinson (2006:19) notes:

Questions as to the form and nature of a professional training, the essential skills, knowledge and attitudes desired of an effective teacher, the most suitable locus of expertise, the relative roles of participants and the balance between theory and practice, are certainly not new or recent but have long been rehearsed by educationists, policy makers, teachers and trainers alike.... Any sense of a coherent, consistent or united system of training in which the various academic, practical and theoretical strands have been reconciled has proved an elusive goal.

However, such questions have been brought to the fore by recent policy, particularly that of increasing the role of schools in ITT. This move highlights the issues of the relative balance between subject content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, and between knowledge and skills. Furthermore, in a postmodern era, the very nature of knowledge is contested and the traditional role of the university in promoting criticality and reflection has come under scrutiny. In this section, I will explore some of the debates that go to the heart of ITT and their implications for the role of the teacher educator.

2.3.1 Education or training?

Recent debates about teacher education are largely underpinned by the distinction between teacher education versus teacher training, and this distinction in turn influences the professional lives of university teacher educators, not only in terms of the way in which they spend their time, but also in terms of the principles and values that they enact in their work.

Furlong et al (2000) claim that there are three policy concerns for initial teacher education: namely, teacher professionalism, the need to maintain an adequate supply of well-
qualified applicants for the profession and the aspiration of the state to establish a greater accountability for the content and quality of teacher education.

However, such policy concerns are somewhat different to the commitment to open inquiry, the enlargement of perspectives and crossing of boundaries that are critical features of the ideal of university education. Nash and Ducharme (1974, cited in Roth, 1999:46) claim that: ‘The university’s most singular contribution to the preparation of public school educators must be to keep alive in young people a sense of idealism and critical social vision.’

Fenstermacher (1986) argued that teacher education should not be a question of indoctrinating or training teachers in prescribed ways, rather of educating teachers to reason soundly about their practice as well as to perform skilfully. For him, sound reasoning required an adequate base of facts, principles and experience on which to reason and to develop theories. Ducharme and Ducharme (1999), writing about the wisdom of practice, claim that it is not enough to have competences; teachers must be able to judge which to use when. More recently, Biesta (2013) argued that the job of teacher education is to create teachers who are ‘educationally wise’ and who can make informed judgements, much more than simply acquiring a tick-list of educational competences. He argues that knowledge, of whatever kind and however defined, is not enough. Instead, teacher educators need to aim for a complex mix of subject knowledge and expertise, pedagogical understanding and experience and critical reflection when planning how to educate new teachers.

Other writers have similarly focused on the need to develop reflection as an integral part of teacher education. Reflection has a place in both the understanding of the relevance of theory and in the generation and development of the knowledge that teachers require. Lunenber and Korthagen (2009) claim that reflection connects the triad between practical wisdom, experience and theory, whilst Mortari (2012) argues that reflection is a necessary condition for acquiring expertise. Indeed, the Advisory Committee on Mathematics Education report (ACME, 2015:4) advocates that: ‘...good initial teacher education should ensure that students have the opportunity to gain and develop critical evaluation skills.’
More broadly, but still in keeping with Biesta’s concept of educational wisdom, reflection is often seen as integral to developing and being able to articulate one’s values as a professional. Kosnik and Beck (2009, cited in Ure, 2010) report that beginning teachers who graduated with a strong philosophical vision for teaching are better equipped to cope with their first year of teaching. Martin (2005) argues that reflection provides an opportunity for student teachers to explore their beliefs and the assumptions that they bring with them, developing an awareness of their own values and an increasing ability to identify an appropriate teaching style.

Thus, Eraut (1994) argues that student teachers need to be taught to reflect in a systematic way, and teacher educators play a key part in this process. Similarly, Beauchamp (2015) notes that reflection has become accepted as an integral part of the preparation of teachers in university contexts, both in terms of the theoretical background necessary for understanding teaching and the practical approaches to classroom action. Teacher educators have a place in encouraging reflection, setting up the debates at the heart of teaching that can be used to draw out theory.

In sharp contrast, much current policy frames the development of teachers as a matter of training. The advent of the Teaching Standards (DfE 2011) has led to teaching being increasingly conceived in technicist terms, strengthened by increasing prescription and performativity measures. This has shifted the balance between theory and practice. Dadds (1997) records that ‘training’ can imply a mechanistic, skills-based process where the aim is competence, reducing the teacher to technician. Collini similarly contrasts training and education thus: ‘Education relativizes and constantly calls into question the information which training simply transmits’ (2012:56). Consequently, Ure (2010) criticises the Standards for Teaching as having limited value. While they provide a competency-based set of descriptors of good teaching, they do not explain how teacher judgements and adaptations are executed in the life of a busy classroom, or how the context in which teachers work influences the judgements and adaptations they instigate.

An emphasis on training rather than education opens the way for a change of location. Hodson, Brown and Smith (2013) examined the new working partnerships occasioned by
school-based graduate teacher programmes that put the majority of responsibility for teacher preparation into the hands of schools rather than the university. They argue that the increased emphasis on placement in this model means that: ‘the complexity and contestability of professional knowledge is no longer at the heart of partnerships, professional knowledge becomes simplified, essentially to contemporary practice in schools’ (2013:6). This predicates a training model rather than an educative one, aligning with the current model of teacher preparation that calls for training rather than education. I focus on the tension between universities and schools as ITT providers in the next section.

2.3.2 Universities versus schools as providers of ITT

The relative balance of the university and schools in the process of teacher education has varied over time. Robinson (2006:20) uses the metaphor of a ‘swinging pendulum’ to describe the continued movement between a school-based/apprenticeship model and a university model of training whilst McNamara et al (2017:21) refer to ‘shifting sands’, reflecting on how this swing is underpinned by political ideologies and dogma. Conventionally, higher education institutions have worked in partnership with schools to provide initial teacher training. McNamara et al (2017) note that the concept of ‘partnership’ had been central to the organisation of ITT since government legislation in 1984 set up the initial requirements for schools and HEIs to work more closely together. However, the report, The Impact of Initial Teacher Training Reforms on English Higher Education Institutions (Universities UK, 2014) records that, despite their long-standing record of training and the significant levels of expertise housed within them, the university element of provision is becoming more vulnerable. Schools now take an increasingly major role in teacher education in terms of their responsibilities within existing university/school partnerships. Moreover, McNamara et al (2017) note that, over the past eight years other models have come to the fore. ITT partnerships are now forged between schools, rather than between universities and schools and there has been:

A rapidly growing ‘alternative’ provision sector of school-centred and employment-based routes, which was not subject to the same regulation of accountability of performance and process measures. Characterised by a different philosophy and model of professionalism, the alternative routes were also not required to work collaboratively in partnership with HEIs. (2017:22)
This shift has an impact not only on the nature of teacher preparation in terms of education versus training, but on university teacher educators’ professional identities and perceptions of how their work is valued.

If training is the model and skills and competences are key, then there is an argument that these can be adequately (and even better) gained in the actual workplace. Wenger (1998) describes communities of practice in which new members are gradually inducted from initial ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ through to full membership, with each member of the community playing a part in the process. In terms of would-be teachers, this may imply that much of their development would need to take place in schools, working with learners in the classroom, whilst supported by more experienced colleagues. The NCTL regulations about the number of days that trainees must spend in schools reflect the importance that successive governments have placed on the school-based element of ITT. Ultimately, this has led to the current position where schools themselves can now select and plan for the training of teachers, within schemes such as School Direct. School Direct, in which training is managed by a lead school, offers the possibility of a salaried route into teaching, making it an attractive option for some well qualified graduates. Under this route, university involvement is minimal, needed only to ratify the award of the PGCE. School Direct has assumed increasing importance as a route to Qualified Teacher Status in England (Parker, 2015), its central premise being to allow schools to: ‘grow their own teachers’ (DfE, 2013). Indeed, as an increasing amount of teacher education takes place in schools, class teachers have been required to undertake more work with trainees. This approach can be aligned to an apprenticeship model, whereby one learns ‘on the job’, observing the model that teachers offer (whether good or bad), taking this as the norm.

Conventionally, university teaching in ITT employs a deductive model, identifying generalised theories that have implications for practice, sometimes via an exploration of specific examples. This model assumes that, as it is impossible to foresee every situation that might develop within a school context, students will be able to draw upon theory and principles when considering the specifics of their own situation, although this is not necessarily straightforward in practice (Solomon, Eriksen, Smestad, Rodal & Bjerke, 2017).
In schools, by contrast, student teachers experience actual situations and, from these, may generate their own theories, using an inductive process. However, such theories may remain unexamined and not reflected upon, and this is the basis for a critique of schools as the main location for ITT. The university can provide a sounding board for student teachers to develop theories of teaching (Hodson, Smith and Brown, 2012). However, Parker (2015) argues, the increased responsibility currently afforded to schools in terms of leadership of teacher education programmes can lead to a diminishing of crucial elements of teacher education which are currently attributed to HEIs such as the development of critical reflection. Citing Alexander’s (2013) analysis of the low levels of curriculum capacity among the teaching profession, Parker (2015) argues that, as products of increasingly prescriptive schooling systems, teachers can be ill prepared for the critical concerns of defending children’s interests and their own professionalism.

There are numerous other issues related to the emphasis on school placements that suggest that a school-only learning model falls short. Parker (2015:108) notes that, given the pressure upon schools for their pupils to meet targets: ‘their need to prove their effectiveness is all encompassing and in comparison, the nurturing and educating of the next generation of teachers pales into insignificance.’ Moreover, if trainees are spending a significant amount of time in one setting, then, inevitably, whatever practices go on there are normalised rather than being explored, discussed and analysed in an independent setting. Ellis (2010:106) asserts that:

> Experience in schools simply becomes an opportunity to receive or become acculturated to the existing practices of the setting with an emphasis on the reproduction of routinized behaviours... (author’s italics)

Furthermore, as she points out, despite efforts to quality assure school placements, there will be variations both in the school contexts and the quality of support that student teachers are offered. However, this can be exploited if differences can be used as a vehicle to ‘unpick’ local pedagogy and some of the assumptions, but novices need the help of universities outside the immediate context of placement schools in order to do this. Again, while experience in the school classroom can develop awareness of the need for pedagogical content knowledge, this is more likely to be explored productively in the

The push to a greater emphasis upon school-based practice and knowledge is also reconfiguring how trainee teachers experience and understand practice-based pedagogical knowledge, or, put more simply, the relationship between theory and practice.... Many re-conceptualisations of teacher education have privileged practical components to the detriment of theory and analysis.

Murray and Passy (2014: 493) argue that:

The current emphasis on preparing teachers to be ‘classroom-ready’ certainly offers a more practical and relevant training [but] cannot and does not include deep understanding of primary schooling... and offers limited foundations to encourage a long-term career in teaching.

Students enter initial teacher education with their own theories about teaching and learning, often connected to their own schooling. Kagan (1992) asserts that pre-service teachers begin teacher education with beliefs concerning the nature of teaching and the role of a teacher, which stem from their own learning experiences as a student. Bullock and Russell (2010: 93, cited in Nolan, 2012) recognise this issue, noting that: ‘every adult knows what teaching and learning looks like because he or she has spent thousands of hours as a student in school.’ Arvold (2005, cited in Solomon, Eriksen, Smestad, Rodal & Bjerke, 2017) offers a more theoretical perspective using Bourdieu’s concept of ‘habitus’, to argue that prospective teachers use the lens of their prior experience of being taught. Hellgren (1988) argues that these perceptions are too restrictive for a potential teacher, partly because the original teacher’s pedagogical aims would never have been made transparent to their students. Moreover, the theories may not have been transparent to their teachers, either. Otteson (2007) notes that teachers’ knowledge is often described as tacit knowledge that eludes verbalization. Meanwhile, Eraut (1994:49) notes that: ‘To make practical use of concepts and ideas other than those embedded in well-established professional traditions requires intellectual effort and an encouraging work context.’ The university can provide such a context. Moreover, universities are able to make explicit connections to theory: Murray and Passy (2014) claim that universities should still have a key role in the education of teachers, despite the drive to base teacher training in schools, because this is where values can be debated explicitly and ideas shared.
Alongside an over-reliance on individual models demonstrated in schools, the emphasis on meeting standards in schools cuts across what many believe the purpose of education should be. Parker (2015:108) claims that:

Schools do not have the capacity to equip or enable students to challenge and question the status quo; rather the imperative is one of acceptance whereby teachers and therefore trainees are likely to implement government initiatives without question, in a bid to ensure their school meets the imposed standards.

As many researchers point out (such as Ellis, 2010), challenge to the status quo is difficult for student teachers, given that they generally see their role as trying to fit in with the status quo (aligning, in Wenger’s terms). Solomon et al (2017:145) note that: ‘In early placements... prospective teachers may be most concerned with ‘getting by’: coping with a new system may be a question of pure alignment with its practices.’ More broadly, they may have difficulty in applying the theory presented to them during their professional preparation (Solomon et al, 2017). Roth (1999) notes that, under stress, new teachers may regress and fall back on a set of teaching behaviours they experienced themselves as learners.

Kennedy (1999) points out the role of affect, in that it is possible for student teachers to learn what their programme intends and to be able to perform this, on demand, but to disapprove of it and never use it when practising independently. Solomon et al (2017:154) recognise that student teachers have to negotiate two communities of practice, the university and the school. They perceive that there are tensions between these but, as they gain experience in schools, they are able to use their experience of crossing this boundary as a useful site of reflection. Universities have a role in encouraging student teachers to debate and be critical of theories. Developing informed and reflective viewpoints on the relationship between theory and practice can enable them to develop the capacity to choose and make judgements in real teaching situations. Part of this capacity relies on the need to be able to reflect in the moment (Mason, 2002). Building in time for reflection seems important, but to be effective in their reflections, student teachers need specific support so that they can learn to think not only about what they are doing, but also about what they are thinking (Mortari, 2012). Similarly, Furlong et al (2000) warn that, without
adequate guidelines, reflective practice often defaults to little more than lay thinking, and needs the support of an academic context.

There are numerous arguments, then, against a move to schools as the primary location for teacher education. Most ITT courses are still validated by universities. However, given the competition between providers, this unique element may also be carried out by others in the future, leaving relatively little that a university can offer as an explicit attribute of their courses. Moreover, if this becomes all that universities are going to contribute to teacher education, the role of teacher educators becomes little more than quality assuring the work of others. Teacher educators, too, may be constructed differently, within what Murray and Passy (2014) refer to as a highly bureaucratic culture of compliance and regulation. Brown and McNamara (2011) note that teacher educators in their study felt the effects of the shift from an earlier role focusing on promoting teacher autonomy in the education of student teachers to one focusing on training them to comply with externally imposed regimes and assessments. This is radically different to the teacher educator who sees her or himself as being instrumental in creating reflective and professional practitioners who are subsequently able to deploy skills, ideas and practices from a range of possibilities offering a reasoned rationale for the choices that they made. As Brown and McNamara argue, the current emphasis on standards and measurable outcomes does not make room for these elements of teacher education.

In the next section, I look more closely at issues of the content of teacher education, and what these mean for teacher educators’ professional identities in the context of a diminishing university role in the preparation of teachers.

2.3.3 The teacher educator’s contribution: subject and pedagogic knowledge

Initial teacher education needs to cover not just critical reflection but also subject and pedagogic knowledge (Zgaga, 2013). McCulloch (SCETT, 2011) points out that the contribution of Higher Education to teacher education has provided the basis for academic standards, helped to develop subject knowledge, established routes to professional status and generated frameworks for teacher education to understand its purpose: its underlying theories, values, general mission, foundations from the past and its vision for the future.
However, given the reduced time available in university and the exhortations of successive
government reports, including Carter (2015), to teach subject knowledge, teacher
educators need to make decisions as to what to cover and what to sacrifice. It has become
necessary to be selective about what is taught and some compromises have to be made.
For example, Heywood and Parker (2010), judging it impossible to teach all aspects of
primary science to teacher trainees, were forced to make the decision to focus on certain
topics only. Meanwhile, university tutors who might offer a range of viewpoints and
models as sources for critical reflection for emergent professionals, have had to cut down
what they can offer within the restricted contact time with students now available to them.
Hence, teacher educators need to consider what counts as the knowledge that teachers
need. This has had an impact not only on what they do in their day-to-day jobs, but also on
their professional identities and their perceptions of self within the academy.

2.3.3.1 Subject knowledge

Neo-conservative views on the curriculum surfaced during the government of Margaret
Thatcher. These were particularly embraced by Michael Gove, in his role as Secretary of
State for Education (2010-2014). Influenced by Hirsch’s (1998) claims that education is
about enculturation of a core of knowledge learned by drill and repetition, Gove instigated
a new ‘back to basics’ curriculum in 2013 (DfE, 2013). Implicit in Hirsch’s ideal is the idea of
passing on, or transmitting, discrete packets of knowledge, translated in the curriculum
into a prescribed list of knowledge that pupils in schools should learn. Hence, there is an
implication that teacher educators should ensure that trainees are also in possession of
these cultural markers of knowledge. Examining the impact of the neo-conservative voice
on education in the 1980s, Furlong et al (2000) report that ITT courses at that time were
accused of being intellectually weak and overly concerned with topics such as race, sex and
class and even ‘anti-imperialist’ education. To combat this, the neo-conservative remedy
was for initial teacher education to develop professionals who are themselves experts in
their own subject area. If the politicians require our cultural heritage to be passed on to
our children, the primary task for initial teacher education, from this perspective, is
therefore to develop professionals in their own subject area. This is reflected in the focus
on strengthened ITT content in terms of more subject knowledge in *Educational Excellence Everywhere* (DfE, 2016)

However, one of the key arguments for the university at the centre of ITT is that students need to go beyond the possession of basic subject knowledge as envisaged in the ‘back to basics’ curriculum, with its focus on transmission and rote learning. The university’s pivotal role in ITT stems from the fact that students can gain specialist subject knowledge for teaching, which includes an understanding of connections within and between subjects, based on research. It also addresses the nature of knowledge itself, providing a forum, in which students’ existing knowledge can be explored, enriched, extended and problematized (Beach & Player-Koro, 2012).

Indeed, the fact that successive governments have sought to legislate what should be taught in schools and ITT reflects the fact that knowledge, power and ideology are inextricably linked (Foucault, 1972). As Apple (1999:5) noted: ‘...education is not a neutral activity; it is intimately connected to multiple relations of domination and subordination...’ Those who have power can determine what counts as knowledge. Ellis (2007:450) points out that, though subject knowledge is conceptualised as entirely context free and stable, the reality is that there are social processes and paradigmatic shifts involved. The nature and content of what is seen as knowledge is a mechanism of the distribution of power (Lyotard, 1984; Hilferty, 2008). This has consequences for teacher education: as Hellgren (1988) notes, if subject and pedagogic knowledge is regarded as a given body of facts, bound by traditions, amounting to ‘pedagogical cookbook recipes and routines’, as well as authoritative laws, rules and regulations about classroom activities, teacher education will be static and conservative.

2.3.3.2 Pedagogical knowledge

Darling Hammond (1999) identifies a need for the teacher to have knowledge of the curriculum and of appropriate resources that can support children’s learning and understanding within this alongside pure subject knowledge. Similarly, Beach and Player-Koro (2012) identify two parts to teacher education: firstly, knowledge of the subjects and,
secondly, knowledge of how teaching is shaped in relation to pupil learning. They claim that subject studies are not abridged copies of disciplines, though they are built on this knowledge, and that teacher educators have a very specific role in ensuring that their students have the knowledge of both elements. Ball, Hoover Thames and Phelps (2008) elaborate further on the specific content knowledge that teachers need. They point out that, though teachers need to know and understand the subject area in the same way as others, there is also a particular body of subject knowledge, which they identify as specialised content knowledge that the teacher needs. A significant element of teaching involves rendering one’s own knowledge accessible to pupils. Teachers need subject specific pedagogical knowledge, bridging content knowledge and practice. Shulman (1987) aimed to reframe the study of teacher knowledge in ways that attended to the role of both content and pedagogical knowledge in teaching.

In the current climate of performativity, there is a tension between preparing students for the requirements of the current National Curriculum, with a relatively narrow focus on subject knowledge, and focusing more broadly on the pedagogy and theories underlying their subject discipline. While the current focus remains on students in ITT in England acquiring subject knowledge, the place of pedagogical subject knowledge in rendering this subject content accessible, meaningful and relevant to learners is downplayed. This is in contrast to the importance that the OECD place on pedagogical knowledge. Guerriero (2017) asserts that it is this pedagogical knowledge, of content and learners, that enables experienced teachers to make the decisions in the classrooms. Moreover, she contends that teacher educators hold a crucial role in contributing to the professionals’ pedagogical knowledge base, as they hold specialist knowledge of both theory and practice. Recognising the importance and value of this would elevate the status of a profession which has sometimes struggled to have its expertise recognised as ‘academic enough’ to count as professional.

Much of the contemporary debate about what is taught in the university centres on whether the focus should be on knowledge or skills, specifically those that are evidenced within the Teaching Standards. Biesta (2013a) expresses concerns about the functional
nature of this kind of approach. A focus on acquiring the necessary skills can lead to an artificial breaking down of knowledge into component parts that can become a tick list that that privileges technical, measurable skills over knowledge. Meeting the Teachers’ Standards as a series of statements about subject knowledge, planning, teaching and assessment denies the complexity of the process. Biesta (2004) sees what he terms ‘learnification’ as a driving force behind this piecemeal approach. His view is that, currently, education is described predominantly in terms of ‘learning’ whilst teaching is reduced to mere ‘facilitation of learning’. He sees teaching as far more than this. It is something that takes learners beyond what they may be expected to acquire as part of their natural development and through exposure to experience alone. Moreover, Biesta argues that ‘learning’ is a process term, saying very little about relationship, purpose and direction, lacking in any sense of purpose (2012). Without a sense of purpose, he asserts that there may be learning but not education (2015). ‘Learning’ he points out, ‘must be about learning something,’ (2013:126). Education is designed so that children learn particular things for particular reasons (2015). Rather than a focus on transmitting knowledge or modelling skills in ITT, he calls for a more virtue-based conception of teacher education, where individuals are judged holistically, rather than against a tick box list of skills. He talks about the importance of wisdom and professional judgement, as opposed to skill sets. He thus underlines the issue of changing values in ITT. In the final section of this review, I consider the issue of revaluing and devaluing in ITT and the impact on teacher educators.

2.4 Revaluing and devaluing

Biesta’s work underlines the moral purpose of teaching, and the central role of values in it. He identifies three inter-linking domains within an educational process: qualification, socialisation and subjectification (2013a:4). Applied to teacher education, qualification can relate simply to the acquisition of knowledge and skills and thus can be associated with the gaining of credentials as a qualified teacher. Latterly, this has come to mean meeting the Standards for Qualified Teachers (DfE 2011) as a set of criteria identifying the knowledge, skills and understanding that those intending to teach must achieve. However, Biesta argues that his domain of ‘qualification’ requires more than a tick list of competences;
teachers: ‘...need to be able to judge which competences should be utilised in the always concrete situations in which teachers work... with a repertoire of possibilities a different type of knowledge’ (2015:2). Socialisation has to do with the ways in which, through the process of education, we become socialised into existing traditions and ways of doing and being. This is firmly associated with becoming a member of a group with a shared purpose and culture or a community of practice. Biesta cautions that, whilst learning from examples is part of ‘socialisation’, this runs the risk that we reproduce existing conditions, including any inequalities. Applying this to a schools based model of teacher education, implies that trainees can unthinkingly adopt whatever practices they see. Biesta contends that we need to use our knowledge and understanding to empower us to move forward to consider new ways of being. This can lead us to the domain of subjectification in which, he asserts: ‘...we can find qualities such as autonomy, criticality, empathy or compassion, that all are potential effects of education’ (2015:4). Biesta associates subjectification with the development of the ability of the professional to make her or his own judgements, informed by their understanding of the complexities of a situation, rather than merely following prescribed procedures and unquestioned dogma. Thus, subjectification relates to one’s sense of self as a teacher. As such, this can be seen as the essence of being an autonomous professional.

In the next section, I explore how teacher educators’ values and beliefs stand against the values operating within education and teacher education at the current time. I argue that as values have changed, much of what teacher educators have seen as fundamental, as experienced professionals and reflective academics, has been devalued. I explore how, in the prevailing discourses around performativity, shifts in the perception of professionalism and increasing managerialism have had an impact on teacher educators, threatening their sense of self and values.

2.4.1 The impact of performativity

Teacher educators who have formerly seen theory as central to what they do now have to adjust to other aspects of training taking prominence. The moves away from university-based ITT to schools as the main learning context and to a more practice-based technicist
way of training teachers reflects a devaluing of more theoretical perspectives. The impact of the standards agenda has also had an impact on the nature and content of what teacher educators working in HEIs have become required to teach. The emphasis on criticality and reflection traditionally associated with ITT in universities has been sacrificed in order to ensure that entrants are prepared for the workplace that they are going to enter.

As Ball notes, the ‘current epidemic of educational reform’, characterised by an emphasis on the market, managerialism and performativity: ‘...does not simply change what people, as educators, scholars and researchers do, it changes who they are’ (2003:215). While Ball’s work focuses on the impact of performativity on teachers as threatening their perception of themselves and their professional relationships with others, his comments are equally applicable to teacher educators. As noted above, the transformation of teachers into a new kind of professional within the management ‘panopticism’ of quality, excellence and entrepreneurial control is reflected in the jobs that teacher educators must do. This, in turn, can increase individualisation and destroy solidarities based upon a common professional identity.

The culture of performativity impacts on individual creativity, willingness to take risks, professional autonomy and personal agency as the focus shifts to standards, microanalysis of the technical aspects of teaching, ignoring inner life and imagination (Klein, 2008). While the linear approach has enabled teachers to think about their teaching, it does not lend itself to asking questions, or using imagination to visualise change and other possibilities. These latter elements: critical thinking, questioning the status quo, thinking deeply and creativity - are where the expertise of teacher educator has previously resided. This is what they did and who they were.

Robinson (2006:19) asserts that:

Increasing government control of teacher education, a significant emphasis upon school-based training, a much greater diversity of routes into the profession, a mandatory national curriculum for trainee teachers and assessment against prescriptive standards and outcomes, have all contributed to the climate of uncertainty, anxiety, hostility and ideological polarisation, particularly in relation to higher education institutions which have long had the responsibility for training teachers.
Within the agenda of accountability and performativity, ideas of professional service relate more to a customer service model and to giving the customer what he or she wants, rather than to the value of professional judgement of needs. Given the constraints discussed above, there is limited scope for autonomy (Ball, 2003:226). The current emphasis on what is desired by the consumer, as opposed to what might be judged necessary for the development of the learner, has diminished the autonomous judgement and identity of the professional educator. Jones (2007) argues that uncertainties regarding roles and autonomy have resulted in the professional identity of the academic being: ‘in a state of flux’. She reports on academics’ ambivalence about whether their job is to entertain or challenge their students: ‘being entertaining’ may rate highly in the student surveys that are an integral part of the culture of consumerism and accountability, but does not strike to the heart of their earlier educational values.

Against the background of inspections and surveys, Cribb and Ball (2010) call for educators to audit their practice, not just in terms of the readily measurable, but also in terms of the underlying ethics of their role as professionals. Obligations that educators have to ensure the short-term success of their students need to be set against how fully prepared these students are to engage in critical reflection and deeper thinking. Thus Hammersley-Fletcher (2015:198) calls for those involved in teaching to recognise the extent to which educational values are constrained by neo-liberal market agendas, and advocates that we continually question and re-evaluate what is happening within education. Similarly, Cochran-Smith (2005:225) highlights the role of values in teacher education:

> Education and teacher education are social institutions that pose moral, ethical, social, philosophical and ideological questions....Questions of value cannot be settled simply by assembling good evidence... the values and beliefs of the interpreter influence the purpose for which evidence is used.

**2.4.2 The autonomous professional?**

Biesta (2013a) asserts that teacher education should be about developing the capacity of students to be able to exercise professional judgement. For Furlong et al (2000), being a professional means having to make judgements on behalf of clients *as they see them* (their italics). This is radically different from adhering to the directives of the government of the
day or to the apparent desires of a student population, expressed as results of surveys. This is about one’s expertise and experience being valued and about professional autonomy.

Hence, autonomy is integral to being a professional. Hoyle and John (1995:46, cited in Furlong et al, 2000:4) suggest that professionals need autonomy because they work in complex and unpredictable situations. Sanguinetti (2000) defines professionalism as relating to ethics, collegiality, social responsibility and good practice: qualities that contrast sharply with performativity’s concern with value for money, accountability, international competitiveness and the market discipline. Linet (2009) notes that professionalism relies on individual initiative and agency, whereas performativity seems to rely on demands from the centre, outside the self. Thus, there is a real tension between professionalism and performativity.

The tension underlies recent changes in teacher education. Furlong et al (2000:1) contend that contemporary governments have sought to change teachers by changing the system of initial teacher training and that: ‘... one significant way of influencing the skills, knowledge and values of teachers - in other words, their professionalism - is to change the form and content of their initial teacher training.’ They assert that: ‘...initial teacher education has increasingly become a major site for political debate and struggle over recent years’ (ibid) and that professional autonomy has been lost in consequence.

Role change and the attendant loss of autonomy impacts on the personal as well as the professional. Ball recognises that there are: ‘Emotional costs to the “values schizophrenia” that is experienced by individual teachers where commitment, judgement and authenticity are sacrificed for impression and performance’ (2003:221). This condition is similarly applicable to those working in higher education: Linet (2009) provides an example in terms of the impact of student survey feedback on lecturers, which can extend beyond their perceptions of themselves as disinterested professionals to the affective domain and as personal. The culture of the workplace becomes a pervasive influence on the self that extends beyond the actual job.
2.4.3 ‘Playing the game’?

Work holds a central place in the development of one’s identity. Dejours and Delanty (2010) use the phrase ‘irreplaceable mediator’ to indicate the place of work in constructing one’s sense of self-fulfilment that has powerful links with one’s identity and social status. Hence, role changes in the work place have an impact. For Morley, the regime of quality assessment and accountability has had a profound impact in terms of reconstructing not only academic conditions of work but also identities, such that the academic habitus has been challenged (2003). Ball (2003) cautions that game-playing, becoming the kind of ‘other’ teacher, required to perform in inspections and the like, can create costs to the self, setting up personal, ontological dilemmas. In this final section I consider the fundamental impact of the kind of role change that is underpinned by a change in values: to what extent are academics able to ‘play the game’ without being overwhelmed by it?

The managerialism associated with the current culture of education has created tensions in the workplace that are exacerbated by ambiguity. Ball contends that changes in the nature of the State, associated with the devolvement of authority and the provision of flexibility, as identified by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 1995:29), are about the establishment of new forms of control. He argues that: ‘…it is a mis-recognition to see these reform processes as simply a strategy of de-regulation. They are processes of re-regulation’ (author’s italics) (2003: 217).

Ball asserts that the moves to align with the performative culture are insidious but powerful and that these have a direct impact on those involved in education. Teachers are: ‘...encouraged to think about themselves as individuals who calculate about themselves, “add value” to themselves, improve their productivity, strive for excellence and live an existence of calculation...as “neo-liberal professionals”...value has come to replace values’ (2003:217).

In the university context, the introduction of the RAE and the subsequent REF have had similarly insidious consequences. Morley (2003) recognises the impact of the discourses of power in the context of the research framework, and the symbolic use of scores. She claims that these can have material and affective consequences that cohere to make a workforce
more governable through compliance, even though individuals may recognise that they are complying with an agenda that is different to their own values and against their better judgements. Bourdieu (1984) purports that, though competition exists in academia, there is also an order of succession, in which power is implicated. He describes the process whereby senior figures in academia maintain their dominance by putting in restrictions so that those less powerful have to wait to achieve their goals. The neophytes cannot compete on the same level but must comply with these restrictions. In order to succeed eventually, they must have the competitive disposition to play this game and must invest in it. In a survey of seventy-one academics engaged in research into higher education, Leathwood and Read (2013) reported that their respondents described themselves as ‘playing the game.’ Their participants identified the stresses engendered by trying to meet all the targets and requirements of their working situation, and the pressures applied to ensure compliance via performance management and, in some cases, actual threats to their contracts. However, simultaneously, they described the satisfaction and pleasure that they got from their research, and how it had enabled them to sustain their own academic identity. This has resonance with El-Sawad, Arnold and Cohen’s (2004) work on ‘Double think’ whereby individuals are able to represent two contrasting viewpoints simultaneously, without registering any incongruity.

The deep connection between work and identity means that workers not only comply outwardly, but also start to think in ways consistent with the discourse, using its language and values. Thus, Fullan (2001) argues that compliance can lead to changes in belief. Wallace and Pocklington (2002) assert that this can begin with a slow, insidious process, involving getting individuals to make the changes perceived as ‘easier’ first. This initial compliance may then lead to later commitment. Thus, those who feel that they are mediating a situation by the pragmatic approach of ‘only doing what is asked of them’ whilst retaining independence of thought, may be just as much mediated by this strategy of apparent resistance.
2.5 My initial research questions: experiencing changing roles and values

The changes that teacher educators have experienced in their workplaces have had an extensive impact on how they enact their roles. McNamara et al (2017:25) argue that:

The fragmentation and increasing marketisation of the field has meant that these HEI-based teacher educators, as an occupational group, have faced significant job losses, derogation of their traditional expertise, and new work patterns and changes to professional knowledge bases and identities.

The changes to teacher educators’ working environment and practice have also had implications for how they see themselves as professionals, and the extent to which they feel valued in what they do and whom they are. Brown and Fisher (2016); Murray, Czerniawski and Kidd (in press) (cited in McNamara et al 2017:25) argue that teacher educators and their work have become changed and increasingly under-valued across the teacher education system.

Henkel (2005) notes that one’s identity as an academic is bound up with both one’s own discipline and one’s own institution. There is a sense in which we can come to see ourselves as a: ‘...distinctive and bounded sector of society, the normative power of which has been sustained in part by a nexus of myths, socialisation processes and regulative practices,’ (Henkel, 2005:158). Thus, it is not only a question of how individual teacher educators see themselves, but of how they see themselves collectively within their context and their institution.

McNamara et al (2017) claim that this is an area under-researched and that little is known about the shifting roles and responsibilities of the teacher educator workforce. This study hopes to contribute to this knowledge.

Hence, my initial research questions are as follows:

How do teacher educators experience change in their roles as teacher educators?

How do teacher educators experience and respond to the demand for a shift into a more standard academic profile?
3 Methodology

In this chapter, I first outline my theoretical framework, and offer a rationale for my choice of Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain’s (1998) theory of figured worlds. I then explain the methodological implications of the theory and the use of narrative enquiry as a method. Next, I explain how the basic theoretical concepts are operationalised in this study, and how the research focus became re-framed as a result. Finally, I describe my research design and sample, and discuss the ethical implications and dilemmas of my study.

3.1 Theoretical framework

3.1.1 Setting the scene

As I showed in the previous chapter, the changes that teacher educators are experiencing and the challenges that these create for them are not just about practice. They are about a change in values that goes to the heart of professional identity. The literature demonstrates that teacher educators in higher education are subject to a range of powerful system-wide discourses that position them in particular ways through the managerialism, accountability and marketisation that are emblematic of the general neo-liberal agenda as well as more localised discourses concerning university management in a competitive market. My focus in this study is on exploring how a group of people, individually and collectively, engage in the activity of being teacher educators at a time when much is changing. This has led me to explore how the prevailing discourses around teacher education and the university as an institution have affected not only their daily roles and practice, but also their professional identities.

I was also interested in how the changes related to their values and beliefs about education, particularly teacher education. I wanted to know how my participants responded to the various demands from within and beyond their institution and what choices they believed that they had in how they responded. Hence, I was concerned to view their accounts through a theoretical lens that enabled me to explore my participants’ response to discursive positioning and to identify what opportunities for professional and personal agency were available to them. Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain’s (1998) theory of
Figured Worlds focuses on identity and agency, and the positioning of individuals within local contexts, or figured worlds. It postulates that, within certain parameters, we do have some choice, agency and the capacity to resist the positions that we are offered.

3.1.2 Figured Worlds

Whereas Ball (2003) writes about the individual teacher with little reference to the details of individual local environments, Figured Worlds sees the individual as an actor in a social context. Holland et al’s (1998) theory focuses on the development of identity and agency rooted within such social contexts, and the social relations between individuals. They assert that the: ‘...development of identities and agency are specific to practices and activities situated in historically contingent, socially enacted, culturally constructed worlds’ (1998:7). They describe figured worlds thus:

Figured worlds take shape within and grant shape to the co-production of activities, discourses, performances and artefacts. A figured world is peopled by figures, characters, and types who carry out its tasks and who also have styles of interacting within, distinguishable perspectives on, and orientations towards it. (5)

Holland et al bring together elements from Vygotsky, Bourdieu and Bakhtin in order to describe the development of identity and agency within culturally and discursively constrained contexts. Drawing on Vygotsky’s work on play and imagination, they argue that, in the specific contexts or environments in which we all live our lives, we collectively imagine or figure our worlds, leading to a shared understanding of these worlds and how they work. These worlds are peopled by a series of characters of lesser or greater significance and there is a shared culture in which certain objects or acts are seen as having particular, commonly agreed meanings. Thus a ‘figured world’ is a:

...socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others. (52)

Holland et al remind us that: ‘...for Foucault knowledge cannot be divorced from position’ (1998: 57). Drawing on Bourdieu’s work on power and position, they note that, in addition to the identities generated in a figured world, individuals are positioned in relation to others. Thus, positional worlds sit alongside figured worlds and power is integral to
positional worlds. Bourdieu claims that whenever humans interact there are power hierarchies at play (Holland et al, 1998:128). He refers to the hierarchies as ‘fields of power’ (Bourdieu, 1984:41) in which social positions are defined against one another. The source of the power can relate to the symbolic, cultural or economic capital that individuals hold, the possession of sufficient capital enabling domination of other positions. Power can also relate to ‘habitus’, the dispositions, tastes and ways of thinking, associated with a culture of like-minded people. Bourdieu asserts that habitus enables the reproduction of social structures (1977). Hence, some will have the power to impose: ‘their vision of the divisions of the social world and their positions within it’ (Bourdieu 1985:732, cited in Holland et al: 158). Each person’s niche or role relates to others as they operate in a world of position and power. Nonetheless, Holland et al maintain that the discursive nature of positioning is not a determining one. However constrained things might appear, there is space for self-direction. Whilst they acknowledge that individuals are socialised into particular cultures, with underlying values and belief systems, they argue that individuals also have choices about how they respond to the demands and expectations of discursive positioning. They can improvise their behaviour, attitudes and actions accordingly. Holland et al contend that:

Agency lies in the improvisations that people create in response to particular situations...They opportunistically use whatever is at hand to affect their position in the cultural games in the experience of which they have formed these sets of dispositions. (279)

They draw upon Vygotsky’s conceptualisation of artefacts as tools of liberation from the control of environmental stimuli: they are central to agency. For Vygotsky, the potential for humans to expand their horizons arises from the use of cultural tools (in Holland et al, 1998: 64). Hence, figured worlds rely upon artefacts employed by people in their performances. Vygotsky recognised the ability of humans to use mediating devices, including language, to modify their own mental environment and so direct their own actions and behaviour. This language, however, is developed and sustained in conjunction with others. The bedrock of socio-constructivist theory is that human development is socially situated and knowledge is constructed through interacting with others. Holland and Valsiner (1988:251) assert that:
For Vygotsky, words constitute the prototypical mediating device. Language is a collective and historical creation that one learns in the course of interacting with one’s fellows and eventually incorporates as a primary tool for organising cognition and affect.

Vygotsky emphasised the potential of words as tools, as ‘bootstraps’ by which one could pull oneself up to another form of behaviour, enabling self-control (in Holland et al, 1998:177). However, Holland et al also acknowledge the place that culture can hold in determining our responses. They see culturally and socially constructed discourses as the living tools of the self. Therefore, the self is always embedded in social practice: ‘Identities become important outcomes of participating in communities of practice...identities are formed in the process of participating in activities organised by figured worlds.’(57) Thus, our stories and collective remembrance can serve as cultural artefacts to mediate thoughts and feeling.

What counts in the identities of figured worlds, is the cultural relations, the rules that govern the movements of the game (Holland et al, 1998). We acquire positional dispositions and identities as we come to recognise the signs or semiotic mediators of status within our world, learning what we can do and cannot do in a given situation. Yet, Holland et al maintain that positional identities are not without disruptions. The same semiotic mediators that serve to reproduce structures of privilege, position and identity, may also work as a potential for liberation from the social environment. We can offer resistance. The world can be figured differently. Bourdieu would have it that the improvisations that are a character of all social behaviour make a difference to the habitus of the next generation (1984a:76). However, Bakhtin asserts that the changes can make a difference in the present (in Holland et al, 1998: 45). Bakhtin sees these places, where cultural forms are re-arranged, as spaces of authoring (in Holland et al, 1998: 173).

Nonetheless, our behaviour can be automatic and unthinking. Holland et al explain how our identity becomes habituated as we go about our daily lives, immersing ourselves in the social activities that position us within a figured world. In what Vygotsky terms ‘fossilisation’, we may no longer be aware of the original mediating devices that modified our behaviour. However, Holland et al assert that this is not an irreversible process.
'Ruptures of the taken-for-granted can remove these aspects of positional identities from automatic performance and recognition to commentary and re-cognitions,' (141). Recognition disorients individuals. They see themselves from other perspectives, becoming self-aware and, in consequence are able to see themselves and their context afresh. Black and Williams (2013:11, cited in Braathe and Solomon, 2015:152) assert that:

The adult can, in the right circumstances, come to see these selves and contradictions, and through semiotic action (i.e. discourses with others and self-reflection), come to have some degree of control over them.

This offers possibilities of making changes in their worlds and themselves. Bourdieu (1984: 182) describes the: ‘...critical moment, when, breaking with the ordinary experience as simple re-enactment of a past or a future inscribed in the past, all things become possible...’ whilst Holland et al (1998:270) use co-development as a metaphor to indicate how changes in perception can lead to opportunities to act differently, to make changes in one’s environment.

There is incongruity in that, in order to change, we draw upon our existing cultural resources, though, in reality, we have little else. Holland et al (1998:170) ally this with Levi-Strauss’s (1966) ‘bricoleur’, who builds with pre-existing materials. We find new ways to use these, to improvise and, in doing so, gain a degree of autonomy and control. Bakhtin (in Holland et al, 1998:45) contends that people can reassert a point of control through the rearrangement of cultural forms as evocations of position.

Holland et al’s theory of agency leads them to present a picture of behaviour as constantly improvised: ‘As individuals improvise their responses to social and cultural openings offered to them, identities are worked and reworked within this landscape,’ (270). Identity is, therefore, always fluid and we are always in the process of ‘becoming’, never a fixed entity. They argue that:

Within specific social situations, persons or groups, caught in tensions between past history and the present discourses that impinge upon them, identities are a hard-won standpoint.(4).
However, these identities offer possibilities of mediating agency. We make the choices that allow a modicum of self-direction. Holland et al draw again on Bourdieu’s (1977) account of social practice, and his argument that we can only ever improvise because we cannot have a complete set of rules for every possible social situation. They claim that culture is not an abstract system but, rather, one in which we constantly improvise within ever changing social and material conditions. In doing this, they argue, we draw upon our own ‘history-in-person’. This relates both to past experiences and how we dealt with these, using the available cultural resources, and to our current position. In combination, these can provide us with the tools we have to afford ourselves some agency. Thus, the: ‘...development of identities and agency are specific to practices and activities situated in historically contingent, socially enacted, culturally constructed worlds’ (1998:7). Such ‘identities in practice’ are the subject of narratives of self, and Holland et al employ Bakhtin’s idea of ‘self-authoring’ to capture this.

3.1.3 Dealing with insider issues: Bakhtin’s contribution

Reflecting on the significance of these narratives, Holland et al (1998) also build on Bakhtin’s dialogism, in which every level of expression is part of an ongoing network of statements and responses. Bakhtin claims that we do not use words in their neutral ‘dictionary’ form. He contends that we each draw upon an ‘authoritative discourse’ that comes from our past which goes unquestioned and retains a higher status (Bakhtin 1981). However, as we engage in the various figured worlds in which we operate, as individuals and professionals, we also begin to take our utterances from other utterances, usually kindred to ours in genre (Bakhtin, 1986: 87). We ‘borrow’ these utterances and make them our own (Bakhtin, 1986:95). Heteroglossia, the appropriation of others’ words and expressions, incorporates many voices, sometimes in conflict with each other. However, this has value for us. Braathe and Solomon (2015:154) assert that: ‘In expropriating or appropriating the words of others, we necessarily enact agency.’

Moreover, our utterances are constructed for ‘others’, in the expectation that they will respond (Bakhtin, 1986:94). For Bakhtin, dialogism draws attention to the twin elements of addressivity and answerability in language: ‘...sentient beings always exist in a state of
being addressed and in the process of answering,’ (in Holland et al, 1998:169). Bakhtin claims that, as humans, in a particular place and time, we must respond to the stimuli around us, responding in a way that takes the form of making meaning (Holquist, 2002). We interpret and respond to what is said to us in the light of that interpretation. ‘Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive...’ (Bakhtin, 1986:68). Bakhtin sees our agency as emerging from rejection or appropriation of available genres. Drawing upon Holland et al, Braathe and Solomon (2015:155) suggest that:

We author the self through the appropriation of genres in an ongoing process of addressivity. It is here that agency lies, in the choices that we make in a never-ending story of self.

In all that we do, Bakhtin (1981) contends that we have to answer the claims of the world. We have to respond to the external discourses. We cannot ignore them, though we can answer in our own way. Moreover, we address others. We communicate and share our thoughts, ideas, views, insights and experiences with others and, in doing so, contribute to a collective community. However, if changes occur within such a community, then this has an impact on the individuals within it:

Dialogism makes it clear that what we call identities remain dependent upon social relations and material conditions. If these relations and material conditions change, they must be “answered” and old “answers” about who one is may be undone. (Braathe & Solomon, 2015:155).

Bakhtin uses the term ‘voices’ to refer to the social identification and valuation of cultural resources and artefacts that tell our social category, our relational position and our group affiliations. Meanwhile, Vygotsky purports that social speech becomes the premier building block of thought and feeling (in Holland et al, 1998:175). Referring to Vygotsky’s belief that society plays a key role in the development of personality, Holland and Valsiner (1988) remind us of his view that human development is characterised by the transformation of the interpersonal into the intrapersonal. We hear others first and then internalise and use what we hear. The forms of speaking and interacting inhabit us as ‘inner’ speech and ‘inner’ action. These are the mediating devices of our thinking and feeling. Individuals re-arrange these voices as inner speech that can serve ideological standpoints (Holland et al, 1998).
Inner speech requires us to be in constant dialogue with ourselves. Bakhtin asserts that we address and answer ourselves as ‘the other’. Moreover, Holquist contends that: ‘In dialogism, the very capacity to have consciousness is based on otherness’ (author’s italics) (2002:18). ‘We also represent ourselves to ourselves from the vantage points of others’ (Holland et al, 1998:172). If, to be perceptible by others, we cast ourselves in terms of the other, then we do that by seeing ourselves from the outside (Holland et al, 1998; Bourdieu, 1984a). This has implications for what we do and how we justify this, as we tell our stories: ‘People tell others who they are, but even more important, they tell themselves and then try to act as though they are who they say they are.’ (Holland et al, 1998:3). Hence, Bakhtin’s account of self-authoring incorporates the ‘I-for-myself’, the ‘I-for-others’ and the ‘other-in-myself’ (in Holland et al, 1998:178). Bakhtin (1981:295 cited in Braathe and Solomon 2015: 155) affirms that: ‘…consciousness must actively orient itself amidst heteroglossia,’… it must choose a language.’ Agency comes about through this choice.

Thus, within the process of self-authoring, Holland et al maintain that the first step towards an authorial stance: ‘...is the creation of internally persuasive discourses- external or authoritative speech that has been married to one’s own’ (1998:182). Bakhtin asserts that this internally persuasive discourse: ‘...is affirmed through assimilation, tightly interwoven with one’s “own word”,’ (1981:345, cited in Holland et al:182). The discourse does not remain static and un-altered. It becomes our own as it is developed and applied to new material and new conditions in a process of improvisation. Furthermore:

…it enters into an intense interaction, a struggle with other internally persuasive discourses. Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony amongst various points of view…and values. (author’s italics) (Bakhtin, 1981:345-346).

Addressing and answering ourselves according to the tenets of the various discourses that have an impact upon us, we have to orchestrate the various voices in such a way that we can function within the worlds in which we operate. Bakhtin contrasts: ‘... the neophyte, given over to the voice of authority, with the person of greater experience who begins to rearrange, reword, rephrase, re-orchestrate different voices and, by this process, develops her own authorial stance’ ( cited in Holland et al, 1998:183). Holland et al (1998) view
Bakhtin’s space of authoring as analogous to Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development and one that is:

...extremely important in an explication of identities as aspects of history-in-person. The “voices” that make up the space of authoring are to an “author” as Vygotsky’s instructing adults are to the neophyte, they do not so much compel rote action as extend, through their support, the competences, the answerability of persons to operate in a diverse yet powerful social universe. (Holland et al, 1998:272)

This study relates to how a small group of teacher educators were able to function within a changing world. Their accounts of what happened and how they felt about this are central to my thesis. Hence, I chose to adopt narrative inquiry as my principal research methodology and I used narrative interviews in order to collect my data. In the next section, I reflect upon my methodology and how this will enable me to apply my theoretical framework.

3.2 Narrative inquiry as a research methodology

A Figured Worlds lens enables us to focus on how people live in a world that is co-constructed with others, on how they negotiate the significance and value of particular acts and artefacts, and on their narratives of positioning and agency within particular social and cultural contexts. It also highlights the concept of a fluid and ongoing identity that occurs in the space of self-authoring. This focus on self-authoring lends itself to narrative inquiry as a methodology.

As a major proponent of narrative inquiry, Clandinin (2006) maintains that this allows us to slow down lives, and study lived experience. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) claim that narrative inquiry must reflect all three of Dewey’s (1938) criteria of experience. These relate to the personal and social (interaction), past, present and future (continuity) and the place (situation). Clandinin (2006) argues that the narrative inquirer focuses on these elements not just as retrospective representations of experience but in the lived immediacy of that experience. Narrative is seen as central to human experience:

...humans are story telling organisms, who, individually and collectively, lead storied lives ... people by nature lead storied lives and tell stories of these lives, whereas narrative researchers describe such lives, collect and tell stories of them... (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990:2).
Moreover, Beauchamp and Thomas (2009:178) assert that narrative inquiry holds a particular place in understanding teachers working in changing contexts:

The power of teacher narrative to express identity within ‘a changing professional knowledge landscape’ is articulated in important work on teachers’ stories, considered indicative of their growing understanding of their professional identities within changing contexts.

Although one of the critiques of narrative is that it stresses the individual over the social context, Connelly and Clandinin assert that narrative can be concerned with groups and the formation of a community. Narrative inquiry extends beyond the experience of an individual, since: ‘... it is also an exploration of the social, cultural and institutional narratives within which the individual’s experiences are constituted, shaped, expressed and enacted...’ (1990:42). Connelly and Clandinin, referring to the work of Robinson and Hawpe (1986), assert that: ‘...stories stand between the general and particular...’ They articulate the value of the story thus: ‘Stories function as arguments in which we learn something essentially human by understanding a life or community as lived,’ (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990:8)

Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach and Zilber (1998) assert that the very nature of the narrative approach is interpretive and that starting from an interpretive viewpoint, narrative materials, like reality itself, can be read, understood and analysed in extremely diverse ways. They cite Runyan’s (1984) suggested criteria for evaluating narrative research, which ask whether the narrative:

- incorporates insight into a person, perhaps suggesting previously unseen connections,
- provides a feel for the person,
- helps us to understand the subjective world of the person, deepening empathy, effectively portraying the social and historical world that the person is living in and illuminating the causes (and meanings) of relevant events, experiences and conditions (Lieblich et al, 1998:172).
3.3 Operationalising the theory and revisiting the research questions

Applying Holland et al’s theoretical framework enables us to see academia as a figured world, peopled by specific characters. The world of the teacher educator occupies a particular niche within the larger one of academia. Undoubtedly, the discourses of the university have a significant impact on teacher educators, in terms of the performativity agenda, for example with reference to student retention rates and outcomes. However, there are other external discourses at play and other voices to orchestrate in terms of the requirements of Ofsted and the need to work in partnership with schools. There are overlaps between the world of the school, the world of the wider university and that of the teacher educators in higher education with some porous boundaries. However, there are also some distinct differences between these worlds. Unlike traditional lecturers, teacher educators rarely come from a research background. Menter et al (2010) recognise that the great majority of teacher educators have had a significant professional teaching career within the school or college sector before gaining employment in higher education. Hence, their background is based on professional experience in classrooms and it is this that informs and shapes their histories-in-person.

In the figured world of a school, certain values dominate, but these are replaced in a move into higher education. Positions also change: teacher educators’ capital as experienced teachers is only part of what is required. In schools, as in any world, there are explicit structures and positions, as well as what Bourdieu terms a ‘doxa’, the unwritten rules of a field. However, these are different in higher education. Some teacher educators might find themselves in a new position as managers within local departmental structure. While the importance placed on results as hard data may be recognisable, their role in the university doxa operates within structures that they might have little insight into or ownership of.

In the particular context in which this study took place, additional changes were significant and these are the focus of the study. The discourses about initial teacher education had shifted from the: ‘teacher as a rounded and full professional whose practical, craft knowledge is informed and supplemented by a wide range of research and knowledge,’ to: ‘teachers as executive technicians, informed by research evidence of “what works”,'
deployed to create effective classroom practice,’ (McNamara et al 2017:47). Alongside this, the increased emphasis on the role of schools in ITT had also led to an apprenticeship model where prospective teachers learnt by watching experienced practitioners. The focus on academic elements and the development of criticality had been supplanted by a technical rationalist view of teaching and an emphasis on trainees reaching the required ‘Standards’, overseen by Ofsted. The metrics of grading and outcomes, compounded by hard data from surveys, resonant with a performative culture, were associated with increased managerial intervention. Just as the impact of these changes were being felt, demands arose for teacher educators to engage fully with the RKE agenda. The personal studies into areas of interests previously enjoyed were replaced with mandates that all teacher educators be educated up to doctoral level and their research be directed towards the REF. The professional development work that teacher educators had done with schools and teachers, under the umbrella of a partnership model, was now to be seen as an opportunity to generate an income for the institution. The voices of authority became increasingly prominent and this had an influence on internally persuasive discourses.

My participants were self-authoring, working on their identity in practice within their changing context and in relation to others. They each brought their history-in-person to their role, either as former classroom teachers or as experienced teacher educators. Against the demands and expectations of a changing culture, the teacher educators were drawing upon both their own past histories and roles and the tools from what they perceived was on offer to them, in their working environment. I wanted to see how they used these things. I wanted to find out if and how they improvised and, if they did, what impact that this had on what Holland et al refer to as identity in practice. I wanted to see if, given the changes in their context, the teacher educators would accept, resist or negotiate the constraints that they encountered in order to create new figured worlds that encompassed new discourses and acts.

Figured worlds, and, in particular its use of Bakhtin, enables a focus on the ways in which teacher educators self-author, working on their identity in practice within their changing context and in relation to others. As such, it draws attention to the issue of potential
resistance to change, and the ways in which participants might exercise agency and improvisation. Holland et al (1998) note that identity is not fixed but fluid. Looking at how individuals had responded to the changes in their professional context was never going to arrive at a fixed point, where one could state: ‘this was how things were or are’, which creates tensions for the researcher trying to draw conclusions. What I could reflect upon was the evidence that people were working and reworking their identities through what they told me. They were encountering new challenges, and having to find different ways to approach these. ‘Figured worlds’ provides a lens for exploring how they shape their performances of self, using the resources afforded to them. Given the changes in their context, how did they accept, resist or negotiate the constraints that they encountered?

These theoretical and methodological considerations led to a re-working of the original focus of my enquiry, with a stronger focus on agency, positionality and identity in practice. The final research questions were as follows:

1. How do teacher educators describe their repositioning in higher education?
2. To what extent do they describe themselves as having professional agency?
3. How do teacher educators self-author in the changing context of higher education?

3.3.1 Data analysis

Horsburgh (2003) suggests researchers offer clear explication of the theoretical, methodological and analytical decisions made throughout the study. In this section, issues related to the use of qualitative research and an interpretive paradigm are considered.

Lieblich et al (1998) remind us that qualitative research deals with discourse and its interpretation. Qualitative research may lack the scientific rigour and credibility associated with traditionally accepted quantitative methods. Horsburgh (2003), however, contends that the quantitative conceptualisations of reliability and validity are unsuitable for evaluation of qualitative research. Instead, evaluation should relate to the plausibility and trustworthiness of the researcher’s account and the potential relevance to current and future theory and practice. Carter and Little (2007) define good quality qualitative research
as research that attends to epistemology, methodology and method, with internal consistency between them. Meanwhile, Hammersley (1992, cited in Lieblich, 1998) claims that validity and relevance are key when considering qualitative research.

For Horsburgh, researcher reflexivity is central to qualitative research. She asserts that:

Qualitative research usually operates from the premise that total detachment on the part of the researcher is unobtainable and that the individual who carries out research comprises an integral component of the entire process and product, as opposed to being a disembodied bystander... (2003:308).

The researcher is an integral part of the world that she studies. Her actions and decisions will influence the meaning and context of the experience under investigation. Hence, researcher subjectivity is a real risk when using an interpretive paradigm. Taking Bakhtin as a theoretical influence also underlines the stance that the researcher/interviewer has a crucial part to play in the construction of data. Bakhtin’s theory has particular methodological implications, related to power and the representation of others’ voices (Braathe & Solomon, 2015). Interviews involve a dialogue in which participants are addressing and answering each other. Interviewers and interviewees may draw on other voices as they do so, some more powerful than others. In conducting the interviews, as in any social setting, there is the possibility that this became a co-constructed narrative, rather than an individual one; the interviewer is ever-present and is both audience and co-participant in the process. Moreover, it is the interviewer who will re-tell the story, who will report on and represent the dialogue.

Given this, it is virtually impossible to eliminate all bias in what one chooses to pay attention to and to report on, in any context. All researchers can do is to aim to be aware of this potential: of the fact that their judgements are never value free but are informed by the researcher’s own ideology and values.

Moreover, people are not objects of study in a laboratory. Participants may become self–conscious, leading to them behaving in different ways. The term ‘Hawthorne Effect’ has been used to account for the impact of observer on the observed. One such impact relates
to ‘demand effect’ whereby people may be motivated to please the observer (Steele-
Johnson, Beauregard, Hoover & Schmidt, 2000).

Furthermore, Braathe and Solomon (2015:152) suggest that an interview is more than a
source of data:

...close analysis of the dialogic space between interviewee and interviewer reveals an
ongoing joint narrative in which interlocutors draw on past, present and future
meanings to express and enact agency in an account of choice.

Stories can be told in different ways. Connelly and Clandinin (1999) note that people live
their stories as an ongoing experiential text and tell their stories as they reflect upon life
and themselves to others. Hence, there is a process of editing going on when individuals
self-author and re-tell their stories. Any analysis needs to consider both the content and
how stories are told. Some things are foregrounded whilst others are omitted. The words
they chose to use have significance. As demonstrated above, there may be echoes of other
voices that individuals have appropriated for themselves. Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach and
Zilber (1998: 166) urge that researchers must: ‘...not only tune into the phenomenological
world of the narrator, they must constantly question, doubt and look for gaps, contradic-
tions, silences and the unsaid.’

Applying figured worlds in analysis of interview data means paying attention to issues of
voice, resistance and refiguring, and noticing figures, positionality, and cultural artefacts
and resources. Following Holland et al, my analysis aimed to gain insight into how the
participants orchestrated the competing discourses, or ‘voices’ which addressed them,
noticing which they chose to ignore, which they chose to ‘hear’ and, as a consequence,
answered in their self-authoring. This approach to analysis also requires sensitivity to the
structure of narrative, and what participants chose to tell me, and how what they
emphasised and how it was incorporated into their stories, in terms of devices such as
metaphor and individual word choice. It also means noticing what some participants
choose not to address in comparison with others.

In Bakhtin’s vision of self-fashioning (called the space of authoring by Holland et al), there
is no simple, unproblematic way in which the collective is internalised. There is always the
conflictual, continuing dialogic of an inner speech, where active identities are ever forming (Holland et al, 1998) thus we have to construct ourselves for ourselves. This can be seen as both a personal and a professional responsibility. In asking my participants to talk about their own experiences and the changes that they have experienced, I aimed to gain an insight into how they constructed themselves as professional practitioners in the contemporary context and what they perceived to be the influential factors, both internal and external, in this process.

Bakhtin’s contribution also underlines the need to consider how the researcher is positioned, and how they position participants in terms of addressivity and answerability. Whom was I addressing when interviewing a participant? Was I addressing them as a colleague, a friend or a research participant and did this vary between the participants? Whom were they addressing when they answered me: were they answering me as a colleague, a friend or a researcher and did this vary between participants? How do I aim to ensure that I was being a researcher? Incorporating the concept of addressivity into the analysis itself means that these issues need to be recognised (Braathe & Solomon, 2015:152).

3.4 Research design and methods

The selection of participants is of central importance to any qualitative study. Quantitative studies require particular sampling techniques but mine was a qualitative study. Horsburgh (2003:311) cites Popay, Rogers and Williams (1998:346) who state that in qualitative work: ‘….randomness and representativeness are of less concern than relevance…’ She suggests that researcher consider whether the sample will: ‘…produce the type of knowledge necessary to understand the structure and processes within which the individuals or situations are located.’ This, Horsburgh maintains, means that the selection of participants should be made based on their ability to provide relevant data. She argues that situational, rather than demographic representativeness is what is sought (2003). I chose to study a small group of teacher educators, whom I judged would provide me with ‘relevant data’ but I also aimed for my sample to be as representative of those currently working in the institution as possible. Thus, I chose both male and female participants, and aimed to
ensure that I got a mix of very experienced academics, mid-career people and those new to higher education. I also wanted to draw upon a mix of subject specialists, to include sciences, the arts, the humanities and to include primary and secondary colleagues. I invited twelve teacher educators in total to participate and eleven accepted. The twelfth gave no reason for refusing. Though each person I interviewed gave me much to think about, I elected to utilise the narratives of seven of the original eleven: one long serving teacher educator, three teacher educators who had worked for the institution for five years or more and three who were in their first year in this role. Of the others, two had left the institution by the time of the second interview. The remaining two participants had much of interest to say. However, I felt that their stories had a slightly different perspective which would have taken my away from my intended focus. One was working part-time and had much to say about the impact of this. The other participant was a lecturer rather than a senior lecturer and a significant amount of her interview related to the implications of being at a different grade to her colleagues.
List of participants (names have been changed to protect confidentiality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of years working as a teacher educator in the institution at the time of the first interview</th>
<th>Former roles prior to going into HE</th>
<th>Current role and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Unit leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>24 years</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Unit leader &amp; Cohort leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>New at time of first interviews</td>
<td>PhD student (former teacher)</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Unit leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>New at time of first interviews</td>
<td>Class teacher (senior management)</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Unit leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Local authority consultant</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Unit leader &amp; Cohort leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>New at time of first interviews</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Unit leader &amp; Cohort leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As a pilot, I interviewed two academics who worked in higher education but were not involved in initial teacher education about their perceptions of the changes in the institution.
As a methodology, narrative inquiry must use stories in some way, but there are no prescribed ways in which researchers may go about gathering or analysing data; the choice is up to the individual (Lichtman, 2011). Connelly and Clandinin (1999) record that interviews are a commonly used data collection tool within narrative inquiry. I conducted two separate interviews, with twelve months between interview one and interview two. This, I hoped, would allow me to collect data on how the participants had experienced the changes that they had anticipated in interview one. I wanted to give them an opportunity to reflect on the impact the changes had had on their roles, the strategies that they had used to cope with the changes and how they thought that the changes had influenced them, as professionals and individuals. During the second interview round, I was also able to ask about future anticipated changes. Of the eleven participants, nine were involved in the second round of interviews, two having left the institution.

I chose to use semi-structured, face-to-face interviews to collect my data in order to give my participants the opportunity to talk about their experiences relatively freely, whilst giving both researcher and participants an entry point and some parameters, ensuring that the participants address the key issues that had been identified for discussion. Interviews are widely used as a research method. Burton, Brundett and Jones (2014) describe the interview as a natural method for those involved in education to use. They claim that such people, by virtue of their nature and training, are skilled at interacting and communicating with others. However, interviews are not without pitfalls. There are practical issues related to finding time and a private space to conduct interviews. At a deeper level, there is a difference in perceived power between interviewer and interviewee. There is a risk of bias in terms of how the interviewer poses the actual questions, how much leeway s/he allows the respondent in moving away from the original focus and how much the interviewer can drive the actual interview forwards, based on the responses given. My use of Bakhtin’s theory highlighted further the dynamics of the exchange between interviewer and interviewee: Braathe and Solomon contend that:

...Bakhtin’s dialogism draws attention to the storying of the self as a process of addressing and answering in which the interview can be seen as part of an ongoing
narrative in which interlocutors draw on past, present and future meanings in a heteroglossic, multivoiced space of communication’ Braathe and Solomon (2015:153).

Bearing these issues in mind during analysis provides a way of addressing them in a way which includes dynamics as part of our understanding rather than trying to ignore or minimise them.

I chose to record my interviews on an audiotape. The use of any such technology can be a barrier to free communication but this does allow the interviewer to review what was said during the process, including any pauses, as often as required. Relying on merely recalling what one has heard can lead to significant omissions and to bias. However, what an audiotape does not convey is the silent cues, the body language and facial expressions of the participants in the interview and these can be significant. Transcribing recorded interviews takes time and there is always the potential for slippage. However, once an accurate record has been obtained, it is in the selection of relevant elements for reporting and analysis that there is the greatest potential for subjectivity and bias. The theoretical lens chosen demands that certain elements will come into focus more sharply than others will, and other cues may be ignored or downplayed.

I conducted my interviews in a small, soundproofed room within the institution, at a time of the participant’s choosing. I suggested that we spend a maximum of thirty minutes on the interview, with some flexibility, as I was mindful of the fact that the participants were all busy people with many demands on their time. Some respondents said more than others did. One issue that did occur was that, once the tape had been switched off, some continued to talk, often raising important points. Due to the nature of the consent form and ethical considerations, I was unable to use this data without specific permission of the participant. The reasons why they chose to talk ‘off tape’ were never clear. It may have been that they chose to say something that they did not want recorded. Alternatively, they may have thought about something they had not yet said, once they felt that the pressure of being interviewed had been lifted.
3.4.1 Ethical implications

As a researcher, I was required to gain ethical clearance before I could begin the process of data collection. Ethical clearance for this work was sought and approved by my institution, Manchester Metropolitan University. I needed to think through the implications of my project carefully, identifying any potential risks and viable ways of minimising these before asking my participants to sign consent forms.

Issues of confidentiality are always important but were paramount in a context in which people were being asked to reflect critically on changes taking place in their working environment. Participants were assured that they would not be identifiable in the final write up. Names were changed and pseudonyms were used but I also needed to consider how much detail I could write about their roles, subject discipline and area in order to avoid identifying them to other readers. I also needed to ensure privacy for the actual interviews.

I needed to be aware of the fact that, as colleagues, they may have felt under undue pressure to be involved and of the fact that this involvement had the potential to change the nature of our working relationships thereafter. In line with accepted practice, participants were assured of their right to withdraw totally from the study and have any data that had already been collected destroyed at the time of their request, though the experience, itself, was always going to leave a permanent mark. In each case, I explained the focus of my study as relating to exploring how individuals experienced and perceived that they managed a number of changes within their working environment. Each participant was offered the opportunity to listen to the taped interview and to read the resultant transcript, in order to reassure themselves that this was an accurate representation. Once I had produced the final version of my thesis and the tapes and transcripts were no longer required, I undertook to destroy this evidence. During the process of the study, all transcripts and the tape recorder were kept under lock and key when not actually being worked on.

However, consideration of ethics needed to go beyond this. Connelly and Clandinin claim that negotiating an entry is commonly seen as an ethical matter framed in terms of principles that establish responsibilities for both researchers and practitioners (1999). They
caution that abiding by these principles alone does not guarantee a fruitful study, because the use of narrative inquiry constitutes a collective relationship and a unity between researcher and participants and this creates extra responsibilities for the researcher. Clandinin (2006:52) argues that: ‘...we must do more than fill out required forms for institutional research ethics boards...for those engaged in narrative inquiry, we need to imagine ethics as being about negotiation, respect, mutuality and openness to multiple voices.’ My participants were self-authoring, within their changing context and in relation to others. When talking to me, in the process of the interviews, I also needed to consider how they were addressing me, as a researcher and me, as a colleague, and how this was relevant to Bakhtin’s notions of answerability.

Moreover, I needed to consider whom I am addressing and answering within my thesis. Am I writing this for myself, or for my reader or my participants? What position do I assume and how do I position the participants? Given that engaging in research should have some value in terms of adding to a body of knowledge and that this should be shared with, and be of use to, others, I also needed to consider a wider audience. The circumstances of my study were very particular to my context. However, in exploring how individuals manage change, I hope that there will be wider applications. As several of my participants noted, the changes that they were encountering were not unique.

3.4.2 Dilemmas
Carrying out this research posed a number of dilemmas, ethical, moral and methodological, that I needed to address. Scott and Usher (2011) note that the place and significance of the philosophical issues may only become apparent, once the research has been conducted and is subsequently being critiqued. They assert, though, that these issues should be at the forefront when planning a study. In my own case, though I had aimed to consider the philosophical issues when planning my study, I found that carrying out the research led to a much deeper and more profound awareness. Lieblich et al (1998:171) claim that: ‘...sharing reflexivity and open disclosure of the researcher’s dilemmas guarantee a fair, mature and critical dialogue between scholars and their readers...’ They argue that this dialogue gives the field of narrative research its energy and drives it forward. It is in this
light, that I disclose my dilemmas, in the hope that this will lead to such a dialogue with my readers.

I used narrative inquiry as a methodology. Clandinin (2006:47) notes that narrative inquirers are always going to be part of the process of narrative inquiry. She argues that:

... they cannot bracket themselves out of the inquiry, but rather need to find ways to inquire into participants’ experiences, their own experiences as well as the co-constructed experiences developed through the relational inquiry process. They too live in the landscape and are complicit in the world they study.

Hence, I was always going to be a part of what I was researching by the very act of engaging with my participants during the interviews in which they told their stories. Indeed, Braathe and Solomon (2015:152) contend that the interview, itself: ‘...can become part of a joint narrative co-constructed by the researcher and the interviewee in which both draw upon and orchestrate voices.’

The likelihood of this was increased because I was researching a world I also participate in, in which I have the same basic role as my participants. Bernstein (1974) cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007:25) notes that the way one interprets a situation, when negotiating meanings, is a product of the circumstances in which one is placed. Though not a researcher participant, directly involved in a collective project, I was interpreting situations described by others within a context in which I was simultaneously working. I was affected by all the changes that were the focus of my interview questions.

The potential for subjectivity contaminating how I interpreted what others had said and meant was rife. I could so easily deviate from what they had said and misrepresent their perceptions. Bernstein records that in, such circumstances one must consider the power one has to impose one’s own definitions of situations upon one’s participants. Power is always implicated in any relationship, including the one between researcher and participants. Being a colleague in the workplace may have eliminated some of the power imbalances at play when, for example, a teacher carries out research with her or his own pupils, but this was a different relationship in which, in the way that I chose to collect, analyse and report on my data, I did hold the power.
There were a number of other issues to consider. My participants knew me as a colleague and I needed to avoid any attempts they made to draw upon this, when I conducted my interviews and asked questions as a researcher. There was a tendency for them to say ‘you’ll know what I mean/ you know what it’s like…’ which was, in many ways, true but sharing experiences which may have been based on assumptions was not an appropriate way to conduct a piece of qualitative research. On my first trial interview, I found that what had been supposed to be a semi-structured interview was more like an informal conversation between professionals. In places, I said far too much, in terms of sheer volume and in the phrasing of questions, using powerful words, for example: ‘So, do you feel that there is any tension between the elements of your role…?’ In steering and commenting on what they had said, to affirm or to point out other factors I was, in effect, positioning myself within their stories. After this shaky start, I quickly realised that I had to say that, for the purposes of the study, they needed to tell me what it was like for them, that I did not know what it was like. This meant that I could gain insights into what they perceived about their context. However, trying to listen to their stories as an outsider did feel somewhat false at times and the fact that I was attempting to do this may have had an impact on what they chose to say and how they chose to say this.

As colleagues, they were addressing me, not an impartial researcher, however much I wanted to position myself thus. They wanted to help me, perhaps leading to them giving me what they thought that I wanted to hear. For example, given that we had a longstanding professional relationship, and that she was instrumental in me making career choices, Angela may have been implicitly advising me, within the context of the interview. She may have done this unconsciously or deliberately. It is also possible that I considered that she might have been offering me advice, purely because of this relationship. On a less directly personal note, the interviews could have been seen to provide space for apparent mutual grievances to be aired and shared (as ‘corridor talk’) thus serving other functions for participants.

Alongside the fact that these were my colleagues, some of the participants had become friends as happens when people work together over time. As friends, I was conscious that
they may have wanted to try to help by being as supportive as possible, behaving in a different way than they would have, had I been an independent researcher.

Taking part in an interview situation also creates a kind of intimacy and it was possible that my participants may have disclosed more than they had intended to, when talking to me. They may subsequently have regretted this. Though they were welcome, at any stage, to ask for the data to be deleted and their words not used, the reality was that things had been said. I was going to have to work with these people in the future, so there was also the possibility that the research project may compromise future working relationships.

Moreover, because I was part of their world, I had to avoid any tendency I had to make assumptions. Just because I had my own perceptions of the situation, these may not have aligned in any way, with the perceptions of others. It was important that I try to avoid any bias or any tendency to 'fill in the gaps' when talking to my participants and when analysing my data. However, I was conscious, when interviewing the new teacher educators, that I was mentally reliving my own earlier experiences of being a new teacher educator, drawing upon my own history-in-person. Moreover, as someone who is in the later stages of her working life, there was a tendency for me to empathise with those in a similar position and this, too, had to be resisted.

Subjectivity is always a concern for the researcher, particularly in qualitative research. Such subjectivity needs to be considered from the start, when conducting interviews, where what one asks and how one asks this will have an impact on the answers one receives. Further filtering with the associated potential for bias can occur when one is considering the data, selecting and analysing elements and writing up findings. When I began to write up my data analysis, I found that at first I was trying to tell the stories in my words rather than theirs. In choosing the extracts, there would inevitably be a subjective element. I was looking for specific things and responding to these. There was a risk that, in doing so, I may have missed something of importance. Employing figured worlds as a lens perhaps goes some way to alleviating this issue, in terms of providing a set of interconnected ideas as a basis for analysis.
Furthermore, having told me their stories, in all good faith, I had concerns over the fact that I only focused on certain elements of these, effectively censoring them in order to make my points and I worried about the ethics of this, in how accurately I was representing them when they had been so open and honest with me. Inevitably, when writing to a prescribed word length, there have to be decisions about what to include and what to omit.

Moreover, in order to explore the themes that I wished to within my data section, I chose to focus on only seven of the participants when writing my analysis. This left me with the feeling that this was exploitative of the others and dishonest, in some way, particularly as one participant had actually said, ‘It’s about time someone asked us about this’. For her, there had been a moral imperative that their story should be told. However, though this did cause me great concern, I questioned whether the direct retelling of stories as told could ever be the role of the researcher.

One of my participants had seen this process as almost cathartic. Ultimately, all narratives can serve this role. The teller tries to make sense of their experience and chooses how they will represent this and, because this is always in hindsight, there will be an element of selection in what is told, just as much as there will be in what is heard. Horsburgh (2003:310) cites Morse (1999:163) who argues that qualitative research must: ‘...add something more to the participants’ words for it to be considered as a research contribution...’ An editing process is integral to research. Moreover, Clandinin (2006) contends that there will always be two texts in narrative inquiry. One will be the field text, which may include items such as observational notes or transcripts of interviews whilst the other is the research text itself, how the researcher interprets what they have been told. She asserts that there are always tensions as narrative inquirers move from working with participants to representing their inquiries for a wider audience.

Furthermore, it was not simply in terms of how I represented my participants that I had moral concerns. I was undertaking a study around how individuals responded to change and some of the changes that the teacher educators were experiencing stemmed from their management. It was likely that the participants would be critical of management in the course of the interviews. As an employee of the same managers, I had concerns that,
in some way, I was letting these people down. My participants often referred to the ‘ones at the top’, apparently faceless but, behind all the systems, there were always real people, some of whom I worked with and knew well and this led to a conflict in loyalties with which an independent researcher would not have had to contend.

Some of this conflict related to financial issues. Management were paying my salary, funding my doctorate and giving me dedicated time to pursue my studies. However, this was the same managers who had decided that all staff be research active. Despite requirements that research should ultimately be ‘REF-able’ the institution had granted researchers the freedom to decide on their own focus for enquiry. I had to balance a sense of fairness to them against a desire to be loyal to my participants who had given me their time, been very honest, open and trusting in the interviews, sometimes talking about things that were painful for them. There was a moral obligation to tell the stories well, but this must not be conflicted with loyalty to one’s colleagues (especially given the emphasis that it transpired that they all put on collegiality). In selecting my research questions, I had taken a moral stance, in part influenced by my own experiences and by my own views and beliefs. This was not neutral ground, yet, as a researcher, I needed to try to maintain a non-judgemental distance in my commentary.

Finally, and of increasing significance as I came to the ‘write up’ phase of my thesis, was the fact that, as a participant in this world, I know how the story continued. It was hard to avoid the impact of having this knowledge on what I focused on as key elements in the story, what I chose to pay attention to and what I dismissed.
4 Analysis one: Looking back on changes in teacher education - an old timer’s story

The teacher educators in my study had all encountered changes in their working context. The next three chapters incorporate extracts from the stories that my participants told. I demonstrate how their narratives reflect the changes in how they figured their world. I examine how they describe their initial positions and how they talk about the impact of changes in their working environment on their perceptions of these positions.

Though they were answering me within the interviews in which they told me their stories, they were simultaneously addressing and answering themselves as they thought about how to answer the questions, editing what they told me. My analysis considers what agency they believed they had and how they resourced this. Some of the changes had been accommodated whilst others had been resisted. There was agency and improvisation but there were also significant losses.

My literature review noted the impact of neoliberal discourses on education, evidenced by an emphasis on marketisation, quality assurance and managerialism. Increasing government intervention had led to a more technical view of teacher training, in which the role of schools was emphasised. A focus on the practical, ensuring that trainees were classroom ready, had displaced the elements that have conventionally reflected the university’s unique role in teacher education: subject knowledge, research and critical reflection. Moreover, the remit of the role of a teacher educator had widened to incorporate research and knowledge exchange. All of these elements feature to a greater or lesser degree in the narratives that follow and were often central to how the teacher educators felt that they were positioned.

This chapter relates to Angela, an ‘old-timer’ who had worked for the same institution for twenty-four years. In the following chapter, the stories are of teacher educators who had been at the university for several years and had experienced, proportionately, more change than Angela had, as the pace of change had increased. These changes had an impact on
how the participants figured their world and their place in it. In some cases, they resisted the discourses and were able to enact some agency with varying degrees of success.

The final chapter in this section features the stories of three new teacher educators. Coming into teacher education in the institution, they had expectations about their new roles. However, they each found themselves having to adjust to situations that they had not anticipated and which left them struggling to locate themselves within their new context, with relatively few cultural tools to draw upon.

In this chapter, I focus on a retrospective story of change in teacher education: as an old-timer, Angela’s story focused on the contrast between old and new as the context for loss of agency. Angela was the longest serving teacher educator amongst the participants, having worked for the same HE institution for twenty-four years at the time of the first interview. This meant that she had experienced a range of models and curricula for teacher education and a number of changes within and beyond the institution. She had fulfilled a number of roles during her time there, including those related to teaching, management and leadership. She told me that she had also worked hard to develop and sustain partnerships with schools, as these had gradually evolved, and become increasingly significant. In this sense, her story focused on changes in the role of the university teacher educator over time, and in her particular institution. Much of it was told in terms of ‘then and now’, with an emphasis on how much better things used to be.

Angela positioned herself as an old-timer in a new world; a world that she did not like much. She contrasted her early days as a teacher educator as a time when there were opportunities to make choices and to be creative, with her current working context which she saw as constrained by a business model focused on accountability, costings and benefits. She charted a process of changing cultures, structures and practices that challenged her own values and beliefs. Her story reveals her struggle to come to terms with the changes in values: ‘The reduction was happening already, it’s to do with a value set, an ethos and the approach to all sorts of decision making was very different to when I first started.’
Changing values (or loss of them) featured in Angela’s discussions of the student surveys and quality assurance procedures which were now so prevalent, and clearly linked for her to the impact of managerialism and consumerism. This had led her to feel that she was being ‘coerced’ to do things in ways she disagreed with and which she did not feel to be morally or pedagogically sound. She said that:

...if you are supporting a consumer base then that is why you are doing things, but you are not doing it for any ethical, moral or pedagogical grounds. There is no validity. It is simply because that is what the consumer says they want.

Moreover, she talked about an intrapersonal conflict:

I think that there is a sense of conflict in who I am, as a professional, and I know I veer from withdrawing to feeling that I have to pitch in, and that is not me. I have never been like that but, you know, there has been an attrition here, and I feel done in.

Despite this, she appeared to have retained some agency within this context of struggle. She made choices, she resisted and she improvised, using the tools still afforded her, drawing, as Holland et al (1998: 18) put it, upon ‘...the sediment of past experiences from which one improvises, using the cultural resources available’:

I probably have in some ways, one of the things that I can do, is that I can draw on a whole range of experiences, similar sorts of things, even though they had a different name, over a number of cycles. This means I can actually help, sometimes, with a little bit of “Can we just have a bit of a think about that?” so sometimes, well always; I can contribute to some of the discussions. I can say, “I think it is quite interesting because there is something similar that we looked at, in the past.”

Nevertheless, Angela’s story is one of no longer belonging in the world of teacher education. Despite some improvisation and resistance, she sums up her situation as ‘I don’t fit where we are heading.’ Her ‘old-timer looking back’ story highlights many issues in the changing roles of teacher educators, providing an overall ‘master-narrative’ against which those of other participants are put into relief, as the following chapters show.

4.1 Agency: ‘Nothing seems to be put out there any more’

Angela’s story began with her feelings about the freedoms associated with gaining her new post some years ago: ‘I was beside myself with joy. I remember driving along, going to a school and thinking, “yes; countryside, isn’t this fantastic”. ’ She talked about a culture of
open opportunities afforded to teacher educators, during her early years at the institution: ‘Things had been advertised and talked about within our big staff development meetings and you could apply….things weren’t hidden, everyone knew about them.’ She explained that the senior staff, managers and leaders, knew her and the kind of things that she was interested in and asked her, ‘Would you be interested in doing this?’ There were choices and time to develop new initiatives.

Angela’s narrative contrasted this agentic, collegiate past with more recent times, explicitly focusing on a loss of agency or autonomy: ‘…nothing seems to be put out there for people to be interested in. It is more “you are doing that” with no discussion.’ Now, the choices that she and her colleagues used to be offered had gone, replaced by tasks allocated by colleagues that were more senior. The power balance had shifted and there was designation without discussion:

Those sort of opportunities and challenges are not as transparent, accessible or open as they were…and sort of people are now steered into things that can sometimes be a surprise to them and there is a sense of coercion which did not exist.

Reflecting on this shift, she commented that: ‘…maybe I have become more realistic or more cynical, maybe I was naive before, but it does feel very different now.’ The world full of possibilities that she had figured originally, in which she was able to choose what she did within her role, had become more constrained, with fewer opportunities and choices, and, by implication, offering less individual agency.

Angela exemplified how things used to be by recalling the choices she was able to make, when working in schools with groups of students:

I was to go into a school with a group of six PGCE students…I used my own specialist expertise to model teaching in the afternoons. I chose what we would explore and I wanted to do something that was a bit different and a challenge.

She framed the loss of this autonomy against a neo-liberal agenda, associated with a business ethic rather than with the emphasis on doing what was of sound pedagogical value in the past. She believed that finance was now the priority for her management: ‘It
would be too expensive now; lots of things that we did then were expensive and would not be happening now, because they wouldn’t pay for it.’ ‘They’ held power and prevented her, and others, from doing things they saw as valuable. She saw a clear demarcation between those who now wielded the power and those who did not, including herself; very different from the former collegiate community she had described, willing to take risks, being creative and doing things differently. The ‘they’ was ambiguous. Whilst in some instances it was evident that she was referring to her own senior managers, elsewhere, she claimed that: ‘there was a message coming from senior colleagues that they did not have a choice, either…’, attributing the power to individuals higher up in her organisation, to people with whom she did not come into regular contact. This higher tier of management had not featured in her recollection of earlier times but had become increasingly significant.

Angela’s view of what management should be about was different. For her, management related to nurturing and caring for others, including her students. Her perception of a loss of agency was not only related to an emphasis on finance: she voiced her belief that: ‘…some of the changes have been in ethos.’ This led her to take a stand against some of the powerful, prevailing discourses.

4.2 Resistance: ‘We fought…’

Angela held several management roles including one of overseeing a whole year group of ITT students in all aspects of their studies, academic and vocational, as well as ensuring that each student received pastoral care. She had had held this responsibility for ten years: ‘a lot of the work I have done has been invested in the final year students.’ This was a very personal and individual investment but there had been a recent shift to shared leadership of a year group. She recalled how she and her colleagues had attempted to resist this change:

We fought to remain as solo cohort leaders and we fought to remain with our years, as we had become experts in that year, and had the confidence of the students that we knew what was required.
She often described her relationships with management in terms of having to fight to defend a viewpoint of practice. In her narrative, she positioned herself as actively engaged on one side of a struggle, representing a set of values which were under attack.

Despite the fight: ‘... it wasn’t going to go away.’ From being the ‘expert’, she now had to build up new relationships in a different context, changing the dynamic between tutor and students and her own role as a leader. Notwithstanding their reservations, she and her partner colleague had done their best to collaborate to make the new arrangement work: ‘We didn’t want to share the role but we were going to have to, so we embraced it.’ They developed a model that worked for them by a process of improvisation where they carved up their shared role in ways that played to their own strengths and interests: ‘...so she did the pastoral and I did the school based training.’

However, the following academic year, having already conceded this change and made it work, more changes were proposed: ‘We had continued it and we continued with it, because that was the concept of the model. When it came to it, we were asked not to continue that model’. They had been asked to break up what they had seen as an effective working partnership, replacing it with one where one of the pair remained attached to the same year of training whilst the other moved up with the actual cohort of students. They refused: ‘...because, having embraced the concept, how could you then change again? So the current year group have the same cohort leaders in the pairings this year.’ This time, they had resisted and won the right to maintain the status quo, which neither had wanted in the first place but both had invested in.

4.3 Dealing with changing values: ‘This will change the nature of collegiality’

Much of Angela’s story concerned an account of her values as a colleague and the way in which these values were embedded in her job. She highlighted how she sought to promote the professional development of her colleagues and issues of succession: ‘I had set it [this unit] up. I thought that it would be a good opportunity if someone wanted to have a feel of being a unit leader...I would be there to help.’
Angela explained that for her, teamwork was based on a notion of complementary, though different, strengths and interests in which they: ‘...balanced each other out.’ For Angela, teamwork and this balance of expertise and experience was an integral element in the world of the teacher educators and it was part of her own role to contribute to this.

Angela had storied herself, thus far, as someone who had been able to make potentially difficult situations work. She saw herself as able to support and protect others during times of change and create some stability, having negotiated changes herself, in the past.

However, she began to see that she could not ‘cushion others’ from the influences of what she perceived were changes in the values that underpinned leadership as these became aligned more closely with managerialism. She described her original role as the unit leader as being: ‘...very much a coordinating role, a facilitating role not a didactic role, so my job was to get people together, to keep facilitating the “so, what are we going to do then?”’ In contrast, when describing her most recent leadership role, she recounts how she made her own position and values abundantly clear when discussing the role with her own line manager:

I made no bones about it... this is a new role .... it had a sense of surveillance and scrutiny about it, which I do not find very helpful. I prefer to see this role as supporting the unit leaders in their challenging roles, which they do really well already. This [her role] is another layer and what these people do can be undermined.

Nevertheless, Angela describes herself as retaining some agency in these circumstances: whilst complying with what was required of her, she continued to enact her own values, where collegiate ethos and encouraging collaboration and sharing of ideas, expertise and workload were seen as important:

So we started off working together early. ... and I tried to put a positive spin on it...I tried to do practical things to support them, setting up registers and groups and things. Then I asked people to come together to complete their action plans, so that they could look at each other’s and use each other’s expertise.

Reflecting on the changes appeared to play a large part in Angela’s self-authoring as an old-timer retaining agency in difficult circumstances which she felt: ‘...will change the nature of
collegiality.’ Collegiality and its loss was a central element of her narrative alongside her own re-positioning.

In the new linear structure, she recounted how she was positioned differently by those above her; no longer someone to be consulted or involved in decision-making: ‘I keep getting things that I just have to pass on. I understand that this is part of a bigger shift… but I don’t think that this is a helpful.’

Reflecting further on the changes going on in her institution, she asserted that:

If you don’t understand the changes are what they are for and nobody has helped you to perhaps recognise opportunities or how it might work or how this change might fit into something bigger, then it’s a big expectation that people might contribute positively to it.

As well as working with and leading her colleagues, a significant part of Angela’s role had related to working in and with schools. For her, this was a key element of her role and world. There had been a continually evolving partnership between universities and schools, where each side contributed to the development of an ethos and shared the responsibilities for supporting and guiding students on their placements.

Angela recorded that she had: ‘…always had quite a strong interest in partnership’ and had worked to develop this:

So what happened was that I had a very strong cluster and some fabulous schools and mentors and some really fabulous things happening in these schools. I was confident that, if Ofsted came, at the drop of a hat, I could lead them to some fabulous practice because I had taken the time to build up relationships and there was some really good stuff. It took a long time and I knew my cluster really well...

Her theme of nurturing of collegiate relationships extended to this element of her role, and she presents this as another context in which change impacted on her position and professional agency: ‘…for some reason, which escapes everybody apart from the people that made the decision, I was moved.’ Describing this change as something that was done to her, she presents herself as passive in the process, and as experiencing a strong sense of loss of something that she had worked hard to build up:
...it was just the relationships that I had made, something that was difficult to replace because it takes a long time... The best way of developing these relationships is not by flying in and being talked to; it is by the work alongside the colleagues in schools.

The world where university and school, academics and teachers related to each other in a very particular way, via relationships built up and sustained over time had changed. Now, the academic role was about quality assurance, ‘flying in’ and checking that all was well and about positioning oneself as ‘other’, not involved in a dialogue but in more of a disciplinary role.

Angela’s story thus focused on how her role as tutor, leader and school partner had changed, and how she had not seen any of these changes as improvements. From her perspective, as an ‘old-timer’ much of value had been lost in this new world. Moreover, she was experiencing this loss as an individual, personally and professionally.

4.4 Loss: ‘I feel this huge disconnect’

Part of Angela’s feeling of loss came from practical arrangements rendering her unable to contribute to the discussions and meetings that had been important elements within her figured world. She no longer had all the most up to date knowledge. Things were moving so quickly and it was difficult for her to keep up without attending meetings. This had an impact. Having storied herself as someone at the heart of things, she now felt that she had become more distant, because of her teaching timetable. She explained that:

I can’t go to programme meetings. I have religiously gone to every management meeting, every programme meeting, every single one, even if there was nobody else there. I have been to every single one, until this year.

For Angela, not being able to attend the meetings was a significant loss. More than this, though, the impact of not being able to attend had left her with the feeling that something that she had previously set such store by no longer mattered and this was disturbing in itself:

I don’t know if I should say this, but it was always so important to me, but now, I just don’t care, which is a bit odd. It shows you that, if you are not part of these meetings, you become distanced from things.
Explaining that, for her, exam boards had signified a collegiate community and a positive evaluation of their work, she continued:

...it now fills me with great sadness because every tutor used to be at the exam boards, to celebrate their personal tutees success. It was a good way of everybody thinking about what we were doing; that we were doing a good job and to hear the external examiners’ reports.

Thus, Angela’s story focused on the loss of a sense of a community with her colleagues but also on the shifts within colleagues themselves: the new arrivals did not value the exam boards in the same way:

Some changes are due to the way that exam boards are run and some people do not realise that they could attend whilst others think: “well, we don’t need to do that” and some is due to changes in the ethos.

She saw that the roles and identities were different to how she had storied herself. Ultimately, she stories herself as a disconnected old timer:

...a feeling, as a person, a disconnect. Sometimes, inside myself, I know that I have colleagues who are hugely involved in what is going on and they are really bothered about changes and I am thinking, “Well, you know, it looks like a fait accompli to me”. So, I think that what I do now is to choose my battles, whereas, before, I would be fighting the fight, whatever. But now I think that I have been worn down and I think that, whatever I say, it is going to happen, so let them get on with it.

Nevertheless, Angela’s use of a battle metaphor suggests that she will still resist and that she feels she has some agency and that she is not totally resigned to the ‘fait accompli’. At the same time, though, her more passive resignation: ‘I have been worn down...so let them get on with it’ indicates a vacillation between the two voices; she is not quite ready to surrender, but is getting close to it.

It was not just in her own role and position that she recognised change and loss. She was critical of the changes to the curriculum that she perceived had been made in order to ensure that the course complied with a prescribed system, however inappropriate: ‘It’s a fudge to cram an organisation of a curriculum that was well conceived and well thought through into a box, a set of boxes that the university brought through.’
She had also seen a change in the students: ‘The students seem to be becoming more and more needy, less resilient, and our structures encourage this.’ She saw the students as increasingly passive recipients of a service, rather than active, autonomous, independent learners. Returning to the theme of values, she argued that, under these circumstances: ‘...education no longer “leads students out”; rather, they stay where they are, in terms of understanding.’ Angela saw this process as: ‘supporting a consumer base, not doing it for any ethical, moral or pedagogical grounds...simply because that is what the customer says they want it, then we give it them.’

Developing this theme further, she described how she had previously engaged with students to find out their views: ‘When I was a cohort leader, I did a lot to ensure that the student voice was properly represented’, emphasising that this was part of her role and indicative of her values. She contrasted this with the current focus on gaining hard data via surveys: ‘If you think about the ISS (Internal Student Surveys) and the NSS (National Student Surveys), what drives them is customer orientated’. In a competitive market, students were consumers and, by implication, tutors and the university were providers.

Moreover, she claimed that much of the data from such surveys was unsubstantiated and that it was:

...never mediated. There is no sense that we trust our colleagues with their experience, it’s all the student voice and what senior management say, there is no one in the middle of the two, no tutor voice anywhere...and I feel that this is pretty significant.

She perceived that the position of the teacher educator came under threat from both sides. Previously, she claimed that she felt that there would have been support for her, from management, had there been any dispute, but now: ‘I could not trust my senior colleagues to back me up’. The mutual trust in the professional experience one had and the assumption that management would be supportive had gone. She believed that her colleagues: ‘...voices are not heard, they are dismissed and that is very damaging.’ She continued: ‘...and the impact of that, for me, personally, is to withdraw.’
4.5  The bigger picture: ‘I don’t fit where we are heading’

Angela made explicit reference to the wider impact of neo-liberal discourses, acknowledging that what had been happening in her own institution was not unique. She saw a bigger picture, citing colleagues working in other institutions. She felt that what was happening:

...isn’t particular or pertinent to just this university, it’s all pervasive. It’s pervasive in many areas of public service because it’s a shift from being a service, which is altruistic, to being a business. They are different things and the priorities are different.

For Angela, this business model would require a complete re-figuring of the world of the teacher educator. She recorded that: ‘...this is not what this institution, as a teacher education institution, has been about’ but now she perceived that her own values and those that she saw as originally important to her institution had been compromised and so she did not: ‘... fit where we are heading.’ Trying to defend what she thought mattered against the changes in values had become hard to sustain. Moreover, the conflicts were also intrapersonal:

I think that there is a sense of conflict in who I am, as a professional, and I know I veer from withdrawing to feeling that I have to pitch in, and that is not me. I have never been like that but, you know, there has been an attrition here, and I feel done in.

However, though ‘done in’, Angela was not going to go quietly; she still had the capacity to resist.

4.6  Resistance, part two

By the time of the second interview, Angela had decided to take early retirement on health grounds. However, she was still busy planning: ‘...because I am leaving this year, in terms of money, this is not going to happen [knowledge exchange] so this is about my professional development...’ She went on to describe a project she had planned in conjunction with a primary school that was using some innovative practices. This involved her taking a group of students into the school. She recorded that:

I still haven’t had permission from the university but I have booked a coach and I will pay for that myself, if I have to, and we are going, because it will be a risk but it will be brilliant for the children and the students.
She was improvising, finding a way to make something that she thought important to happen, irrespective of the financial constraints of her context and, in doing so, was finding a way to address the requirement that all staff engage in KE activity. She was complying with the requirement to do this but resisting the notion that KE had to relate to income generation. In a strange way, this was an echo of her first experiences of working with students in a school in a creative way, so she had come full circle, but it also felt that she was making a final statement about what mattered to her.

Angela’s story was very much about being an insider in a changing world. In the next chapter, I focus specifically on this story of a changing world and changing values. I consider how the changes in values affected the way that the teacher educators talked about their positioning within this world and to what extent they expressed a sense of agency.
Analysis two: Working with changing values

I consider the narratives of three teacher educators in this chapter. They came from different departments, taught different subjects and held different levels of responsibility. All were well-established in the university although only one of them – Andy – came close to matching Angela’s old-timer status. Their narratives focus on changing values and the pressures that this put them under, but their accounts of how they have responded differ. Helen’s story is one of an impossible conflict in values between the university’s demands and those she experienced as shaping her own particular context as a teacher in the past. Her story is one of some resistance competing with a more powerful devaluation by the system. In contrast, Michael’s story is one of seeing that the extra possibility of becoming an academic offered new avenues. He aimed to re-invent himself, authoring himself as an academic in the making, embracing the new values. He self-authors as seeing new possibilities and exercising agency in his work. Andy’s story, on the other hand, focuses on how his attempts to engage in new elements of his role did not align with requirements; as a consequence, he decided to ‘opt out’, creating distance by storying himself as someone who had other possibilities to focus on.

Each of their stories reflects changes in positionality though there were differences in how they addressed this.

5.1 Helen’s story: Loss - ‘I used to love the teaching’

For Helen, the change in values and its impact was stark. Her story was of someone who was not able to compromise, who could not subscribe to the changes and whose own values were under attack. She self-authored as a very experienced and expert practitioner, but what she had come into higher education as a teacher educator for - her ‘recent and relevant experience’ - was no longer valued. Being a teacher was central to Helen’s storying of her identity and practice, but she felt that her teaching skills and attributes were decreasingly valued by her students, illustrated by what she saw as challenges to her position within the classroom. Consequently, she no longer enjoyed the teaching, and this was a major motif in her story. Bereft of the things that mattered to her, professionally and personally, Helen’s story was one of loss.
5.1.1 Disappointment: ‘This has made me feel quite cynical…’

Helen had entered higher education following a number of years as a senior teacher. More recently, she had been a local authority consultant, working with practising teachers. She had enjoyed this role:

I loved doing my advising role. I loved working with NQTs [Newly Qualified Teachers] and with experienced teachers. The teachers I was working with, in that local government job, were either subject leaders who were passionate about my subject or they were struggling and with children who needed something that their teacher could not provide; perhaps less passion for the subject, perhaps less knowledge...I don't know, less passion anyway.

She highlighted her ability to make a difference in those days and her enjoyment in seeing this happen:

The other group I worked with before [in schools] were struggling with the subject. I mean, they might have been an expert in other areas of the curriculum, but they weren't teaching my subject well and working alongside those people, I really enjoyed the coaching and mentoring aspect, one to one. I really enjoyed actually seeing somebody change, seeing practice change, seeing someone put something into practice- very small changes that made huge differences.

However, following cutbacks to the local authority service, she had had to find a new job. Reflecting back on her options then, she talks about her love of teaching and learning: ‘I could become a head or move into ITT. To be a head seemed like the opposite of everything that I loved and totally everything that I would find awful, like Listeria in the water tanks, needles in the playground and stuff that was nothing to do with teaching and learning.’

Helen’s account of her entry into teacher education highlighted the importance of teaching and learning in her career. She had believed that going into teacher education would enable her to pursue and share this passion with others: ‘...and I just thought well how better to influence children’s learning than through reaching the teachers before they even qualified, that was the thinking process...’ Of all the participants, she was the one who talked most about her own specific discipline and about the passion she felt for it. Enabling others to share in this world by acquiring the knowledge and skills to participate was central to her perception of her own role and her identity in practice as a teacher educator. Helen viewed ITT as a place where teacher educators were experts and were there to share this
expertise, subject and pedagogical knowledge with the students. Consequently, she saw herself as an expert wanting to model what she saw as good practice.

However, once in teacher education, she was not able to see how her students used what she had modelled and shared, and she missed being able to see things she had suggested actually put being into practice and making a difference. Despite this, Helen had enjoyed the teaching she did when she first moved into HE. However, latterly this had changed; she had become disappointed by her students’ lack of engagement, which she saw as a direct result of the introduction of the £9000 tuition fee – she described complaints prefaced with the phrase ‘I am paying £9000 a year for this’. Helen felt that the values related to her role in helping learners acquire knowledge and skills were undermined, but she described the situation as one where she was no longer prepared to fight:

I used to love teaching most of all but I don’t now because the students have changed. I think that the students have changed; their attitude has changed ... I think that they challenge the things that you say in a way that is non-productive and, sometimes, they don’t turn up for sessions and when they do turn up to sessions, they have their mobile phones on, so there is a battle. It’s a battle that I am increasingly reluctant to bother fighting.

This change was linked to what Helen described as a critical incident, rupturing her perceptions of the students and her relationships with them with implications for her identity. Becoming aware of some students’ use of social media to make personal and derogative comments about various tutors had made her ‘feel quite cynical.’ Thus she storied herself as having moved from someone actively engaged who had ‘passion’ and ‘loved her job’ to someone who was more of a cynical by-stander, with little capacity to affect change. Anticipating a forthcoming management restructure, she was clear: ‘I certainly don’t want to take on a load more teaching which is what will happen, if I lose those pastoral hours. I don’t enjoy the teaching anymore.’ The teaching was what she had initially come for, but the enjoyment and satisfaction that she had gained from this had been compromised.
5.1.2 Disempowerment: ‘I feel very insecure’

Power relationships and lack of power featured significantly within Helen’s narrative. Arguing that facts were being kept from her and others, she criticised the lack of explicit information and explanation about change within the institution, and in particular change to the teacher educators’ roles. She emphasised the uncertainty and insecurity associated with people not being able to see how they fitted into the overall picture. Helen talked about ‘speaking up’ about this situation despite her own insecurity, emphasising the lack of participation in decision-making about change:

We are due to undergo another complete rehashing of our roles ... and I did speak up at a meeting about the fact that people feel very insecure. I feel very insecure, being asked to look at a spreadsheet, which has numbers of bodies on it but no names, so I cannot see where I fit into that spreadsheet, so there is uncertainty and insecurity and changes without information without consultation, without discussion, without anything. Those are the things that make our role difficult.

Hierarchies of power and access to information compounded the problems, alongside lost opportunities to resist at each level:

There are some people who have a clear picture of who they want where, but they are not telling anybody that, yet. ... I think the catalyst for change is very high up in the university, at the top and going downwards. But, at each level, each strata, there is a point at which somebody on that level, that strata, could say, “No, we are not making these changes”, but it seems like, under the current situation, no-one, at whatever level, is prepared to do this.

This power dynamic had not always existed. She recalled times in the past where managers had successfully challenged some of what they had been asked to get others to do:

I think that when we had Mark, he stopped a lot of these things from trickling down. I also think that David, when he was one of the leaders, stopped a lot of things trickling down or went back and said, “No, we are not doing this”.

Although these former senior colleagues were able to mediate the effect of changes on behalf of their teams, this was something that the present incumbents were less likely to exercise, because now there was a different management style:

The demand for change is trickling down to the level immediately above me, in the hierarchy, and that level reacts in a knee-jerky sort of way, without consultation,
because that is now the management style and we all have to respond rapidly to change, perhaps not the best sort of change.

Helen herself had been required to take on various management roles. However, reflecting back on these, she went on to say that, though she thought that she did a good job and was a good leader, this did not seem to be appreciated by management. She believed that she and her colleagues were being encouraged to compete, rather than collaborate:

...there is another cohort leader who is considered to be the best, who is consistently held up as an example to the rest of us as someone who does things perfectly...and I have not got the time nor the energy nor the inclination to do what she does.

Her reluctance to engage in competition with colleagues also related to the value that she placed on her professional relationships in the workplace. For Helen, the support and guidance of her colleagues when she took on new roles had been a significant factor:

One hundred per cent of the support came from my colleagues. With regard to being a unit leader, Rachel [a former colleague] was probably the strongest in telling me what a unit leader had to do, and, also Sandra, [who shared a role with her]and I worked well together. With regard to being a cohort leader, other cohort leaders told me what to do, so it is colleagues who make it easy, because they had the experience of doing those exact roles already.

Helen set great store on being a member of a team. During her first interview, she talked of how recent changes in personnel had been: ‘...significant for our team. We have lost people for whom I had, and I am only talking about myself, for whom I had a very strong professional but personal bond with, who I miss and we have gained people who I can’t even relate to and I find that very difficult.’ In the second interview, there was a sense that this issue had been resolved for her: ‘In the last year, we have had a person take a lead on the subject team and that has been very good because it has drawn people together as a group, which we have been missing for a couple of years.’ This was someone she perceived as able to draw the team together, who valued the collegiate above the competitive.

In contrast to the support offered by her colleagues, she felt that the management had made things harder. Acknowledging the fact that she, personally, did not like change, she still questioned whether all the changes that she and her colleagues were experiencing
were necessary: ‘I can’t help but think that, if something is working well, and there is nothing actually wrong with it, then why does it need to be changed?’ She described changes as, at best, unnecessary and, at worst, counter-productive and imposed from outside, by those in power. Recognising the drivers for change and the mechanisms involved, she identified the place of consumerism and managerialism as significant factors in the changes and the cause of changes in what was valued in a teacher, teacher educator, colleague, manager and leader.

5.1.3 Resistance: ‘I have no intrinsic motivation to do any studying whatsoever’

Part of the changes related to the devaluing of teacher educator as teacher and expert focused on the increasing prominence of the need to contribute to RKE work within the institution. This particular issue was another feature of Helen’s story, engendering a resistance which she ultimately enacted by opting for early retirement.

Helen did not feel able to make the role change into becoming a traditional academic, resisting the associated pressure to enter into the research agenda. She asserted that her original decision to move into teacher education: ‘...did not have anything to do with moving into academia. In fact, really, what I should have said is that I wanted to do teacher training.’ For Helen, initially, the world that she had believed that she entered was linked to the original requirement that would be teacher educators had ‘recent and relevant experience’ of classroom practice. This was different to the emerging emphasis on undertaking further academic study and the subsequent pressures to publish. She resisted the notion of academia, saying that she was ‘too busy’, framing scholarly work as peripheral to what she perceived as her key role of being a teacher: ‘I have no intrinsic motivation to do any studying whatsoever.’

Yet, she then went on:

Hang on, going back to what I have just said, that’s not really true. I was interested in things like girls’ achievement, I am still interested in this, and I am interested in things like the place of classroom talk in my subject. I would have liked to do more of the lesson study that we had done in the local authority. I do still have interests but I can’t be bothered to do things like reading and writing.
Thus, despite her initial avowal that she had no intrinsic motivation to study, she described herself as someone who was curious, who had interests and was willing to try out ideas and to research her own practice. What she was refusing to engage with was what she perceived as the associated work involved in the credentialisation of study, the working towards a higher degree. She resisted the ‘reading and writing’ integral to becoming a part of the researcher community in which, influenced by the whole REF agenda, the need to publish was significant.

She thus described teaching as her priority, claiming that: ‘I would [get involved in academic study], if I had more time, if I wasn’t so busy in my job...’ She explained that this had resulted in her making some choices:

I have had a very sensible discussion with my line manager whereby I said that, as I will never finish my Masters there is no point in me starting it. Therefore, it has been decided that I won’t do any RKE but I will have to do a load more management stuff instead.

Thus while Helen describes herself as having agency in terms of speaking out to her manager, and as asserting the pointlessness of taking a Masters’ degree, she also positions herself as someone for whom things were ‘decided’ in terms of having to take on more management work, not something that she particularly enjoyed. Other aspects of her story suggest a loss of control in reference to ‘having the head space’ and to ‘...a sort of muddle-ness in my mind...’ and a need to ‘take time to get my head straight’ as she tried, but failed to position herself within what had proved to be a very different context to the one she had thought she had entered.

Helen made frequent reference to her age as a significant factor in terms of dealing with change: ‘Along with the fact that our working circumstances have changed, our students have changed but, along with that, I am now five years older than I was...’ She cited her age as pivotal in her response in terms of deciding to ‘put up with it’ rather than fight, because retirement was not far off: ‘I think that because I am the age that I am, I will just have to put up with it, with an increasing amount of whining, anything that happens with my role; I am not going to be working forever.’ However, ‘putting up with it’ had taken its toll: ‘I
think that, when I came here, I was lively and enthusiastic and positive. I am turning rapidly into a miserable, whinging, bad-tempered battle-axe.’ She laughed at this point, but the contrast in her choice of vocabulary to describe how she had been and what she had become was marked.

Helen thus storied herself as someone at the end of what had been largely a successful and productive career now having to make the best of the situation: ‘to put up with it because of the age that I am.’ Though she was prepared to ‘put up with’ the changes, the loss of a sense of self-efficacy and personal empowerment, for herself, she did express concern for her colleagues:

There must be quite a lot of people who are in their forties that are going to be feeling now, or feeling in the future, that I can’t tolerate this anymore and they will go and I anticipate a huge amount of movement because all the change; I think that there will be a lot of movement.

Helen saw some of the challenges and changes that she was facing as potentially problematic for her younger colleagues. Michael was one such.

5.2 Michael’s story: Self-transformation- ‘It is making me into the person that I was supposed to be’

In contrast to Helen’s story, and to her predictions, Michael’s story highlighted the potential which the new context afforded him. He described himself as working to construct a more radical, and more authentic, version of himself, tracing his transformation from a teacher into a teacher educator, and thereafter into an academic, something he was still working on. He recalled that when he first came into higher education he had feared that he was not ‘good enough’ to fulfil the requirements of his role. This sense of continuous striving to reach an ideal permeated much of his narrative, symbolised by studying for his doctorate which was ‘...making me into person I was supposed to be’. Though he did talk about the changes within and beyond his institution, much of what he said related to how his perception of his own role had changed over time and how, by being actively engaged in this project, he had changed. Throughout, he storied himself as
someone able to reflect and to be critical of what was happening within his working environment.

5.2.1 Management: ‘it has been a lot more managerial, a lot more fire-fighting actually’

One of the drivers for Michael going into higher education had been that his sphere of influence would be wider, working within ITT: ‘I felt that I could have more of an impact by training teachers than by being a teacher in the classroom. I mean I am training twelve teachers now and they will all be teaching in ways that I have taught them.’

Michael talked about his role as a teacher educator as fundamentally different from what he had done and been in schools, moving from imparting knowledge as a teacher to developing students’ awareness and criticality. He saw his role as developing critical thinkers: ‘My role as a teacher educator is to get the students to be critical about what is the best approach.’ However, like Helen, this led to clashes in values related to students’ expectations as consumers. For him, criticality was a key value whereas his students saw their training as the acquisition of the required pedagogical knowledge and skills. Michael feared that his students did not appreciate why he chose not to tell them the very things they believed that they needed:

 Sometimes the trainees that I am working with get quite frustrated when I say, “Well, you could do it this way or you could do it this way, but we are never going to tell you how to teach algebra.”

Nevertheless, unlike Helen, Michael had come to feel confident in his role. He remembered ‘… in my third year, thinking, “Yes, I feel different now, I feel more confident now …”’ However, there were other challenges to overcome, related to his management roles, rather than to teaching.

Michael had little choice, initially, about the management roles he had to take on. Moreover, he felt that he had not been given a clear picture of what was involved: ‘I felt I had, somehow, pulled the short straw because I was told there was not much to do and, in actual fact, there is a massive amount of work involved…’ This amount of work had the potential to take time and effort away from the teaching and thinking that he wanted to
do. Michael described a situation of having little support from senior staff and just being left to get on with it. He went on to explain that this led him to be anxious about being positioned as an expert: ‘...sometimes, it feels like I am the expert that people ask, that I have the knowledge and I don’t have time to research it. Sometimes, when I need that time, I just don’t have it...’

Michael talked about how constraining he found his administrative role, explaining how this took up so much time that it got in the way of doing what he had intended to do each day:

There has been a shift in the last year. I’ve been given some more roles, management roles and responsibilities for placements and assessments. So, for that, the management, you get management hours; some of them are reasonable but others are just not realistic, you need a lot more time, than what the allocated hours are.

This had led to a sense that he had not accomplished much and to a sense of dissatisfaction with the role that he had been given. Moreover, much of what he had to do was reactive rather than proactive. He frequently used the metaphor of firefighting, having to respond to issues as they arose, with some urgency:

I have spent a lot of time and I feel like I am not achieving that much, doing a lot of work to get something done and I don’t find it as rewarding as I did ... In the last year in particular, it has been a lot more managerial, a lot more fire-fighting, actually. I don’t like the phrase “fire-fighting” but that’s what it’s like; like an issue in a school that a teacher might be struggling with or they don’t know the procedures so I have to go in there and sort it out.

5.2.2 Changes and pressures: ‘There has been a big political shift...’

Other issues also caused tensions which Michael saw as directly related to policy and politics. He reflected on the pressure to award good grades on placements when, in reality, some students needed more time to develop, before they could legitimately be classed as ‘good’, though they had this potential:

We are driven, these days, by Ofsted grades ... We need to get all teacher trainees graded as “good”, because we are under pressure for them to achieve this outcome. But we may be creating some artificially “good” teachers when really they should be
satisfactory and we have all these measures go put in place to make them good and, by the end of the placement they should be good...

In Michael’s authoring of himself as a critical teacher educator, this created a quandary: ‘...really, in our heart of hearts, do we believe that they are good, given everything that we have put in place to make them good?’ As with Helen, he was aware of a threat to his values as a teacher educator; his comment that ‘you have be comfortable with what you are doing’ prefaces his concerns about turning out ‘good teachers’:

I believe that they will be good teachers. They just need more time to develop but I also think that there has been a lot of pressure within schools. The pressure that we are dealing with because of Ofsted is even more intense in schools. There is even more pressure and the notion that what we define, what a school defines, or what Ofsted define as “good teaching” might not be the same thing. I think some tensions between that need to be addressed...

He went on: ‘So is there a sense that some of these good teachers are just jumping through a hoop but, fundamentally, they are not going to be good teachers once they get out there, at least to start with.’

Reflecting on the initial recruitment process in which he was also involved, Michael talked about other tensions in terms of trying to meet recruitment targets whilst also trying to ensure that applicants were of sufficient calibre to make them likely to secure the requisite good or outstanding grades in the future. He saw this as a moral dilemma in the context of his beliefs about creating reflective practitioners against a more mechanical ‘production line’ for would be teachers:

It is a moral ethical dilemma and there are issues and there are pressures. ... Sometimes ... we have had to take teachers that we would not have taken, had we had more to choose from, picking up some that we are not sure of. So, we have got to say: “should we go even lower ... to be sure that they’re all outstanding or do we take risks, where we are not sure”. There is always that dilemma of what to do, and there are lot of pressures within that.

Alongside these personal, professional dilemmas, Michael expressed wider concerns about the apparent movement of teacher education into schools and away from the university, something that he saw as a ‘big political shift’. This, he believed, had resulted in uncertainty
as to what the university’s role and the role of the teacher educator within the organisation should be:

... [we are ] feeling more pressured in our time and we are being told what to do ... the schools have control and they select how the teachers are trained, so you get a much more narrow minded teacher at the end of it, because everything that they do is based on one perspective.

Michael contrasted this approach to teacher education with the university one, again appealing to his values as an educator: ‘The massive advantage of a university programme, as opposed to a school-based teacher training programme is that we open minds rather than close them down.’ However, he noted the changes in values and shifts in power as market forces had become the driver; financial constraints were emblematic of the situation: ‘[there is ] more of a focus on money generating ... I feel that there is a lot of pressure to generate money, to bring in numbers...’

5.2.3 Becoming an academic: ‘I used to see things as black and white’
Alongside these pressures within teacher education itself, Michael identified explicit pressures on the teacher educators to gain further academic qualifications which made them feel uncomfortable:

There was a massive push, two or three years ago for everyone working here to have a doctorate and they were not going to employ anyone who did not have a doctorate...I think that they have relaxed this now... but it made you feel like you were inadequate without one.... I had just done my Masters and I wanted to do my doctorate very much but I wasn’t sure that I was ready to do it. To be honest, it was our [manager] who was quite a bit of an instigator to quite a lot of people doing it. She pushed and sometimes made us feel that little bit uncomfortable...

Although his story emphasises that doing the doctorate had been more about compliance and meeting institutional aims rather than individual personal and professional development, Michael puts a positive spin on his own case: ‘... I was really pleased that I had gone and done it...’ Indeed, he describes it as affirming, changing him at a deeper level: ‘I am glad that I am doing my Ed Doc now, because it is making me into the person that I am supposed to be.’ Enlarging on what this might mean, Michael says that doing his Ed Doc had given him: ‘a little more information about stuff I am supposed to know.’
knowledge had given him more confidence in himself and in his identity as a teacher educator working in higher education. It seems to be in this sense that, when his doctorate is finished: ‘I won’t be this false person, anymore.’ There was a sense that the doctorate and the values it represented would somehow complete him.

Nevertheless, Michael continued to author himself as a radical thinker, open to different ideas. He described how he had changed since he came into HE and how this had been a positive experience for him:

I really think about how people learn. Working here has really challenged some of my perspectives on teaching in a really nice way and I have enjoyed that. In the past, I was quite traditional but now I am more willing to take risks; rather than use a worksheet or a textbook, there are so many different approaches...

The possibilities afforded to him by the RKE discourse had opened up what he saw as new ways of being. He contrasted how fixed his perceptions were as a teacher with how he now storied himself, as an academic:

I have become more of a researcher...I used to see things as black and white; in schools it was all about targets and levels...whereas now, from a social researcher perspective, it’s the story behind the results that matter...understanding what is happening, rather than looking at statistics.

In contrast to this positive and agentic view of personal and professional change, Michael talked about of the changes he was experiencing in his working environment in an almost fatalistic way: ‘These things are happening and you have got to accept them; you cannot fight against the tide...’ However, he aimed to see the positive aspects of these changes: ‘...what you have to do is to think about what opportunities you have...’ Ultimately, Michael storied himself as positive, embracing the opportunities that the changes in values offered as enabling him to become the person he was ‘destined to be’ not the ‘false’ imposter as he worked on his project of becoming what he saw as a ‘genuine’ academic.
5.3 Andy's story: Disengagement - ‘I would have done lots of things but, to be honest, I no longer feel like doing them now’.

Like Helen, Andy felt that the changes in values had led to the things that he had held dear counting as less important. Having made initial efforts to participate in the new elements of the role of the teacher educator, as time passed he decided to avoid activities that he associated with what he perceived to be new values. Though he retained his enthusiasm for the teaching element of the role, by the time of the second interview, he was in the process of carving out an alternative role altogether, a new story alongside that of the teacher educator. Thus, Andy’s final narrative focused on the contrasts between the world that he had entered when he first became a teacher educator, with the one he now experienced: demands from managers and students were increasing and he had struggled to keep up. ‘Feeling out of the loop’ of the decision making process, he ‘no longer felt like doing things’. Tired, disappointed and feeling marginalised by the system and structures, he had chosen to distance himself, disengaging from key elements of his role.

5.3.1 Rejecting neoliberal values: ‘They were told that that didn’t count’

In his first interview, Andy had talked about a collaborative commercial project that he had been involved in. He had attended international conferences, co-authored a book and was working on developing resources with commercial potential. He was the only interviewee who talked about this more commercial element of knowledge exchange and his involvement in it:

I am making links with another European university, doing a conference there about supporting children with English as an additional language. I have also been trying to develop something with computing, designing Apps...

Andy self-authored as someone who not only tried to accommodate the new values, he was also proactive in developing projects and strategies. In his first interview, he talked about his plans for participating in building up Continuing Professional Development (CPD) activity: ‘I like the CPD work and I would like to see that grow and become more popular, so I would like to develop that. I think that there is scope to do that and I would like to be involved in a few more projects along the way.’ However, the CPD courses did not recruit
sufficient numbers to run. Andy’s later narrative began to focus on the impact of market forces and the values they brought: ‘My RKE next year is going to be cut to the minimum … I did a lot of stuff for my area of expertise, planned lots of CPD courses, but they did not recruit, so that’s not going to run next year.’ He reflected on how managerialism and the need to make a profit for the institution had also had an impact on other things that he had done: ‘I did the book, but then I was told [by management] that it was not part of the hours, it did not count as “scholarly hours”…it’s not making money for the institution.’

He had been unaware of this financial imperative until work on the book had been completed. He expressed his frustration: ‘I didn’t realise that it wasn’t part of RKE until my PDR [Professional Development Review] when my manager said it wasn’t. So I got a bit annoyed about all that.’ Others had also misunderstood the directives around KTP activities. ‘It was like my colleagues who took on school governor roles [as their contribution to Knowledge Exchange]. Then they were told that that didn’t count, either, like the book. So, we were told all this and that these things wouldn’t count.’ He went on ‘I am really annoyed about the RKE stuff and I think that everyone has been let down by that.’

This frustration and disappointment in his institution had made him reluctant to contribute more: ‘If it hadn’t been for that, I would have done lots of other things, but, to be honest, I don’t feel like doing them now.’ He rejected the neoliberal underpinning of why these things “didn’t count”:

... well, it’s not making money, is it, for this institution? It’s sad really, the whole thing is changing, into a business model and it’s slightly worrying really. I think that’s why a lot of the management are leaving, so it’s like a transition.

Both Michael and Andy recognised the impact of the neo-liberal discourses of marketisation. Unlike Michael, though, Andy resisted the idea of engaging in any further academic study, citing busyness alongside a desire to do things properly if he was going to do them. He was not as such opposed to further study, but he wanted to do it well, and would only do it if it were demanded of him:

I’m so busy that I wouldn’t have time to do the Ed Doc properly. So, unless it becomes a necessity, I don’t want to do it at the moment...When I want to do
something, I want to do it properly, to get my teeth into it, to really enjoy it. I would not want to do it just for the sake of doing it, not something to be ticked off on a management list.

Andy also resisted the impact of neoliberalism on changing values in the context of teaching and the student experience. He commented frequently on how positively he viewed the teaching element of his role: ‘I love the teaching... I want to be with the students, teaching, because that’s what I get a buzz out of...’ He saw his work with students as being fundamentally about human relationships ‘... look at those fourth year students [attending for a celebration of course completion on the day of my interview with him] ...we know all those students and the richness of those relationships that have evolved with them...’.

However, he feared that the culture of staff-student relationships was changing in a quality assurance system which ultimately rendered both staff and students more passive:

We are getting more and more like a secondary school where we are drip feeding the students and I worry that it is going more and more that way ... we did not used to do this and they used to manage fine ... I worry about the university’s obsession with this kind of [student evaluation] feedback ... We’ve not got a voice.

None of the things that he valued in terms of relationships with the students were: ‘...picked up by hard data.’ He saw this as representative of the way that things were becoming: ‘...it’s the way of the world, I guess.’

5.3.2 Increased demands: ‘More and more is being asked of you’

Andy often referred to the ‘past’, in his interviews, whilst recognising the incongruity of this given that, in his terms: ‘we have to move forwards’. He storied himself as someone who was: ‘...positive about the changes’, whilst ‘missing what we used to have, the good old days.’ Reflecting on the changing values of his workplace, he recognised the danger of re-writing the past as all good: ‘It’s all about looking back with rose tinted glasses. I think now we are in a different place and a different time... we have moved on, and it’s a lot more business -like, isn’t it?’ Yet it was clear that he was concerned about the drive to be more ‘business-like’; new values meant new managerial pressure to do more with less time: ‘... I just worry about them squeezing more and more out of us in less and less hours.’
Some of the ‘more and more’ related to his perception of increasing demands within his own management roles.

A key theme in Andy’s narrative of his move into higher education from school teaching was that he wanted to continue being a teacher, the element of the job that he most enjoyed, and which was threatened if he stayed in the school sector. He believed that moving into teacher education would prolong this enjoyment:

The next step would have been deputy head; but, to be honest, I didn’t want the stress and the paperwork and things that management have to go through in schools. I thought I don’t want to get like that, I want to enjoy my job.

However, the reality was that Andy had found himself undertaking a range of management roles, but had initially been quite positive about the situation: ‘I think that all these roles are interesting ... I enjoy, them I don’t mind the management stuff...’. However, by the time of his second interview, his management workload had increased, and Andy described the situation as increasingly demanding and stressful:

... it’s been full on ... I have found it quite hard this year ... with all of the subject teaching, the marking and the meetings and you have got everything else. I find it quite hard to keep on top of it ... The role of the unit leader is getting more and more intense and more and more is being asked of you and we are going to end up doing an awful lot and that can be quite stressful.

Combining his various roles had led to tensions: ‘I have found myself literally running from one classroom to another...There are so many different things going on, and you have try and keep a handle on it...my head is all awash ...’ This had led to a decision to shed some of his management responsibilities, although Andy was conscious that this could mean that he lost power in the system:

Actually, I turned down the management bit for next year. I felt that it is becoming so huge, I was spending so much time on it and it was very stressful and I like the teaching role most, and that is what I most want to do. I worry that that does not get seen as important, I mean I get pulled out to do the management bit, but management is not really what I want to do.
5.3.3 Losing control: ‘I feel out of the loop’

Loss of power and control in terms of his general positioning in the institution was an overarching theme in Andy’s interviews. He felt that, in contrast with the past when: ‘there used to be time and a sense of ownership and involvement in what was going on’, decisions were now made hastily, without time for proper reflection and consultation: ‘Sometimes, we need space to sit back and work out where we are going...’ Andy expressed his frustration at other changes that were happening, without any apparent rationale or explanation to those affected by the prevailing culture of managerialism and lack of transparency:

> I get frustrated with things, with systems that need to work well but don’t. For example, with the strategy that we are trying to develop, we have not been able to meet, as a team, so nothing at all has happened. Then my colleague has had her role altered; she is not sure why this has happened and she does not understand what she has to do; it has changed and she is not sure how it is going to work.

His own initial drive and motivation to be involved in any changes had diminished as he encountered what he perceived to be management constraints: ‘So we kind of get our teeth into something and we get excited about it and then there are so many barriers and rules and, actually, you just lose the will to do it and to carry on...’

Overall, Andy’s experiences of RKE and management had led to him feeling less actively involved in what was happening around him, compounded by a teaching timetable that made him even more peripheral and removed from the action:

> I am not able to attend meetings on a Wednesday, because I am teaching. So I feel out of the loop and not sure what is happening. Then we get told different things. Maybe we used to have more time to discuss things and make our points. It is just that I am never available to do that anymore and I don’t feel as if I know what is happening.

His response is to focus on the things he enjoys and values:

> You have to just do what you can and try not to let it get to you, too much. I am trying to not let it annoy me, because it will spoil my job and I love this job, or aspects of it, I enjoy teaching the students and that is what I came here to do and that’s really the bit that got me here, and I do enjoy this so much.
While this aim appears to reflect some agency on Andy’s part, his narrative ultimately appears to be one of disengagement as he talks about other interests that he plans to develop beyond his workplace:

There are things that I want to do privately and away from work that I am looking into doing... Sometimes, I think that I would do something completely out of education because you get so bogged down with it...

Helen’s, Michael’s and Andy’s stories are all change narratives, contrasting the past and present as contexts for their identities as teacher educators. They contrast in their responses to change, however. Thus Helen describes losing a significant part of her identity, taking up a position of failure, while Michael focuses on ‘rising from the ashes of the old’ to be ‘the person that he was destined to be’. Andy’s account is of one who had done his best to accommodate to the changing values, but in a context of lack of control chose to disengage. In the next chapter, I focus on the stories of three teacher educators who did not have a past in the role to draw on. How would the reality of becoming a teacher educator in higher education match up to their initial expectations? I will suggest that there were disappointments and challenges as they, too, came to understand the impact of the changes in values.
6 Analysis three: Embracing Academia

Unlike the experienced teacher educators, Caroline, Hannah and Simon were new to higher education, and did not have anything like the old timers’ experience. Analysis of their narratives shows that they arrived at the university thinking that they were in tune with its mission in terms of academic values (as opposed to neo-liberal values). Strongly aligned with these from the start, there was no apparent initial clash of values. Nonetheless, issues of agency arose in terms of how they were positioned - and positioned themselves - as teacher educators and as academics.

6.1 Caroline’s story: Managing conflict - ‘Why am I doing this?’

Caroline’s story described how she had entered higher education with the explicit expectation that she would combine being a teacher educator with being an academic. Having already obtained a PhD, she explained her decision to make the move into teacher education as:

... a nice way to do two things that I was interested in. I enjoy teaching and wanted to go back into the classroom and working with people but I also like the academic side, so I thought that this role would be the best of both worlds.

However, it was in attempting to combine these two aspects, and do justice to each, that Caroline came to a point where she could see no way of meeting what were to be often conflicting demands without some sort of change. Her story is one of unfulfilled expectations and disappointment, in herself as much as in the system.

6.1.1 Encountering a new discourse: ‘I wasn’t aware what the climate was like’

Part of Caroline’s rationale for becoming a teacher educator in higher education was a disillusionment with changes in schools and a parallel expectation that working in HE would be different:

In school, it was like a conveyor belt, with no time to think, no reflection. There were other things going on in the school that weren’t there when I first started there, related to management and stuff, and I found that I was enjoying my role less and less...

Her expectations were that, in her new world, she would have time to reflect, to learn, and to become a ‘better teacher’, with better relationships with her students:
You can have a dialogic approach and it really is a community of learners not just you trying to hurl information at them. Sometimes it is, but a lot of the time you can try and make it not like that and that feels nice because you feel like you are learning and they are learning and you can see the thought processes going on and you can react to that.

However, she was taken aback by the quality assurance pressures she was to encounter, and their impact on how she should do her job. Despite expressing a certain degree of outrage about the constraints on failing students - ‘I found that out, I thought it was ridiculous. I was shocked’ - her story is one of feeling guilty:

The nagging thing in my head at the moment is that one of my students came out as a grade three [on school based training] and I feel guilty about that. I should have known about this, before it happened ... The main surprise was I didn’t know what politics were going on inside education because I’ve been out of schools for four years, I wasn’t really aware what the climate was like. I didn’t know anything about Ofsted and the framework for ITT. I didn’t know nobody was allowed to get a three [SBT grading] and that was something that struck me.

Like the more experienced teacher educators, Caroline describes a sense of disempowerment in the context of teacher education policy:

I know that the current government are trying to move teacher education out of universities and that there is a very uncertain future for ITT. I don’t know enough about it, but this is politicised... Who makes these decisions? There must be some rationale for it but seems ridiculous ... it all feels like a black box to me, things are done to you, you don’t seem to be involved in any consultation.

6.1.2 Looking for resilience: ‘Trying to find a way to do it better’

Caroline’s high expectations of what she would achieve in terms of volume of work also led her to feel guilty about what she saw as insufficient production: ‘...I always feel guilty ... you feel you should be doing more work...’. Identified as a possible ‘REF-able researcher’ by her institution, publishing research at the level required had proved to be problematic. She talked about knowing the pressures related to this position when she took up the post:

I think that I really knew, I wasn’t under any illusions, having worked at another University, doing my PhD. I spent a lot of time with my supervisors who were lecturers so I was aware what I was getting into. I couldn’t really see anyone there who wasn’t really stressed or very busy.
However, while anticipating initially that she would manage to publish from her thesis, a year later Caroline talked about how her role as both teacher educator and researcher was pulling her in different directions, despite having been given extra research time on her timetable:

This year, I was given an extra quarter day [beyond the nominal one day per week each senior lecturer was allocated for RKE work] because I was REF possible. There was an expectation that, if you are a REF-able sort of person, there are things that you will be doing [in terms of publishing papers] but, particularly in the last two or three months, so much teaching is also going on that it has been quite stressful. I feel quite frustrated that the research stuff and all these ideas, I will have weeks when I can’t get on with these, because I am swamped with other stuff….

She blamed herself rather than the system:

I need to become more resilient because I feel that there are certain things that you cannot change, though there are some things that you can…It was only about a week ago and I felt really unwell and I could feel myself panicking a little bit and thinking, “I am not doing this anymore… why am I doing this?”

She went on: ‘I think it was because I was ill and had loads of marking to do and things were backing up. I was due to go on holiday and I thought, “I don’t want to go on holiday”, quite dysfunctional things like that.’ Caroline describes this incident as a turning point in her reflections, leading her to consider how she could better manage the situation:

...and I thought, “This isn’t good; I should not be thinking I don’t want to go on holiday”. So, I am thinking, well, I don’t want to leave my job, because I love my job and I really am getting what I came for. I am using my brain a lot more … but I really don’t want to feel like that, I don’t want to feel unwell, so I am going to have do something different ... trying to find a way to do it better.

As elsewhere in her narrative, Caroline sees the solution in herself: ‘I mean, I know that a lot of stress is in your own perception and your perception of whether you can cope with it or not, not the actual workload itself.’ She went on to explain how she was using her own research and ideas to support her: ‘One of my new lines of research is into what makes teachers resilient.’ However, she recognised the heteroglossia in what she was doing:

I was talking about the need for resilience to the third year students, the other day, and I was thinking, “Am I the best person to be standing here talking about resilience
when I am so stressed that I don’t even want to go on holiday?” But then, I thought, yes, I am the best person, because I am living it.

6.2  Hannah’s story: Disillusionment - ‘Is it worth me doing what I really want to do?’

Hannah had also anticipated that going into higher education would offer her what she described as ‘the best of both worlds’, as a teacher educator and an academic. Like Caroline’s, her story reflected the fact that the job did not live up to expectations, and she was beginning to ask questions about the world that she had entered with such high hopes. She too was trying to hold on to the positives despite the questions: ‘...you have to remember the things that you do enjoy when you have those challenging times ... and stay positive.’

6.2.1  Missing values: ‘It’s more of a production line’

Hannah’s story is that she had always wanted to be a good university teacher, and this had underpinned her earlier career choices:

When I was at university, I wanted to be a lecturer....but I did not want to be one of those who did not know how to teach, so that was my initial motivation to be a teacher... I wanted to be a good teacher so that I could go back to university at some point.

She had felt that it was essential that she had experience within the classroom before she applied for any posts but then, when she started teaching: ‘I absolutely loved it so I just got on with it and forgot about the other thing [becoming a lecturer].’ However, as part of her role in one school, she became involved in student mentoring and so she: ‘started to think about making the change.’ Having gained an MA by studying at night, whilst working full time, she knew that she wanted to continue her academic studies. Like many of the other teacher educators, she had also reached a pivotal stage in her career realising that: ‘...if I carried on down that route in school, I would spend less and less time teaching children.’ She believed that working in higher education would allow her to retain the teaching she enjoyed and to continue her research: ‘... in the university I get the opportunity to keep
teaching which was something that I really enjoyed and I would get time to do the research that I really wanted to do.’

Hannah had talked of: ‘having the opportunity to keep teaching, which was something that I really enjoyed’ when she came into HE. However, building up relationships with learners had been a key element of her role in schools and she had anticipated that she would continue to do this with adult learners. The erosion of contact time between tutors and students resulting from the increased amount of time spent in schools as well as an overall increase in student numbers since her own training rendered this difficult. This world had proved different to the one that she had anticipated, in which teacher-student relationships were valued. In the world that she now encountered, there was a greater emphasis on performance. She felt that the teaching was becoming

...more of a production line. You want to build up that relationship with the students but it’s like one session a week and then another the following week. How do I build up that relationship up? That relationship with them, that’s a challenge...it’s knocked my confidence...I mean in schools, you get to know your kids from day one.

Hannah noted the contrast between the teacher standards requirements in which: ‘We are so driven by market and external pressures’ and her experience of other courses run within the faculty that were not so constrained by external requirements. This had led to her to speculate on the value of her role as a teacher educator and the way she wanted to teach: ‘I wonder if I should give up trying. I am wondering what I am doing now? Is it a lost cause? I think that is sort of a worry at the moment: is it worth me doing what I really want to do?’

6.2.2 Juggling competing demands: ‘I still feel guilty about this’
Hannah had also been motivated by the idea that she would continue to learn and gain a higher degree when she took up her job. This academic element was part of the attraction of how she imagined life in academia might be, offering her a chance to reflect: ‘In the university, I would get time to do the research that I really wanted to do.’ However, this perception of the world of academia, as a less pressured, more scholarly place than school teaching was based on her own experience as a student; she described the reality as
proving somewhat different, because of the competing demands of her role as a teacher educator.

Hannah had fulfilled one of her ambitions, enrolling on the Ed Doc programme. She found it rewarding: ‘I was really excited, getting my own little space for all those books that had been in crates, bringing them in and getting started. I love the reading...’ However, finding the time for study meant that time for teaching preparation came under pressure:

I felt guilty about doing reading and research even though this was part of our practice ... the difficulty of managing the commitment to teaching, school based training at the same time as trying to do research ... I have got to plan and deliver sessions. It’s tricky but it’s something that I want to do, so I guess I will have to keep on doing it and hope it will get better.

Hannah had begun to appreciate that the perceived freedom of her new role: ‘to come and go’ and to be able to work off site if she chose, came with restrictions. Being off site did not mean being away from work, and guilt flowed into this area of her work too:

I find you never switch off...you get emails until late at night or first thing in the morning and the people that are sending you emails first thing in the mornings, they don’t know that you have been emailing until that time of night and if you don’t email back, you feel guilty and so, you are constantly “on”.

She compared this with when she worked in schools. She would be at home, in an evening worrying about the children she taught and their lives outside school, but she thought that this would be very different in higher education. She had not anticipated that concerns related to her students would invade her personal life to the extent that it did.

Hannah’s new management roles also impinged on her free time and time to study. She expressed dismay that she still had to do so much of this as part of her role:

I was aware that I would have some administrative responsibilities as part of my role but not as many as I now have. I have to confess that management was the least favourite part of my role as a teacher and it is still my least favourite part of being in higher education. I thought that I had escaped from this, once I left schools.

Along with her management role, Hannah was asked to teach other areas of the curriculum outside her own specialist area of expertise. While she was concerned about how students
might perceive this: ‘Well, she is teaching one subject here and another there and a third one elsewhere. Who is she?’ - she noted that within a rapidly changing context in which there was: ‘a lot of instability hanging over you’, it was best to be ‘as flexible as possible. Her uncertainty about her future reflected a general uncertainty and disillusionment regarding the purpose of her role.

6.3 Simon’s story: Disappointment - ‘I thought academia would have a lot more freedom to it’

Simon’s narrative is one of extreme disappointment in the ability of academia to make a difference to the world of schooling, and the frustration of his personal goals in the face of managerialism and education values that he did not share. Entering teacher education from a position of senior management in schools, his story had been one of leadership in times of challenge:

I had been a head for six years and an assistant head before that. Each time, the school was struggling and, each time, I have put myself into it, not separating the personal from the professional...

Describing each school as ‘struggling’, he was someone who had invested time and effort in a cause. He described himself as someone with passion and ideals, who wanted to continue to work towards the things that he felt mattered within higher education. However, he resented the limitations of his new role, becoming frustrated with a lack of agency and with his inability to drive forward his own particular values and his vision for education. He felt that he was being under-used, given his experiences in the world outside.

6.3.1 Positionality: ‘I was used to being in charge’

Simon’s narrative focused on his thwarted desire to bring his particular values and experience to teacher education in general, and through leadership in particular. He had expected that he would be given a broad outline of areas to be covered each academic year and then, as an experienced teacher, to be able to develop his own lessons within the ITT courses. However, this was not the way that the programme was designed and run, and he felt that the potential for a personal element and use of his own experience had been sacrificed in order to ensure the consistency and equity of experience for students that the
quality assurance procedures demanded. He described himself as: ‘constantly trying to find the wriggle room’ to insert this personal element within his teaching, explaining that:

You and I could both teach the same session and you would bring your special thing to it, your character, your experience and I would bring mine ... so I am trying to find the wriggle room to do this. I just think that it feels very prescribed. I thought that it might be done in terms of “right; here’s the objectives for the year. Go and plan these, plan what you are going to do.” I thought that there would be more ownership of what went on in lessons and the structure of lessons.

Simon positioned himself as someone who had experience, agency and authority, but his new teacher educator role in the university challenged that positioning: ‘I was used to being in charge ... I felt like being an NQT again and that just didn’t sit right after nearly twenty years in the classroom.’ In addition to the constraints on what he could do within this new context, he found the level of management that he was expected to engage in ‘irksome.’ He complained that he had: ‘no proper responsibility for a team’, and of feeling relatively junior. Unlike other participants, he did not talk about being part of a team; rather, he was someone who anticipated leading a team. He described leadership as: ‘...creating an energy that drives things forward...’ with ‘a shared ethos and a core goal that you are working towards.’ However, he suspected that he would have to be in a higher grade, ‘by at least two levels’, in order to enact genuine leadership as opposed to management:

Thinking forward, I am concerned that I still have thirty years to work and working at this level for another thirty years feels like it might be suffocating. There is no appeal in the level above. This would be a necessary evil to get to the level above that, which is probably where I would feel happier, not because I am anything special, but more because there is a leadership role at that level, rather than it being about all about management.

6.3.2 Reacting to values change: ‘The university is more of a business...’

Simon’s personal and professional philosophy underpinned his identity in practice as a teacher and scholar, and he extended his vision of educational change through his doctoral research. He saw the value of his studies residing in the potential for theory to influence what went on in schools and teacher education:
If something were to come out of this Ed.D. stuff about this approach and links with schools and we were able to put together something more substantial on the university programme around that ethos then it would be worth doing.

However, he recognised that the prevailing values associated with managerialism were now the key drivers. Discussing the future of the institution, he commented that: ‘There is an overseas agenda … but I think the motivation around the university agenda is more about marketing than social justice...’ This contrasted to his own avowed commitment to social justice. He acknowledged that this was not unique to his institution: ‘I think it’s the extent to which the university is more of a business than an educational institution…that’s the way that society is, these days.’ However, he had not anticipated that this change in values would have such a personal and professional impact upon him:

But the extent that that impinges on your everyday life, in terms of things like parity of student experience and student satisfaction and those kind of things that go with that, I am surprised how much that impinges on our freedoms and I thought academia would have a lot more freedom to it, yes...

Simon had very specific expectations about his role. The mismatch between these and the reality across virtually all aspects of his role had led to disappointments, and he opted to leave teacher education, returning to school work in which he anticipated he would be able to have a more significant impact.

These final three narratives from Caroline, Hannah and Simon share a central theme of high expectations of teacher education which are not fulfilled. While Caroline and Hannah both respond with what seems to be some doubt in themselves, Simon presents himself as unable to exert agency in academia, asserting his values by leaving. Despite their recent entry into teacher education, all three notice and react to the changing values around education that underpin the stories of more experienced teacher educators. At the same time, while they embrace academia, none of them finds that this is easy to do in the current climate.
7 Discussion

The data discussed in the previous three chapters tells us many things about agency and resistance. The impact of discursive tensions on the subjects are significant and the loss of what the teacher educators stood for is woven through the stories. They perceived that they had lost agency, capital and professional identity. Believing that they were being positioned differently by both management and students, they spoke of being caught in between the two. Their stories are of them having no voice in what was happening within their context. Their opinions about changes were not sought; they were not consulted. In one case, this went further; one teacher educator claiming that they had been deliberately ‘kept in the dark’. The over-riding impression is that they believed that things might have been done differently. The necessary changes could have been managed better and they were not convinced that all the changes were needed, possibly because they had been prevented from seeing the bigger picture. Some of the teacher educators recognised elements of this bigger picture, acknowledging that the changes that they were experiencing were not unique. They saw that a business model pervaded many sectors and workplaces and that profit motives and competition in the market place were key drivers. The changes had been uncomfortable and challenging, with underlying threats to their sense of who they were, as educators and, in some cases, at a personal level, as individuals.

In the next section, I revisit my research questions which focused on positionality and agency.

7.1 Question one: How do teacher educators describe their positioning in higher education?

Positionality is one of the four constructs within Holland et al’s theory. How they were positioned was a key element in the teacher educators’ narratives. They spoke of being positioned by managers and by students, sometimes caught between the two, and of their own positions being vulnerable and lacking in power. The power and capital that they had, as experienced teachers or teacher educators had been eroded. The teacher educators had
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been subject to a range of powerful discourses related to the prevalent neo-liberal agenda, which had contributed to this process of change. Tensions and conflicts featured heavily in the stories, reflecting the pressures they experienced, how far they were able to enact their roles within these and the impact on how they positioned themselves and were positioned by others. Michael recalled the tension during his first few weeks of working in the institution between feeling very uncertain of his role in this new context, he had been simultaneously positioned as an expert, expected to know all the answers.

Holland et al (1998) note that socially constructed selves are subject to positioning by whatever powerful discourses they happen to encounter. However, for these teacher educators some of these discourses were contradictory. Michael talked about how the need to recruit sufficient numbers of students to meet targets or make courses viable conflicted with demands that student outcomes were uniformly good. The increasing prominence of the RKE agenda had led to conflicting pressures between meeting requirements to be involved in research whilst ensuring that the quality of one’s teaching was maintained. Being subject to conflicting discourses made it hard for the teacher educators to assimilate and appropriate these voices in ways that would lead to the agency that Holland et al and Braathe and Solomon had suggested. Even in the familiar context of their teaching, there were tensions. The actual job of the teacher educator, the day-to-day work, on the surface at least, had changed little. What had changed was what they taught and the conditions and context in which they were doing this. They were subject to the discourses related to the teaching profession and schools, referred to earlier, including Ofsted for whom performativity was key. In this, they reflected a world very similar to that described by Ball (2003). The standards agenda had had an impact on the selection of teaching topic and course content. Concerns about teaching content and teaching to meet the standards and Ofsted’s requirements were set in opposition to teaching in ways that the teacher educators, as experienced professionals, believed to be appropriate in creating autonomous and reflective practitioners, able to make professional judgements. Moreover, the student voice, reflected in surveys, indicated that teacher educators should provide more support for academic studies. This was seen to be in opposition with their belief that university study should be about developing independence and critical thinking.
The sheer amount of time that students were required to spend in schools also had a direct impact on what could be taught in university time, leading to difficult decisions around what to keep and what to shed in the teaching.

Alongside these tensions, some participants recognised the drive for greater school involvement in ITT and this created some apprehension in terms of how they conceived their relationships with partner schools.

Against the background of powerful discourses about the education of teachers and the purpose and place of the university as an institution, changes in the context had a significant impact on how the teacher educators were positioned within their world. Critical of the business model, they resisted the implications that students were now ‘consumers’ and their own positioning as ‘providers’ in a financial transaction. It was these changes in the underlying values that had made themselves felt, making the teacher educators question not only what they were doing, but also the why. Student satisfaction, as indicated by the survey responses cited earlier, related to how well they believed they had been prepared for their role, in terms of knowledge and practice. The teacher educators commented that the students seemed to be more interested in whether an element of teaching would help them to pass a course assignment or help directly with how to teach a topic or concept in schools. This meant that previous beliefs about the importance of producing reflective practitioners with the professional wisdom and ability to judge what was the best approach, identified as key by Biesta (2013a), had been marginalised. Within the move to ensure that students had the requisite competences, critical reflection and engagement with theory in any depth had retreated in importance. The change in relationships with the students also influenced how the teacher educators talked about positioning. For Helen, the move to students as consumers, demanding value for money and wielding considerable power, had proved a threat to her position as an authority on her subject area and as an experienced teacher.

For each of the newer teacher educators, there were particular challenges. One had entered HE with clear intentions to combine teaching and research and found it hard to combine the two. Whilst one was able to continue her own studies, initial uncertainties
about her teaching had been replaced with anxiety about own future within the institution. The third had expected that the position would involve responsibilities and allow for autonomy. Entrants into teacher education tend to be quite senior and experienced teachers. Being positioned at a relatively low rung on the management ladder of the university, they still wanted to be actively involved in what was going on, to have timely information, a voice and to feel part of all decisions.

Furthermore, they had learnt a role in schools. Over time, these roles had become embodied. They ceased to reflect on the nature of what they did and who they were, as teachers. Their new roles required them to think again about this and ruptured their sense of themselves as teachers. Influenced by their own experiences as students on teacher education courses, they had expectations of what this world would be like. Despite what they had to offer, in terms of ‘recent and relevant experience’, the experienced classroom teachers coming into teacher education in higher education talked of feeling disempowered. They referred to ‘feeling like an NQT’ when faced with the new demands and expectations of their teaching role from their adult students, their colleagues in the university and schools and their managers. At the same time, they were being asked for advice, perceived of as all knowing. Being positioned as an expert by others, whether one’s colleagues or by those outside, created tensions for new teacher educators. The cultural and symbolic capital that they had acquired by being successful in the classroom suddenly became of less significance once they entered higher education. This group positioned themselves as less powerful within the Figured World, needing to know the doxa, the culture and rules of the game, before they could play it with any confidence.

For the more experienced teacher educators, there were also uncertainties as they sought to enact roles in which they had previously felt themselves to be confident and competent. Government discourses suggested that their part in educating would be teachers was increasingly marginalised. The emphasis was on what could be measured rather than on the things that Biesta (2015:4) refers to when discussing subjectification - the development of wisdom, compassion and the whole person as a human being. The teacher educators had seen this as an integral element of their work with the students. This was perhaps best
epitomised by Andy: ‘We know all those students and the richness of those relationships that have evolved with them…’

The more experienced participants spoke of how things had changed. They had no choice or voice in how they were deployed; rather they were compelled to take on certain aspects of their roles. Combined with the lack of consultation, this had led participants to feel less valued within their organisation. Their habitus was being called into question. Their narratives reflect their attempts to work within this fluid, unstable environment, at times questioning their own worth, as they were required to see themselves from the point of view of these others.

There was a very different style of management, more interventionist than developmental and supportive. This had a double impact on those teacher educators who were both managed and managers. The increased emphasis on managerialism had left the teacher educators with little voice or capacity to redress claims or influence matters within this world, in effect, with little agency. There was an ever-present ‘they’, never precisely defined, who controlled things, such that the teacher educators conveyed a sense of themselves as being part of big impersonal machine, in which who they were, as individuals, their talents, experience and beliefs did not matter. Many decisions appeared to be taken higher up the management chain. In the past, the higher management at university, above the level of their own faculty, had seemed to have far less impact than was perceived as happening now. Indeed, there was reference to how their immediate managers used to protect them from the worst excesses. On the one hand, the teacher educators were less directly involved in the bigger picture of what was happening within the institution. On the other hand, they perceived that they were held more directly attributable for the hard data, key metrics of recruitment, retention and outcomes.

Some participants spoke of not knowing how they fitted into the bigger picture and this had caused anxiety and uncertainty. This was compounded by the fact that the meetings, the semiotic mediators that they had utilised in the past, proved harder to access. On the surface, this related to logistics and pragmatics. Some were unable to attend meetings during which they believed these matters were discussed. However, those who were able
to attend these meetings asserted that they felt that their opinions and ideas were not taken into account. Hence, the symbolic capital that they held was diminished in worth. Alongside the uncertainty, there was a feeling of disempowerment. If what one offers is comprehended as having less relevance and less worth, then one’s position is de-stabilised; one becomes sub-ordinate to others more powerful.

There was a reluctance to position themselves as academics. This was not what they had come to do or be and so they resisted this. There was an uncertainty as to why they were doing this, a lack of awareness of how this fitted into the ‘bigger picture’. They knew that the REF was important but, equally, understood that any research that they might be involved with was unlikely to fulfil the relevant criteria. The teacher educators interviewed all indicated that they were curious, reflective and open to finding out more in order to enhance their own practice, knowledge base and understanding of what they did. They frequently had a history of doing this within schools. Indeed, those entering into teacher education, as well as having the experience, may also have had an extra drive to do this, so were self-selected to some extent. What was a concern was the formalisation of the process. There was an element of compulsion linked to continuing one’s academic studies, as evidenced by comments about line managers ‘pushing’ for this. This was seen as being about compliance with directives rather than about on-going professional development. It was about numbers and ticking boxes as much as quality.

The teacher educators had been made increasingly aware of their own part in the research agenda, which formerly resided within a separate department within their faculty. They had become party to discussions about the REF, about the need to share one’s research and to publish at a particular level. This was a culture shift from developing small-scale initiatives within their own department, sharing these ideas at local meetings or their own subject associations. Their history-in-person had not necessarily provided them with the skillsets to write at an appropriate level for an academic audience. Moreover, the REF’s association with competition was different to the collaborative working to which they had been accustomed. Knowledge exchange added yet another layer of tension. Previously, teacher educators had been happy to share their expertise in a particular area with those
working in schools. Partnership arrangements had stressed reciprocity. However, under the new regime, knowledge, ideas and insights were things to be sold, not shared. Whilst some of the teacher educators recognised that they had the necessary expertise, financial transactions for this were out of their experience and made them feel uncomfortable, rather than proud of what they could offer. They recognised the imperative for the institution to compete and to generate income as a key driver and this was in tension to their own understanding and experience of what the world of higher education should be about.

Being subject to the discourses and pulled in different directions with little capacity to answer left them lacking in a sense of individual worth and autonomy. There was a sense of loss. They had lost their symbolic capital, professional identity and agency. Any feeling of being appreciated for who they were, the knowledge and skills that they had and what they did had gone. They had lost what they perceived to be a sense of themselves as professionals and people. This sense of loss was intensified by uncertainty and not knowing what was happening in their own context. Uncertainty was a key theme and this had an impact on the amount of professional agency that they believed they had.

7.2 Question two: To what extent do the teacher educators describe themselves as having professional agency?

Holland et al recognise that within a figured world, some will have more power than others, some will invest more than others and the effect of this is to position people. However, their theory asserts that individuals do not have to accept these positions. They can find ways around these, drawing on resources and improvising in order to resist. Whilst recognising that there may only be limited possibilities, they maintain that some agency is possible.

Despite the fact that some of the participants had talked about loss, disempowerment and a lack of agency, there was evidence that they had retained some sense of agency within the changes that they had experienced. Some of the participants had resisted the management strictures around their roles. We can work the discourses, even as they work
Foucault (1978) notes that discourses transmit and produce power. This power can reinforce the discourses but we can also undermine it and expose it, rendering it fragile and, hence, possible to thwart it. Angela, for example, explained that when she and a colleague were asked to make yet more changes: ‘We refused because, having embraced the concept, how could you then change again.’ Helen had resisted all attempts to encourage her into further academic study and had ultimately reached a compromise about the need to do this. Accordingly, she perceived that she had been able to exercise some agency, however expedient this had also been for her managers.

Hence, within these narratives of the teacher educators, there was agency. Figured Worlds would have it that there is always this possibility. The teacher educators storied themselves as actively seeking to manage the situation, navigating the perceived tensions. Angela had talked about finding ways to improvise so that she could lead her team in ways that were commensurate with her own values and beliefs about developing and supporting others. She used metaphors related to battles and talked about refusing to comply with some of the edicts from central management. Holland and Valsiner (1988:264) maintain that, ‘... metaphors and analogies are commonly used as mediating devices to aid the comprehension of abstract processes and invisible entities...’ Whilst bemoaning the devaluing of the cultural resources that she had been able to draw upon in the past, she was finding ways to work with partners and meet with colleagues. Part of Angela’s agency came from her ability to stand back and to see things for what she believed they were. She could comment as if from the outside.

Andy had also spoken of feeling distanced from what was happening but this distance had enabled him to consider other possibilities. Recognising oneself as at a distance can enable individuals to see things differently. This can become a cultural tool for reframing what is happening so that we can see it in context. Holland et al (1998:182) recognise a process of ‘outsideness’, a way of standing apart from immediate experience, whilst yet defining this experience as one’s own. This ability to ‘hover over’ and reflect upon what she was doing, whilst remaining aware of her own stance and values, epitomises what Angela had done. This had enabled her to retain a sense of who she was and to resist becoming fully
implicated in what was happening. In order to do this, though, individuals need to have a strong sense of identity as well as a comprehension of the prevalent discourses and implicit or explicit power relations inherent in these.

7.3 Question three: How do teacher educators self-author in the changing context of higher education?

Thus, there was a sense in which, though the values were challenged and they felt devalued at times, some were still able to hold fast to the values that mattered to them. They had been subject to a range of tensions that had an impact on how they perceived that they were positioned. They had found some ways of resourcing their agency within this, but this came at a high cost. One, having tried to resist, spoke of ‘feeling done in’, of ‘attrition’, tired of fighting battles. Others had talked of ‘opting out’ or had actually chosen to do so.

Holland et al (1998) cite Bakhtin’s insistence that the world must be answered, but the form of the answer is not predetermined. We make choices, consciously or not and, in doing so, author ourselves. Hannah offers us an example of this when she explains how she has trained herself to focus on the positive aspects of her role. In doing this, she is using language as a mediating device to enable her to modulate her emotions (Holland and Valsiner, 1988:250).

Holland et al (1998) reflect on how individuals accommodate in order to enter figured worlds. The figured world of the teacher educator was, itself, constantly changing in order to adapt to the external influences upon it. The discourses and practices that had been the tools to build the history-in-person of the teacher educators had been displaced by powerful discourses around accountability, managerialism and marketisation. Both identities and worlds were in flux and this constant change led some of the participants to feel disempowered, having lost some of their cultural capital as a result of the changes, whilst others were able to recognise and enact a role within this. There are various places in which we can see them as repositioning themselves as they self-authored.

Further study afforded an opportunity for some of the participants to stand back from their immediate situation and to think about what was happening and why. Studying for higher
degrees alongside their peers had enabled them to develop a sense of community. The taught sessions on these programmes afforded them a safe space to reflect on their concerns and gain comfort from knowing that they were not alone in their difficulties. Moreover, this studying had exposed them to a range of ideas and literature beyond their everyday experiences. Offering a broader perspective seemed to enable the participants to recognise that their own experiences were not unique, nor, necessarily, restricted to their own fields. They came to see that there were wider discourses at play and to appreciate how changes were permeating education and society more widely. They began to see how the culture that they had encountered was part of a prevailing neo-liberal agenda. Their study towards higher degrees gave them a vocabulary to talk about these things and, in doing so and extending their own understanding of this context, they were becoming more confident in articulating their own ideas and values. The experience of further study had become a space for change and for authoring. They were able to figure their world and their own place within it differently as a result. Michael, perhaps, expressed this the best, offering an anticipated self: ‘I am glad that I am doing my Ed Doc now, because it is making me into the person that I am supposed to be.’ Hence, the changes in their roles, occasioned by the drive to become more academic had led to a potential for agency when so much else seemed constrained.

The teacher educators spoke of trying to negotiate conflicting demands in ways that addressed the needs of different discourses that they had internalised. Juxtaposed with this, they had to address their own inner voices and beliefs, other internally persuasive discourses, about what was appropriate in teacher education, some of which related to their own history-in-person. In Michael’s terms, ‘wanting to be comfortable with himself’ required that they orchestrate the voices. Their self-authoring reflected their struggles. In some instances, they chose to author themselves as different to what they had been, making contrasts between being required to ‘teach to the tests’ in schools and encouraging critical reflection in the university, despite the pressure to focus on ‘transmitting knowledge’. Utilising the professional discourse about the value of critical reflection, they were able to incorporate this into their practice.
Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism is of significance here. The participants were being subject to powerful but conflicting discourses and needed to find a way to answer these, using whatever resources they could muster. Some explicitly mentioned ways of answering by looking to things they saw as positive; an internally persuasive discourse that enabled them to continue. Others saw that the tensions offered possibilities for improvisation. Hence, Caroline’s use of her own anxieties about her inability to meet both academic and teaching demands and her lack of resilience became something that she embraced and used with her students.

Within the space of authoring, some were able to improvise and utilise the ‘tools at hand’. Of greatest significance was the relationships that they had with their colleagues. There was mention of both formal and informal support and of camaraderie. Identity in practice seemed to be bound up with perceiving oneself to be a member of a team. Teamwork was valued and the quality of relationships within these teams was stressed. Collegiate practice, despite the emphasis placed on competition, was valued as colleagues shared insights and ideas. Encounters and discussions were often informal. These had replaced the more formal scheduled meetings in terms of developing the culture and world as they saw it.

Hence, it is possible to adapt to and accommodate changes in the figured world as one works on the project of developing one’s identity in practice, if one has the necessary tools and capital. Indeed, Stronach, Corbin, McNamara, Stark & Warne (2002:109) contend that flux is currently an integral part of being a professional, claiming that ‘discursive dynamics come to re-write the professional teacher… as split, plural and conflictual selves.’ They portray practitioners as ‘caught between… an ‘economy of performance’ (manifestations broadly of the audit culture) and various ‘ecologies of practice’ (professional dispositions and commitments individually and collectively engendered’ (ibid). In terms of figured worlds, this has links with improvisation as individuals negotiate demands and desires.

All the teacher educators had been made explicitly aware of the need to engage in RKE, even if the underlying rationale related to income generation had not been made explicit. Some of the newer academics sought to embrace this requirement, seeing this as integral to the role. Michael saw his academic study as a route to liberation. Others were more
circumspect. They saw this as a threat, taking time away from their core purpose of teaching or as part of a process in which what they had done traditionally had become devalued and of less importance. Nonetheless, this requirement was there and needed to be addressed in some way. Some sought to improvise, to find ways of meeting this requirement whilst still doing the things that mattered to them. Angela’s decision to take a group of students out to a school exemplifies this. Others claimed that they had tried to engage in KE but had seen that this was not what they thought; it was purely about revenue. Others resisted, offering tactics of delay. However, those who did embrace the research strand, though initially complying with the agenda, had gained a new set of tools. These could be and were used to analyse and critically reflect on their own situation. In some cases, this had led to a capacity to act, to try different ways of doing things, exploring new possibilities as they continued with their studies.

7.4 Reviewing the theoretical framework

Working within the same context as my participants, having a theoretical framework offered me a tool to stand back and to ‘hover over’ what was happening. This afforded me a different perspective and allowed me to position myself as a researcher. My chosen theoretical framework gave me a lens that allowed me to focus on what became the key elements of my data. It enabled me to look, in depth, at positioning and self-authoring and to reflect critically on what I saw as key elements in each story. However, there were some limitations. However carefully one looks, there will always be things that are missed and different lenses will privilege some elements over others. Moreover, I was looking at a figured world at a time of great change, a figured world in flux, whereas the figured worlds described by Holland et al tended to be more stable. Nonetheless, I believe that this lens enabled me to look how individuals influence and are influenced by their social context.

Holland et al’s theory contends that within any social context, individuals collectively ‘figure out’ how things work. They acknowledge the part that culture and socio-constructivism play as people work together to forge meaning. Inevitably, language is the tool of choice for this figuring though there are other semiotic mediators. Through language, we address and answer others. Others may not be physically present within the world but their voices
can come to us as powerful discourses. Holland et al assert that we have to respond to these but can respond in ways of individual or group choosing. For the teacher educators, there was a lack of a cohesive group response, despite common concerns about the prevailing discourses. The lack of this may have related, in part, to the difficulties that they had encountered in attending meetings. Beyond this, the culture had changed; attending meetings was seen as far more peripheral. However, there are associated mechanisms of control here. It was not simply that people chose not to go to meetings; in some instances, management had restricted access to these. People were required to answer when addressed by managers but this was not always reciprocated because the power resided with them; there was no real dialogue.

Between colleagues, this was not the case. Within the narratives, there was recognition of dialogue with each other, albeit that some of this was at the superficial level of ‘office banter’, this still served a function. Every participant, without exception, spoke of supportive colleagues. However, these relationships had not always been mobilised to resource agency in the ways that they had done in the past. Nonetheless, individuals sometimes formed alliances, taking strength from these so that they could refuse to comply, as Angela and her colleague had done.

Drawing upon Bakhtin, Holland et al propose that dialogue is intrapersonal as well as interpersonal; it also occurs within the individual. The theory proposes that we draw upon other voices to self-author. Caroline offers us evidence of heteroglossia within her discussion of resilience. In embracing the opportunities that his doctorate had afforded him, Michael demonstrates how he had orchestrated the voices to arrive at an internally persuasive discourse. Addressed by others, we reflect upon what has been said, internalising the ideas, shaping them in new ways for ourselves, though the echoes of the original ideas and other voices remain, even as we conduct this internal dialogue. In order to arrive at an answer, we can choose which voices we will use but we have to find ways of organising these into some sort of cohesive response. This was exemplified by Caroline, struggling to address the demands of being an academic alongside that of her teaching, she found a way to improvise and address both discourses.
This process of organisation was integral to the narratives of my participants. They answered the interview questions but each did this in a unique way, choosing what to say or not say, and how to say this. Narrative inquiry purports that a narrative involves such selection of what the teller considers salient points at the time that they tell the story. Given that there was a year between interviews, the salient points had changed for some of the teacher educators. Andy, for example, storied himself as someone committed to the knowledge exchange agenda in his first interview. By the time he came to the second, he had abandoned this and wanted to talk about the importance of his teaching and of his alternative occupation. Hannah had entered HE with such hopes but, within the second interview, her narrative expressed the doubts and uncertainty she was feeling.

We address ourselves as we tell ourselves our stories. Helen had told herself a potent story in which she was cast as a teacher, but was having to reframe this story of who she was, as a result of her experiences. Her new story was of someone getting older for whom work was no longer going to be a central element of who she was. In a similar vein, Simon had self-authored as a leader. He found this to be incompatible within the context of higher education because he held less power, less symbolic capital. Because of this mis-match, he elected to move on, rather than accommodating the changes into his story.

Having reviewed my research questions and the theoretical framework, I will consider the implications. The completion of my initial fairy tale serves as an introduction to this section.

7.5 Implications of my research

The princess put down her pen. It was evening and the light was fading. She was tired. She had listened to the stories and thought about them a lot. She had tried to paint the pictures of each story faithfully on the pages of her book but, somehow, the colours were not quite as bright as she had hoped and the outlines of the drawings were a little fuzzy. She had wanted to finish her story with a happy ending but she knew that, in real life, there were no endings; things keep going, things change and people change. At the start of her journey, getting ready to listen to the stories, she had been excited, positive and hopeful, even naïve about what she might find. It seemed to her that she had changed, as a result of her journey.
and she now saw things differently. Perhaps this explained why the colours were less bright and lines less clear. It was her eyes, not the pictures themselves. She felt sad and fearful....but sad and fearful storytellers may have limited audiences for their tales. Fearful storytellers may not tell the truth as they see it. Readers may want happy stories that make them feel good about themselves and what they are doing. How might she make hers a story that would inspire, would encourage, and would make people feel valued? She could talk of how people tried and went on trying. She could talk about how people tried to make their palace a better place for themselves and each other. She could explain how much the people did care about each other and the flowers, vegetables and chickens. She could talk about how they were growing and changing and what all this might look like in the future, the possibilities ... or she could let the readers make up their own minds for themselves...

Having written the above prior to the final analysis of my data, I was struck by the theme of the characters being paler and less well defined when I returned to it. Originally, I thought that this was because of my own inability to render things clearly, but, in the light of my subsequent analysis, I now think that this ‘paleness’ related to what was happening to my participants. The nature of the job they were being asked to do undermined their deeply held values. This was not merely about role change or having more to do, it was about the devaluing of the job that they were doing. Pedagogical knowledge had been displaced and devalued by a focus on subject knowledge and even that was conceptualised in a very restricted way. Deliberate reflection on subject knowledge, as envisaged by Eraut (1994), defined by Prestage & Perks (1999:3) as ‘...the explicit working by teachers of their subject knowledge beyond that gained from classroom practice...a deliberate standing back from the classroom situation...’ had become restricted to ensuring that the students had sufficient subject content knowledge to achieve the standards. The lack of opportunities to reflect themselves or for their students to do the same was a recurrent theme in their narratives.

7.5.1 Personal implications

The choice of the fairy tale genre has implications for how I choose to see the world and to position myself within it. I use this as an artefact or tool, enabling me to use metaphors.
However, it also enables me to be playful and to produce an understanding of myself for myself (Holland et al, 1998: 4). My thesis, ostensibly, about how others perceive their world and themselves within this was always, at some level, about myself and my struggle to gain a better understanding of what I was being required to do. The search has taken me into some unexpected places. I was certainly naïve about the wider political agenda, over-optimistic about what I hoped to find and definitely had not fully appreciated the ramifications of conducting research with one’s own colleagues. The fairy tale extract indicates that things became less clear-cut the more I read and thought about the issues.

My initial quest to understand the elements of my own role within ITT has not been fully resolved, though I now have a greater understanding of the complexities of teaching and teacher education. Moreover, there are commonalities and it has become clear that pedagogy has a central place within each element. I also believe that this process has changed me at a more personal level. I believe that I have become more resilient and persistent, even when things have not gone according to plan and I have wanted to abandon the project. I have been privileged to receive some expert constructive criticism and realised that, however uncomfortable this might have been, it was intended to be and was very supportive, not something to be taken personally. This is an important lesson in life and will be of value to me, as I continue to develop my own identity in practice, working with my colleagues and students in the future. Furthermore, I have learnt a great deal about the research process and about being a researcher. Much of this relates to ways in which I went wrong.

7.5.2 Implications for research
Bakhtin claims that we are always in dialogue and, hence, engaged in a process of addressing and answering. In interviewing my own colleagues, this process had been contaminated. They were not addressing an unbiased researcher, rather someone who was steeped in the same culture and figured world, so there were assumptions and elisions. Nor was I addressing them as unknown participants; there was always the tendency to add in some back-history to what I perceived and noted. Moreover, in answering me, they had to consider whether to answer me as researcher or me as a colleague. There were places
where I, inadvertently, chose to address them in a particular way, steering a response by the way that questions were asked and they did not always choose to answer me. This may be because they were resisting being drawn in, recognising errors on my part as a researcher, and being too polite to point this out explicitly. Alternatively, it may also have been because they did not wish to engage with the issue raised. In hindsight, I would not have attempted this kind of study with my own colleagues. The practical difficulties, the ethical dilemmas and the risks to working relationships and, in some cases, friendships proved far harder than I had anticipated. Nonetheless, I continue to believe that, in any research in which the researcher looks at something that matters deeply to them, inevitably, there will be bias and subjectivity. Research is always going to be a messy business as people and organisations in which they work are hugely complex so it is unsurprising that the princess did not get the nice neat story with a happy ending that she had hoped.

7.5.3 Implications for knowledge exchange

The impetus for my research came from a chance remark about Knowledge Exchange and this element has featured significantly in my own role since then. However, though I tried hard to generate discussion about this element within the semi-structured interviews, it seemed that few of my participants had much to say about this area. Holland et al (1998:285) caution that ‘...a fantasized world may never gain purchase in a sociohistorical landscape. Its figurings and the identities afforded by them may simply not be taken up.’ Individuals have to accept and engage with elements within a figured world and it seems as if these teacher educators did not wish to do so. Only Andy talked at any length about this. He had tried to engage with this agenda but had found that it related more to his institution making money and to commercial discourses than to any sharing of expertise. This was about a neoliberal agenda in which there was competition and winners and losers, where financial profit was seen as a marker of success. The phrase ‘knowledge exchange’ implies that knowledge is a commodity to be traded with little reference to the fact that knowledge is not fixed but something that changes over time. There is no link with the critical thinking that institutions have conventionally encouraged in their work with practising teachers, on both award bearing and CPD courses. The phrase also implies that
something is offered in exchange rather than this being a financial transaction, but the university’s priority is payment for the courses. However, those involved in such transactions also talk about the value of teachers getting together and sharing ideas. Hence, within the actual context of sessions, more may be exchanged between participants and tutors than the financial transaction implies. The terminology is simply not appropriate for this element.

My own KE work involves working on a KTP with a small local company. The project relates to developing web based learning resources designed to develop conceptual understanding of mathematics. In this context, what I am exchanging is my knowledge of mathematical pedagogy. What my colleague and I are gaining is an opportunity to explore a pedagogical approach and to research this. This is not a simple financial transaction. Given this, I feel that we may do a dis-service to the underlying principle by reducing this to financial transactions, rather than recognising the potential. The university still has a respected role and value in terms of the subject/ discipline expertise that resides amongst the academics and we may need to celebrate this rather more.

7.5.4 Implications for teaching

It seems that those involved in ITT have also been required to ‘down play’ this expertise in their roles of working with students on initial teacher training programmes. Individual strengths and areas of expertise are subsumed in the demands for consistency of student experience. Yet, it is this pedagogical expertise and pedagogical content knowledge that is at the heart of what the university can offer. Moreover, it is the work on developing this that, as Guerriero (2017) argues, can be a significant contribution to the world of research.

At the time of writing, the teacher educators were beginning to work on a new degree programme. This programme was being planned in the light of the recommendations of the Education Excellence Everywhere (DfE, 2016) white paper that schools become responsible for accrediting teachers against the professional standards. If this is to be the case, then this does afford university teacher education departments the opportunity to offer a very different experience for students, one in which criticality can be developed. Individual tutor specialist expertise and interests can be foregrounded. If they are not
required to ‘cover it all’ then they can focus on specific elements and what they do well, in order to offer students some rich possibilities. Thus, the changes can be used to benefit the students of the future and may lead to ways of teaching that are more in line with original values.

As a result of my studies, I have found that my own teaching has changed. I no longer see myself as a keeper of a reservoir of un-contested knowledge or as someone required to provide a series of fun activities that will engage my students and which they can transfer to their own classrooms. Instead, I find myself asking questions, encouraging students to talk about their own ideas and to reflect on their own experiences and thinking. I have realised that it is impossible to cover all aspects of my subject area within my teaching sessions. In the future, my aim will be to explore the key aspects of pedagogy around selected topics. This will offer the students a model to explore other topics and, hopefully, will deepen their pedagogical content knowledge and increase their ability to reflect critically about their own roles.

However, the teacher educators must still work within the opportunities and constraints afforded them by their leaders and managers. How they are led and managed also has an impact on how far they may be able to enact their values.

7.5.5 Implications for leadership and management

Though they recognised that the changes they had experienced were part of something bigger and more pervasive, the participants also offered insights and expressed opinions on the part played by their leaders and managers. They felt that there had been a lack of communication. This had led to them feeling distanced from what was going on, and to a lack of ownership and involvement in the changes. They were rendered as passive objects, used at will by those who held significant power within their institution.

Angela expressed a view that things could have been done differently. She claimed that:

If you don’t understand the changes are what they are for and nobody has helped you to perhaps recognise opportunities or how it might work or how this change might fit into something bigger, then it’s a big expectation that people might contribute positively to it.
She saw that providing information and explanations might have helped the people involved to feel more empowered and more actively involved. They would have felt both valued and trusted.

There was a belief that the next level above of leaders and managers were also being used themselves, to pass on messages from those at the most senior level and were, thus, equally dis-empowered. It may also be that, those ‘at the top’ in turn were subject to ever-higher discourses, so that it becomes increasingly difficult to determine the origins of the discourses. Nevertheless, Clandinin (2006) points out that all such discourses are human constructions and that these reside in all of us, we each have a part in constructing and sustaining these. Hence, we all have accountability at some level.

However, this accountability can be interpreted in various ways. Those at a senior level could have shared their plans and ensured that the views of all stakeholders were sought, as a mere cosmetic exercise to secure co-operation and, ultimately, compliance, apparently open communication thus being used to manipulate a response. Allowing the teacher educators’ involvement under such terms would have been dishonest, in implying that they had choices. Moreover, those involved may have come to believe that they did have some ownership when asked to offer their own views, even as they were aware of the fact that they were being manipulated by their leaders, ‘mis-recognition’ in Bourdieu’s terms, within this. In essence, this is dishonesty to and with oneself.

Providing a platform for people to speak out and to be listened to does not sit easily with the agendas integral to neoliberalism; the focus on performance and accountability leads to a particular kind of management. Creating a genuinely more democratic system within the large-scale structures of higher institutions may be difficult, but it appeared that there had been little attempt to try. Whilst many of the changes were not about transparent choices, but were rather part of the process of performativity recognised by other researchers such as Ball, there could have been a more open dialogue about what was happening so that there was no sense in which people felt ‘kept in the dark’. The power dynamic associated with this had created a climate of fear and anxiety. Instead, dilemmas
could have been shared and communication more open and respectful of colleagues. This would enable all those involved to figure their world and their place within it rather differently. What teacher educators do could be valued more openly. There can be few jobs with so much potential to influence a future generation of teachers and their students. At a more localised level, it may still be possible to return to the collegiate notions of practice that some participants recalled. An open recognition of the value of mutual support between colleagues and of the place that they can play in developing others, including those new to the academy, may pave the way for this. Participation in meetings could be facilitated rather than restricted by expediency and timetabling. Small changes can lead the way to bigger ones; things do not always have to be imposed from the top down but can be allowed to develop organically. Big and brave questions could be asked requiring individuals to step back and reflect, to ‘hover over’ what was happening. Holland et al (1998) assert that standing back can rupture the taken-for-granted and lead to commentary and recognition. This commentary and recognition can provide the seeds of change, in that they can create new cultural resources for meaning making (1998).

The ongoing studies that some of my participants were engaged in had enabled them to do this, but not all their colleagues were involved in such study. However, it is one thing to reflect on an issue within the confines of a discussion or a written assignment. It is entirely another to ‘put one’s head above the parapet’ and say these things to a wider audience. Hammersley- Fletcher (2015:198) had advocated that those involved in ITT continually question and re-evaluate what is happening in the world of education. Writing this thesis has been my own attempt to answer the powerful discourses operating within my context, and, in doing so, I have been able to exercise my professional agency. However, asking individuals to do this publicly may not be without risk in a culture of managerialism, where the future is uncertain. Publication of research can allow for this, but not all audiences will choose to access such research. Yet the ideas need to be shared if things are to change. The storytellers need to have a way of resourcing their personal agency in order to give them the confidence to share ideas and shape their worlds. So much depends on how those involved see, or story themselves, what identities they choose to develop within their context.
In some cases, the teacher educators had recognised things for what they were. Several mentioned the neoliberal agenda explicitly and the fact that they realised that what was going on was not unique to their own context but was part of something bigger. In recognising this, they were able to retain a modicum of local control as they worked on their projects of developing their identities in practice, fulfilling a professional role in which they could take pride. They talked a great deal about the prevailing discourses and of how these had attempted to position them. They addressed these and had resisted where they could, finding ways to be colleagues, teacher educators and managers in keeping with their own beliefs and history-in-person. They storied themselves as being able to draw upon a range of resources, including their own professional study and their relationships with their colleagues. Recognising this has enabled me to have a glimmer of hope, within what seemed a very dark and sad story. This notion that people will continue to struggle and to hold fast to what is important to them, however devalued they feel, gives some degree of optimism for the future.

7.6 Conclusion: contribution to knowledge and messages

In hindsight, what I had hoped for was some magical formula that would enable me to offer a view about how teacher educators, collectively, could manage the changes they encountered whilst retaining their sense of agency and identities. However, the changes had put them at risk of losing things that they held dear as they complied with the changes. Connelly and Clandinin (1999:10) claim that a particular danger in narrative is what they term the ‘Hollywood plot’, where everything works out well in the end. As with the use of the fairy tale metaphor, this now seems incredibly naïve. Underlying the romantic notion, I believe there was also, rather like Helen, a sense that I could somehow ‘fix’ this. Teachers are used to ‘fixing things’ be it a child who struggles with multiplication or an unruly class of pupils but this belies the complexities behind these features and creates a sense that those with whom we work are passive recipients of our professional largesse. In attempting to ‘fix’ we are denying these individuals a sense of agency, we are not recognising them as equals. Likewise, in any attempt to support individuals, one may be simply mediating them, oneself, from a position of power.
As discussed earlier in my thesis, knowledge is not something that can be neatly parcelled up and handed over to grateful recipients. The post-modern view of knowledge is that this is something that is contestable, never fixed, always developing and laden with values and ideologies. So, given this, what can I offer and how can my own story and those of my research participants help to contribute to continuing dialogue around the role and place of teacher educators and teacher education in the twenty first century, a time when it seems at its lowest ebb?

I have shown that values have changed and that people have recognised this to a lesser or greater degree. It is this process of re-valuing and de-valuing which had the greatest impact on identity in practice as my participants continued to story themselves within a changing world. Utilising my theoretical framework, I have indicated where and how agency has been expressed, whilst acknowledging how hard it can be to do this. I have shown how the framework of Figured Worlds can be applied to worlds in flux. Characters, resources and positions may be developed at a time of change. I have alluded to new possibilities in terms of teacher education and reflected on what this might look like, and how it might draw upon the past and present understandings of the nature of the role. The nature of this role is highly complex and worthy of rather more respect than it currently receives from government and institutions. I have told a story of a particular place and time that I believe reflects wider truths about what is happening in education and our society.

Clandinin (2006) points out that, as humans, we collectively create stories. We tell these stories to ourselves and to others to enable us all to see certain aspects more clearly. In this, then, lies hope, for, if we can see more clearly, we can see new possibilities and we can develop new plotlines and tell new stories. Stories can become new discourses, which have the potential to change ourselves and others, for all discourses arise in us, as a people. There are some rays of hope in the overall story. The new degree offers possibilities and, recently, some of our students have shown a surprising and rather moving willingness to question the status quo.

Wider changes may be afoot elsewhere. Donaldson (2011:4), reviewing teacher education in Scotland, asserted that:
The most successful education systems do more than seek to attain particular standards of competence and to achieve change through prescription. They invest in developing their teachers as reflective, accomplished and enquiring professionals who have the capacity to engage fully with the complexities of education and to be key actors in shaping and leading educational change.

Meanwhile, the BERA-RSA report proposes that, ‘Engagement in and with research becomes an everyday part of teachers’ professional identity and practice,’ (2014:21).

Recently, in response to issues including the poor retention rates for teachers, DfE documentation aimed to reduce teacher workload in terms of planning, marking, and the associated documentation, to more manageable levels. The claim is that this will allow teachers time to pay attention to the things that matter, but the accountability agenda with the emphasis on results belies this and teachers appear to be working just as hard.

Clandinin cites King (2003:92), portraying himself as a ‘hopeful pessimist’ who claimed ‘...we wrote knowing that none of the stories we told would change the world. But we wrote in the hope that they would.’ Clandinin (2006) writes of her own hopes that, ‘...narrative inquiry will help me to change the world, at least in a small way...’ I, too, write in the naive hope that this story will be a very small part of a next chapter in which we continue to ask how we go about the complex and complicated task of recognising the potential of our students and helping them to prepare for the challenges of their future. My own research has led me to understand the significance of values in a changing world. I have shown how these can be called into question. The changes in values proved to be the biggest challenge for my participants and I believe it is important that, however the neo-liberal discourses impinge, we still need to defend what we believe in about education. I think that all I can say is that I have tried to illuminate one small corner within a much wider context. I have tried to explain what the lived experience of a group of individuals is like and to describe their world from a particular view. There are other lenses; other researchers may approach the process differently or may discover different messages within the data. I have ended up with more questions than answers, but the questions are now different. It is the ability to continue to ask questions about one’s practice and field that marks the professional. I hope that my questions will be someone else’s starting point.
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9.1.2 Appendix two: Information for participants: newly appointed teacher educators

The focus of my doctorate is on how colleagues working in HE experience the changes that seem to be so much a feature of their working lives; are they able to mediate this change in some way or are they mediated by it?

As part of my study, I am looking to interview some of the colleagues who have only begun to work in HE relatively recently and I wondered whether you would consider being interviewed by me, in this capacity, please. The interview would take around 30 minutes and should be relatively informal. I would be asking about your previous experiences and how far you feel that these have prepared you for your new role, what you enjoy about this new role, what you perceive to be the challenges, and how far you feel that you are able to meet these. It may also be that I would ask if we could repeat these interviews, a little further on, to see if and how the things that concern you now have changed. I would be taping these interviews and would then be analysing these. I would, of course, not identify you, explicitly, in any writing up, in order to protect your confidentiality and you would be most welcome to have access to the audio recording and transcripts and to my final findings.

As we are colleagues, I realise that this is a big ask and would not want to compromise our working relationship in any way. Please do feel free to say if you do not wish to be involved, I know how busy you are anddevoting time to such things as this has to come way down the list of priorities.

Many thanks for giving this request some consideration.
9.1.3 Appendix three: Information for participants: experienced teacher educators

Information for participants: experienced academics

The focus of my doctorate is on how colleagues working in HE experience the changes that seem to be so much a feature of their working lives; are they able to mediate this change in some way or are they mediated by it? Teacher educators working in this institution have all experienced a considerable amount of change over the last 12 months, with new ways of working. There are now to be changes to the organisational structure and in the way that hours are allocated to take account of the RKE element of teacher educator roles.

As part of my study, I wondered whether you would consider being interviewed by me, please. The interview would take around 30 minutes and would be relatively informal. I would be asking about your experience of working at MMU and how you see your role as changing. I also would want to ask about what you perceive to be the opportunities and challenges, resulting from the changes and how far you feel that you are able to meet these. It may be that I would ask if we could repeat these interviews, a little further on, to see if and how the things that concern you now have changed. I would be taping these interviews and would then be analysing these. I would, of course, not identify you, explicitly, in any writing up, in order to protect your confidentiality and you would be most welcome to have access to my findings.

As we are colleagues, I realise that this is a big ask and would not want to compromise our working relationship in any way. Please do feel free to say if you do not wish to be involved, I know how busy you are and devoting time to such things as this has to come way down the list of priorities.

Many thanks for giving this request some consideration.
9.1.4 Appendix four: Participant consent form

Consent form:

Dear

You have kindly agreed to be interviewed, as part of my doctoral research, looking at how academics adapt to changes in their working environments. An audiotape recording will be made of this interview and this will be transcribed later. You are welcome to listen to this recording or to read the transcripts to review what was said, at any stage of the project.

Should extracts from this recording or transcript be used in the final thesis, you are also welcome to view the relevant section. Every effort will be taken to ensure that your confidentiality is protected, including the removal of any reference to your particular department or subject discipline that may identify you. All names will be removed from the transcripts.

If, at any point, you decide that you do not wish any extracts from the recordings or transcripts to be used, then please let me know. If you choose to withdraw then all data collected from you will be destroyed.

Throughout the duration of the project, the recording device and any paper material will be kept in a secure manner. At the end of the project, any hard copy of the transcripts and associated materials will be destroyed and the audio-recordings deleted.

If you accept these conditions, please could you add your signature and the date below.

Many thanks.

Participant signature

Researcher signature

Date
9.1.5 Appendix five: Questions for semi-structured interview number one (new teacher educators)

New academics: Interview questions

Name                                      Date

What was your role prior to coming to MMU?

What made you decide to apply to work at MMU?

Does the experience of working here differ from what you initially expected? If so, how?

What do you enjoy about your current role?

What were the challenges when you began to work in your current role?

What, if anything, helped you, during your first term?

What advice would you give to new academics in the future?

How do you see your current role developing?

What further challenges do you anticipate?

Is there anything else that has not been covered by these questions that you want to discuss?

Many thanks
9.1.6 Appendix six: Questions for Semi-structured interview number one (experienced teacher educators)

Established Academics – Interview questions

Name
Date

What did you do prior to coming to MMU?

What was your role when you first came to work at MMU?

What is your current role / area of responsibility?

How did these changes come about?

What factors supported you in developing these roles?

Were there any barriers to this process?

How have you changed, within this?

How have you managed these?

What challenges do you anticipate in the short and longer term?

How do you see yourself developing in the future?

Is there anything that you wanted to talk about that has not been covered by these questions?

Many thanks
Appendix seven: Questions for interview two

Second round of interviews: questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It’s been about twelve months since we last met and you have kindly agreed to be interviewed again. So, what has the last twelve months been like for you, in your role?

Has the management re-structure had any impact on your role? If so, what kind of impact has there been?

What kinds of things have you been doing for your research or knowledge exchange work?

In terms of the next year, looking forward now, are there other challenges that you can see coming up in the next academic year, either for yourself or for the faculty?

Many thanks for all this. Is there anything else that you wanted to say or talk about that we have not really covered?