A study on the changing role of the mentor in school-led initial teacher education.

Georgia Louise Hindle

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Manchester Metropolitan University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Education

Education and Social Research Institute

Manchester Metropolitan University

2020

Abstract

This research investigates the school-based mentor's (SBM) role following the shift towards practical, school-led initial teacher education (ITE). It contributes to an understanding of how SBMs are positioned as facilitators of adult learning within a diversified landscape of ITE. This study identifies how mentoring practices are translated within a newly diversified school-led system, considers how teacher professionalism is affected and the status of teaching in the professional sphere as schools have been afforded greater autonomy. Using mentoring as a practice-based model of professional learning, this study draws upon three key theoretical concepts to examine mentor practice - legitimate peripheral participation, professional practice knowledge and 'third space' (Lave and Wenger 1991, Kemmis et al. 2014a, Heikkinen et al. 2018a, Bhabha 1994.) School-university ITE partnerships are explored with consideration given to communication, inclusivity, and collaborative work.

This study uses a qualitative, semi-ethnographic research design to focus on the SBM's role and responsibilities as outlined in programme policy, alongside participant perspectives. Using an interpretivist approach, this research explores school and ITE programme culture, reflects participant knowledge and builds on observations over the course of an academic year. It considers SBM authority within this context and their influence over programme design, content, and implementation.

This study shows that mentor practice and school-led ITE stakeholder relationships can vary. Opportunities for collaboration within school-university partnerships are subject to the participant's role and status. The development of school-led ITE has created uncertainty surrounding the re-making of teacher professionalism(s). This study considers what forms of professionalism are produced within this setting and how this affects mentoring practice and novice teacher development. Despite the ITE policy trajectory towards schools-led ITE in England, this study found that not all school-based teacher educators experience the contextual conditions that would equip them well to contribute and lead ITE at school level.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisory team, Professor Moira Hulme and Dr Harriet Rowley. Their diligence, attention to detail and general approachability have been exceptional. From the start they have demonstrated a genuine interest and enthusiasm about my research and having the opportunity to be mentored and guided by Moira and Harriet has kept me motivated and inspired. Thank you.

I would also like to thank this study's participants for their honesty, interest in my work and commitment to their roles and the development of ITE.

I remain forever grateful to my family, friends, the IBWs and Paul. Some were proof-readers, some simply there when I needed them most. They have been a constant source of support and love. They have also weathered the many storms that this thesis has brought to their lives! Without them, this research study would not have been completed.

Dedication

For my Popsi, who continually supported us, devoted his time to us and believed in us. Thank you for everything. I wish you were here to see this.

Contents

List of abbreviations

BERA	British Education Research Association
CATE	Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
DfE	Department for Education
EAL	English as an Additional Language
G and T	Gifted and Talented
GTP	Graduate Teacher Programme
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectors
INSET	In-Service Training Day
ITE	Initial Teacher Education
ITT	Initial Teacher Training
LEA	Local Education Authority
LPP	Legitimate Peripheral Participation
MAT	Multi-Academy Trust
NCTL	National College for Teaching and Leadership
NLE	National Leader of Education
NQT	Newly Qualified Teacher
NT	Novice Teacher
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
PCK	Pedagogical Content Knowledge
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
PGDE	Professional Graduate Diploma in Education
PM	Professional Mentor
PP	Pupil Premium
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status
RQs	Research Questions
SB ITE	School-Based Initial Teacher Education
SBM	School-Based Mentor

SBTE	School-Based Teacher Educators
SCITT	School-Centred Initial Teacher Training
SD	School Direct
SEND	Special Educational Needs and Disability
SLE	Specialist Leader of Education
SLT	Senior Leadership Team
TF	Teach First
TS	Teacher Standards'
TSA	Teaching School Alliance
UT	University Tutor

List of tables

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 The school-based mentor in the 'practicum turn'

The primary purpose of this qualitative study is to establish how the role of the mentor has changed in the move towards school-led initial teacher education (ITE), following the 'practicum turn' (Mattsson, Eilertsen and Rorrison 2011, Van de Ven 2011). As will be explored, this role has altered considerably in the English policy context following the shift to practical, school-based learning and training in ITE in the last decade. My interest is rooted in the potential impact of the school-based mentor (SBM) on the novice teacher (NT) and the mentoring relationship within school-led ITE programmes, wherein mentors are viewed as the main source of support for professional learning within the school setting. I explore how school-led ITE partnerships function and consider the communication and collaborative work of schools and universities that are engaged in partnership work. I consider how the extent of collaboration and cross-institutional work can affect participants' sense of professionalism and self-efficacy.

1.1.1 Background of this study

For many of those in favour of school-led initial teacher education (ITE), it is accepted that the (education) field is 'broken' (Kronholz 2012) in terms of university involvement with ITE and a more practical, contextualised approach is welcome.

Educationalists have noted that since the early 1980s, English education policy has adapted and changed to emphasise and focus on practical training, with more time spent within the school setting (McNamara and Murray 2013, Furlong et al. 2000). This is largely underpinned by the belief that teaching is predominantly a practical vocation, which requires a specific skillset and increased time in schools to hone and develop these skills (Gale and Parker 2017). This discourse emphasises compliance with and regulation of a predominantly practical, relevant and school-led ITE curriculum and assessment framework (Brown 2017, McNamara and Murray 2013, Beauchamp et al. 2015, Brown and McNamara 2011, Brown and McNamara 2005).

Within this study, I identify how mentoring practices are translated within a newly diversified school-led system. A key theoretical concept relating to this research

topic is that of teacher professionalism and the impact of the 'practicum turn' on teacher education and the status of teaching in the professional sphere as schools have been afforded greater autonomy (Mattsson, Eilertsen and Rorrison 2011, Burn and Mutton 2015, Douglas 2015, Zeichner 2006, Hagger and McIntyre 2006, Fletcher and Mullen 2012, Jaspers et al. 2014, Kemmis et al. 2014a). This shift towards practical-led ITE affects the role of the mentor considerably (Korthagen et al. 2010, Jaspers et al. 2014). Within this new landscape, the mentor role is enhanced significantly as a leader, support system, guide and 'expert' (Douglas 2017, Douglas 2015).

I am interested in the role of the SBM in the professional formation of the novice teacher (NT) during their training year. This includes exploring the SBM's professional identity and mentoring as a model of professional learning. Hobson et al. (2009) argue that mentoring is a contested practice with the mentor's needs and professional knowledge requiring further study, which should take precedence when educating novice teachers (NT) and formulating policy. Development of school-based ITE (SB ITE) and mentor activity creates uncertainty surrounding the re-making of professionalism(s) within teacher education (Whitty 2014, Whitty 2006, Ball and Bass 2000, Bereiter and Scardamalia 1993, Darling-Hammond and Bransford 2007, Crawford 2007). This study considers what form of professionalism is produced within this setting and how this affects SBM practice, NT development and the ITE landscape.

1.2 My interest and topic choice

I come to this study as a former novice teacher who took part in a school-led ITE programme (Teach First) in 2012. My experience was extremely positive as my SBM, university tutor and professional mentor communicated regularly to ensure I achieved Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and developed professionally, within a specific school context. I then became a mentor on a school-led ITE programme and developed an interest in the SBM's responsibility, their impact on NT's development and how collaborative work with higher education institutions (HEIs) can improve SBM and NT practice.

Within this study I explore these ideas and position myself as a researcher, who was a former teacher and mentor. My experience is intertwined with my interest in this topic as I am passionate about education and exploring the quality, consistency and variability within ITE that could be indirectly impacting on the current teacher under-recruitment and high attrition rate of teaching staff that England is experiencing (Britton, Farquharson and Sibieta 2019, Chowdry and Sibieta 2011, Allen et al. 2016). My research is particularly relevant in the current climate of ITE, with the abundance of provision that is emerging within a diverse, marketised landscape.

1.3 Aims and research questions

This aim of this investigation is to contribute to an understanding of how school-based mentors are positioned as facilitators of adult learning within a diversified landscape of teacher education.

My research questions (RQs) are as follows:

1) How does the 'practicum turn' affect the role of the school-based mentor?

2) How do the concepts of professionalism and mentoring practices differ between settings?

3) What are the contextual conditions that create and support school-HEI initial teacher education partnerships?

RQ1 considers how the move towards practical, school-led ITE has affected the SBM's responsibilities, including any wider professional roles that they have within school. I reflect on how these responsibilities can affect the capacity of the SBM, who is considered the main source of support for an NT.

RQ2 focuses on the different approaches to the concept of professionalism. I consider how mentoring practices differ between the two schools and three school-led ITE pathways included in this research through observing, reviewing and comparing their practices and foci. This question looks at how an SBM's professional status is constructed and whether SBMs have increased or restricted autonomy within the school-led field of ITE.

RQ3 examines the partnership between SBMs and university partners, and to what extent collaborative learning is facilitated when constructing and administering school-led ITE programmes. I consider what this might suggest about the SBM's knowledge of mentoring practice, their understanding of the role and the impact on NT development. This question also explores the nature and diversity of school-HEI partnerships, specifically who has authority within these and whose knowledge is favoured when creating, designing, and administering school-led ITE programmes.

1.4 Methodology

This investigation takes the form of a qualitative, quasi-ethnographic study. This design suited my prolonged study which explores school and ITE programme culture, reflects participant knowledge and builds on the observation of people in naturally occurring settings (Creswell and Poth 2017, Hudson and Ozanne 1988, Carson et al. 2001, Shankar and Goulding 2001, Tadajewski 2006, Cova and Elliott 2008). I adopted an interpretivist approach, as participants articulated their viewpoints and shared their knowledge which is socially constructed and based on their version of reality (Hudson and Ozanne 1988, Gummesson 2000, Carson et al. 2001).

The fieldwork was conducted between September 2017-June 2018 across two different sites: one independent school and one academy in the North West of England. Three different school-led ITE programmes feature in this study and participants include seven SBMs, seven NTs, two professional mentors (PMs), four university tutors (UTs) and three school senior leaders (SLT). I integrated myself into the school community as a non-participant observer and collected over 350 hours of data. My methods included: semi-structured interviews, observations of mentor meetings/feedback sessions, school and ITE policy documentation and fieldnotes. The time dedicated to each school site and mentor pairing was key in addressing RQ2 and RQ3 and capturing school-HEI and mentor partnerships as they developed over time. Equally, it was important for me to observe a multitude of lesson observations, feedback sessions, mentor meetings and faculty briefings. This allowed me to gather sufficient data on mentor practice, responsibility, professional knowledge and capacity over the course of one full academic year.

My sample is distinctive as it gives an insight into the role of SBMs working with new teachers who are receiving a salary whilst learning to teach at their employing school. This is in contrast to other studies (Mincu and Davies 2017, Manning and Hobson 2017 and Cajkler and Wood 2016) which also explored mentor relationships and perspectives of mentoring, but which focussed on student teachers undertaking school placements. Five NTs were employed by Schools 1 and 2 on a newly qualified teacher (NQT) salary. The other two NTs were on a non-salaried programme and paid standard university tuition fees.

Throughout the study I considered my positionality and the ethical implications of undertaking research on professional formation in schools. My previous role as a teacher and SBM guided my area of interest and choice of research topic. My teaching experience allowed me to use reflexivity as a tool to build on my previous knowledge and further my understanding of the field (Attia and Edge 2017, Sandywell 2013). However, I aimed to distance myself and reduce threats to validity through using unfamiliar school settings and participants with whom I had no connection (Ratner 2002). I also consciously worked to consider participants individually and be dispassionate in my communications.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

My thesis is structured to iteratively address the core themes of mentorship, professionalism, partnership, communication and SBM preparation.

Chapter Two outlines the English policy context of ITE, explores the marketised landscape, and discusses school and government control over ITE. It considers how ITE policy from 2011 (DfE 2010) promoted a market for initial teacher preparation and led to the introduction of a range of routes into teaching, thus repositioning the role of the mentor, and all those involved in ITE provision (Mutton, Burn and Menter 2017, Rayner, Courtney and Gunter 2018, Apple 2005). Within this context, education providers have jurisdiction over their operations and can choose to deliver their own form of ITE- as an alternative to HEI-led provision- within a strong external regulatory framework.

Chapter Two also explores teacher professionalism and how this has been changed since the shift to practical-based ITE (Evetts 2008, Whitty 2014, Zeichner, Payne and Brayko 2015, Katz and Rose 2013). Within this chapter I investigate the concept of teaching as an occupation or apprenticeship, wherein teaching becomes the practice of knowledge- based skill and reflective practice, rather than being rooted in theoretical expertise and knowledge (Evetts 2008, Salvio and Boldt 2009, Gewirtz et al. 2009, Wilkins 2009, McNamara and Murray 2013, Mutton et al. 2017, Hagger and McIntyre 2006).

RQ1 and RQ2 investigate the SBM role and practice, and so Chapter Three defines and explores the multi-faceted nature of mentorship. I explore key theoretical concepts in different approaches to mentoring as a professional model of learning in order to explore varied mentorship within my study. I draw upon Lave and Wenger's (1991) model of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) as a way for NTs to assimilate into a school community and develop professionally, but also acknowledge its limitations.

I explore the 'doings, saying and relatings' model of mentorship that is committed to developing NT 'professional practice knowledge' (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Kemmis and Smith 2008, Kemmis et al. 2014b, Heikkinen et al. 2018a). Within these, mentoring is a social practice wherein NTs observe and reproduce SBM practice, thus transforming their own disposition.

The investigation also draws on Bhabha's (1994) version of 'third space' as a tool to examine how SBMs might contribute their expertise to ITE provision through productive partnerships in an open place of 'hybridity'. This concept involves a sense of levelling (Oldenburg 2001) that, if achieved, can create collaborative dialogues that help to shape the direction of school-led ITE. I explore this concept fully in Chapter sections 3.4 and 3.4.1 and consider the theory's limitations and the challenges of 'transforming' the ITE field (Zeichner et al. 2015) through the notion of 'horizontal expertise' (Kerosuo and Engeström 2003). Crucially, I acknowledge that collaboration can only occur if SBMs are invited to share their knowledge through regular communication with ITE partners. 'Third space' theory is utilised throughout my thesis to consider how professionalism and mentoring pratices may differ

between school-led ITE programmes. This also enables me to contemplate how partnerships and cross-institutional relationships can affect these practices.

My examination of 'third space' theory and collaboration in practice draws on international examples of ITE. As the move to practical-led ITE is evident across different countries, different approaches to this have different historical bases and represent different views on how professional practice is best nurtured (Eilertsen and Strom 2008, Haugaløkken and Ramberg 2005, Kvale, Nilsson and Retzlaff 2000, Lave and Wenger 1991, Lindstrom 2008, Ponte 2007, Van de Ven 2011, Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002, Mattsson 2008a, Eraut 1994, Eraut 2007, Eraut 2009, Mattsson 2008b). Whilst exploring various Nordic approaches to ITE and contrasting these with the Anglo-American marketised model, I note markedly different approaches to partnership and the utilisation of 'third space'.

Chapter Four outlines my methodology and how I conducted my study to address my research questions. I present my methodological framework, how I considered site selection and explain the logistics of collecting data across two school sites over the course of the academic year. I also attend to my analysis strategy and coding framework which developed over the course of the study. Finally, I explain my data collection methods and how I considered ethical issues, participant welfare, positionality and reflexivity.

Chapter Five addresses RQ3 as it explores data relating to the themes of relationships and communication including ITE programme design, collaborative working and how communication is shared between partners. I explore the relationships between participants and data that illustrates the effect of a negative mentor-mentee relationship on the NT's personal and professional development. This advances my understanding of RQ2 and varying forms of professionalism and mentorship. I analyse data that focusses on branded, localised forms of professionalism emerging from school-led ITE programmes, mentor practice and senior leaders (Whitty 2014, 2006).

In Chapter Six, I explore data relating to the SBM role, responsibility and their level of accountability, which further addresses RQ1. I also focus on RQ3 and issues

surrounding partnership and communication through exploring SBM power and influence over ITE. Finally, I investigate data relating to the challenges regarding SBM time, capacity and their varying levels of commitment.

Chapter Seven presents the study's findings, focussing specifically on the role of the SBM, varied mentor practice and how partnerships exist between institutions. I analyse stakeholder relationships, the working conditions that exist to achieve collaborative work and how these ideas affect SBM and NT development. I discuss three key themes here. First, I consider who is involved in school-HEI partnerships and how they function. Second, I analyse the fragmentation of ITE and the new models of professional learning that emerge from school-HEI partnerships. The third theme focuses on SBM involvement and authority within school-led ITE. I explore how not all school-based educators have authority and influence within this context, despite the English ITE policy discourse trajectory towards school control.

Finally, Chapter Eight presents this study's conclusions. I recognise the preferred practice-based model of mentoring of the SBMs and consider how mentorship is conducted across the sites and experienced by participants in this study. I evaluate how the theoretical ideas of professional practice knowledge and mimicry through the model of doings, sayings and relating were utilised by SBMs (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Heikkinen et al. 2018a) and then explore how localised forms of professionalism can affect NT development and ability to diversify and develop professionally. With the mentor's role as an 'expert' varying between ITE programmes, a further conclusion of this study relates to the concept of partnership. I review which partners utilise third space as a tool to collaboratively develop ITE within this study, and which are excluded from this conversation. I conclude that the concepts of levelling and hybridity do not apply to all within this study, thus reducing SBM authority and influence. I consider the conditions that stakeholders should facilitate for the SBMs status to 'level' that of a programme leader/manager and for their opinions to be valued.

The concluding chapter addresses the study's limitations and puts forward recommendations for future studies including different methodological approaches, sample size and length of study. I suggest that there is a need to examine what is

meant by partnership in school-HEI collaborations, and if there is a shared understanding and common goal between partners. The discourse of policy makers, programme coordinators and senior leaders are highlighted as crucial to the development of mentorship and its perception across the ITE landscape. For SBMs to become full 'partners' within ITE, I argue that senior leaders, programme managers and university teacher educators must value the role, contribution and status of the mentor as an 'on the ground expert'.

My recommendations for future studies include focussing on new teacher development through the early career phase (i.e. the first years of practice) to continue to assess the expectations, realities and impact of the SBM role. When regarding the possibilities for future research projects leading on from my research, I recommend investigations into cost-effective forms of mentor learning and projects that review the SBM's status and role from a leadership perspective.

1.6 Contribution to knowledge

1.6.1 Empirical contribution

This study is particularly relevant in the climate of ITE in England as it stands in 2020, with the expansion of school-led ITE providers within a diverse and marketised landscape. I focus on the role of the school-based mentor, including their perspective on and experiences of school-led ITE, the partnerships they form with university-based mentors and their involvement in the planning and delivery of ITE programmes. This study offers an in-depth exploration of the nature and diversity of school-HEI partnerships in two schools in North West England, including assessing where power sits within these partnerships and whose professional knowledge is favoured when designing and administering school-led ITE programmes. I also consider whether professionalism is being redefined by these programmes and SBM practices.

My contribution to the field is distinctive through its focus on the role of the SBM, its critical examination of emerging forms of local professionalism and exploration of school-HEI partnerships providing school-led ITE. This is a significant contribution in comparison to other studies which have focussed specifically on research-informed

practice in ITE (Cain 2019), and national policy surrounding ITE and NT learning (Murray, Swennen and Kosnik 2019). Although there is current research on the impact and challenges of school-led ITE on university-led teacher education (Mutton et al. 2017, Brown et al. 2015, Brown 2016) these focus mainly on NTs completing university-led ITE courses of university-based participants. These cited studies do not include NTs on school-based ITE programmes who are employed by the school and viewed as staff members. This differs to my research which was school-based and only included university staff when visiting the school as a UT. My study specifically focuses on the impact of school-led ITE on the SBM and how their practice can vary, thus affecting NT development and potentially the quality of ITE. It is significant as I consider the position of employed NTs who are learning to teach as colleagues within the school community. Also, the Brown et al. study was conducted upon the introduction of SD. My study is distinctive because school-led ITE is now at a different level of maturity from the time of Brown's (2015, 2016) work and focuses on three different school-led ITE programmes in the context of a marketised landscape with a number of ITE providers.

This study contributes to the field of teacher education, exploring the dynamics of collaboration between ITE partners and the development of specific forms of teacher professionalism within school-led ITE. This involves critical consideration of the concept of professionalism that emerges within different settings and programmes, and how recalibrated partnerships between institutions support novice teacher development. My contribution to knowledge is characterised through my in-depth analysis of communication between school-HEI partners, generated over an academic year.

Several studies have analysed the design of ITE programmes, school-HEI partnerships, underdeveloped ITE relationships and how mentors view their role (Mincu and Davies 2019, Pieser et al. 2019, Struthers 2017, Herbert et al. 2018). Pieser et al.'s (2019) study speaks to my own as findings suggest mentors were restricted to supporting and monitoring roles, rather than as assessors or teacher educators. However, their study focussed on SBMs who were supporting NTs on university-led ITE programmes. My study offers a range of stakeholder perspectives

regarding school-led ITE and involves observing school-based mentor practices as I consider the SBM's role and responsibility in developing NT professional knowledge and practice within the context of school-led ITE.

Although they also explored ITE partnerships, communications, and mentor responsibilities, Mincu and Davies' (2019) study was largely interested in a school-centred initial teacher training (SCITT) programme and management, rather than the SBM directly. Equally, Struthers (2017) and Herbert et al.'s (2018) studies focussed on the nature of school-HEI partnerships, how these can be strengthened and who holds jurisdiction over practical-based ITE provision. In contrast to their focus on partnership sustainability, my research considers the contextual conditions that create and support school-HEI ITE partnerships. My study also attends closely to the issue of how partnerships might be recalibrated within the ITE sphere to produce collaborative work. I examine to what extent different partners design and manage ITE programmes that encourage growth in NT professional practice and knowledge, thereby preparing them for their future careers. My analysis provides insight into an area that is under active development as I consider the SBM's role in developing NT professional knowledge within school-HEI ITE partnerships, their influence and where their responsibility sits.

Other studies have considered ITE relationships and varied provision within school-led ITE but focus specifically on the NT's perceptions of their training programmes and the impact of professional practice on their development (George and Maguire 2019, Waitoller and Artiles 2016). Like my own, these studies focussed on the school-HEI relationship, tensions around who is the programmes 'lead' and which demands should be paramount. However, this research is partial as both studies focus on NT perceptions but do not include SBMs as participants. Considering SBMs are an important part of the school-HEI partnership, their perspective is vital. As I include SBMs, PMs and UTs, my study presents a more realistic and accurate view of the nature of this partnership, as explored by the partners themselves.

Unlike the studies outlined above, my research looks at the dynamics of the school-HEI partnership and explores the collaborative working that takes place within these. My contribution is important to the field as it explores the design and

management of school-led ITE within an academy and independent school. It considers how collaborative working and different perspectives are utilised to enable the development of professional practice and knowledge. I include participants that are undertaking or contributing to school-led ITE directly, with a focus on the SBM.

1.6.2 Methodological contribution

As a full-time researcher, my semi-ethnographic approach was distinctive as I immersed myself into school communities over an academic year, learning about the participants in depth and exploring relationships between stakeholders. While other studies exist within this space and focus on students during their training years, such as Brown, Rowley and Smith's (2015) School Direct (SD) research project, they do not offer a similar depth of engagement over time. The study by Brown et al. (2015) comprised of over one hundred and twenty hour-long interviews with university-based educators, SBMS and NTs involved with the SD programme. This was a large-scale project as the data sources spanned twenty university and twelve SD partner schools. Consequently, the researchers were not immersed in the various contexts and conducted only two interviews per participant at the start and end of the study.

Similarly, although relating to mentee and mentor perspectives of mentorship, Pieser et al. (2019) and Manning and Hobson's (2017) studies had limitations to their methods as both were based on data collected from surveys and had limited researcher interaction with participants. This method of data collection has its drawbacks as there is no opportunity to explore participant responses through further questioning or to observe the practices they describe. Surveys are inflexible and, unlike my study, do not afford the researcher the opportunity to shift or alter their focus depending on a participant response. My research involves observing mentor practices and engaging in communication in a quasi-ethnographic style. To this end, my approach and use of mixed methods allowed for more depth of data.

My study's design and methodological approach contrasts with other studies in terms of the data collection periods (Mincu and Davies 2019, Cajkler and Wood 2016). The cited studies collected data over a 2-5 month period, and included single

interviews with NTs, mentors and senior managers. My study is broader in terms of its data collection period, regularity of site visits and observations. As a full-time, semi-resident researcher, I collected data over the course of an academic year. Within this novel position, I was able to assimilate into communities and learn further about the intricacies of SBM practice, knowledge and school-HEI partnerships. The frequency of my communications with SBMs and NTs is distinctive as I was present at mentor meetings, feedback sessions and faculty briefings at least once a week for every mentor pairing. This allowed for a more immersive approach to fieldwork wherein I fully explored participant perspectives and observed mentor practice and school-HEI partnerships over an academic year, thus gaining depth of insight.

Due to the longevity of my research, I was able to consider the impact of the 'practicum turn' and SB ITE on the SBM in greater depth. I became mindful of SBM attitudes towards these programmes and observed how their level of involvement with ITE affected their sense of value and authority over time.

1.6.3 Theoretical contribution

This study makes an interesting contribution to the use of theory in research on teacher education. A key aim of this study was to interlink critical policy analysis with key conceptual tools. I used my examination of the marketisation of ITE in England to consider how 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) theory can be utilised by partners within school-led ITE. My analysis of the prominence of the SBM role in ITE policy discourse (Carter 2015, DfE 2018b and DfE 2019d) further informs how partnerships are established within school-led ITE. I draw upon 'third space' theory to consider how school-HEI partners participating in this study establish new, or already known, ways of working between stakeholders, and if this transforms pre-existing relationships.

My focus on how collaboration can, but does not always, occur between institutions makes a valuable contribution to the field. This is different to Williams et al. (2018) study which is predicated on the assumption that 'third space' theory is functional in the school-HEI partnership. In contrast, my study aims to ascertain the nature of school-HEI partnerships and determine if a model utilising 'third space' exists within

this context. Furthermore, Williams et al.'s (2018) study is written from the perspective of HEI-based teacher educators. My study's participants include HEI and school-based educators, thereby allowing me to explore all partners' viewpoints regarding the nature of collaborative working.

Although some studies also explore teaching practice, student learning and collaboration between educational practitioners, they focus on utilising 'third space' to enable new forms of education (McDougall and Potter 2019, Jang and Kang 2019, Potter and McDougall 2017, Schuck et al. 2017). In contrast, my study uses 'third space' theory as a conceptual tool to understand mentoring, cooperation, and collaboration between ITE partners.

McIntyre and Hobson's (2016) study examines partnerships that could be developed within the 'third space' with subject specialists who are not based in the school. In contrast, my study is important in its examination of SBM, HEI and NT partnerships that exist. It considers how the strength of the partnership can be positively or negatively affected, with a focus specifically on the SBM, unlike the studies mentioned above.

1.7 Summary

This study engages with key debates surrounding the SBM role following the move to school-led ITE including: responsibilisation, marketisation of the sector, partnerships, communication, mentorship, models of professional learning, authority and the influence of mentors within the school-led ITE field.

As a former teacher, school-based mentor and in my current position as an education researcher, I believe that these issues are key to the development and retention of our national teaching workforce. In this study I explore the importance of the SBM's role, support, advice and guidance in an NTs formative year as a teacher. If not prepared fully for a broad range of contexts, classroom challenges and student needs, an NT may be reluctant or feel ill-equipped to stay in the profession. Thus, as the main support for an NT on their journey to qualified teacher status (QTS), the role of the mentor in school-led ITE cannot be underplayed or undervalued.

Chapter 2. A critical review of the English initial teacher education policy context

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will look at the development of the current marketised landscape of ITE which, through heightened school control, led to the increased responsibility of SBMs in school-led ITE provision. I consider the process of market making in ITE and how this affects teacher professionalism in England. I also reflect on how increased school-level responsibility for recruitment and delivery have influenced ITE pathways. ITE policy from 2011 (DfE 2010) repositioned the role of the SBM, and all actors involved in the process, drastically through the promotion of a market for initial teacher preparation and the introduction of a range of routes into teaching, with the introduction of School Direct (Apple 2005, Mutton et al. 2017, Rayner et al. 2018).

The school-led routes extend responsibility for ITE delivery to affiliated schools, rather than traditional HEI-led courses, although this is still heavily regulated by the DfE. These routes are often salaried and involve the NT being employed by the school they are training in, although non-salaried pathways exist wherein NTs pay HEI tuition fees. These are alternative routes to the Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Arts/Science and the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) teacher training degree pathways which award QTS, incur tuition fees and were previously the most common routes to becoming a teacher in England. Practical, school-based routes previously existed with English ITE provision, such as the 1998 Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) (DfEE 1998). This ITE programme allowed schools to appoint NTs and train them within their schools. However, this route was criticised for its recruitment, training and accessibility (DfE 2012) and was replaced by School Direct in 2012.

Chapter Two considers how the shift to practical ITE has affected school-based teacher educators. Schools feel a level of pressure and accountability as they are responsible for an NT's progress and success in their journey to QTS. Through examining how policy has repositioned the SBM through a process of devolution of

control to school level, the literature review begins to address RQ1. It analyses how policy direction and the growing fragmentation of the school system and ITE landscape affects the roles SBMs and UTs play in ITE. This addresses RQ2 and RQ3 concerning differences in mentorship, professionalism and the partnerships that exist within a space where control has shifted from HEIs to schools. As I consider school control over ITE and their right to personalise the programme to suit their priorities, I explore if/how professionalism is being redefined within the field.

2.2 The marketisation and growing fragmentation of initial teacher education

To consider the effect of the 'practicum turn' on the role of the SBM, and how mentoring practices and partnerships differ between pathways, it is crucial to explore how marketisation was initially envisaged and implemented into policy. The move towards government endorsement of school-based mentoring in England can be traced back to the 1972 James Report, which suggested that schools should deliver in-service training as that is where professional learning takes place, techniques are developed and deficiencies are revealed (HMSO 1972). Conservative ideology of the 1980s sought to combat the putative free reign of universities, teachers and local education authorities (LEAs) through the establishment of the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) in 1984, alongside increased state control over curricula and subject content. The questions and unease from the government regarding the nature and quality of teachers' work led inevitably to tensions in their management and control, which focussed attention on teacher selection recruitment and training (McNamara, Murray and Jones 2014b). Steerage of the school system through market mechanisms was paralleled in ITE, affecting universities, schools and mentors who needed to meet government criteria. The origins of CATE are linked to a number of contextual factors including diminishing resources and growing concern with competition and effectiveness in schools (Ginsburg 1997:30). The establishment of CATE can be traced back to inspection visits of schools that led to a report of Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) on the efficacy of teacher training as judged by assessment of the performance of NQTs (Ginsburg and Lindsay 2004).

The CATE wanted to open up teacher education to the 'realities of the market', with the aim of insisting that ITE appropriately related to the real world of school (Furlong et al. 2000). The CATE increased government control as it assessed all ITE courses against nationally defined requirements and recommended whether they should receive accreditation to award QTS (Whitty et al. 2016). This control was furthered as HMI, the government regulatory body which later became Ofsted, were charged with reporting to CATE on the quality of provision and expanded this role over 30 years. The process of accreditation for teacher education required institutions to conform to criteria on course content and manner of delivery. As only CATE-accredited courses conferred the license to teach (QTS), the government held complete control over ITE courses, with all assessors reporting back to the government and regular inspections taking place. Additionally, the professional responsibility of the teaching body was diminished through the abolishment of the School Council in 1984 that reduced the influence of teachers in curriculum development (Gillard 2011). Not only was the government in control of who delivered ITE courses, but through CATE, inspections could be carried out to quality assure and compare success rates of different providers. Following this, the 1988 Education Reform Act (HMSO 1988) altered the education landscape considerably; it took the first steps towards shifting power over education from the local education authority (LEA) to the market through the introduction of new school types (City Technology Colleges and grant-maintained schools) and through the introduction of school performance tables (Gillard 2011).

Policy changes by the 1980s Conservative administrations challenged who held expertise in preparing new teachers (Furlong et al. 2000). This was an evolutionary period through its focus on professional knowledge (Clarke, Gewirtz and McLaughlin 2000). Conservative education policy sought to establish definitions of expert knowledge, alongside freedom of choice among consumers of education services (Jones 2016, Gillard 2011). This surveillance was justified by a high level of mistrust towards public schools, teachers, teacher unions, the curriculum and teacher education programmes (Hargreaves and Lo 2000, Tröhler 2017, Apple 2016). Democracy in education was reduced to consumer choice in an emerging

competitive market (Whitty, Power and Halpin 1998, Jones 2016, Ginsburg and Lindsay 2004). The Conservative move to licensed autonomy indicates that teacher autonomy has been reduced by school reforms and restructuring. This creates a structure that distributes power to the central state (DfE) school governors, headteachers and consumers within the school market. This includes 'customers' (students and parents) at the expense of teacher autonomy, thus emphasising the influence of market logic (Ellis 2019, Knight 2017).

In line with the move towards marketisation, many leaders and organisations favoured new public management (NPM); a specific approach to running public service organisations, containing insights from law and the discipline of economics (Lane 2000). NPM exists in ITE where there is a contract between two private partners (a school/MAT/academy and a HEI), with the government acting as the guarantor (Lane 2002). The government oversees agreements and ensures compliance to funding agreements, thus revealing a new attitude to public governance through utlilising a managerial approach and style of contractualism (Lane 2000). NPM was endorsed across the public sector, with institutions responsible for their own success in a competitive environment. Achievement in this sphere was determined by consumer demand and levels of enrolment for NTs beginning a teaching career. School governance was measured by a government approved success criteria through the HMI reporting system which measured progress and outcomes based on educational attainment and Ofsted reports.

Financial autonomy was coupled with heavy regulation, Ofsted inspections and school performance league tables. Such moves led to much inter-institutional competition (Jones 2016, Gewirtz 2003, Gewirtz et al. 2019). Critics were wary of this system of market managerialism that interweaved market arrangements and state regulation, with concern growing that schools, pupils and knowledges were, and are, being commodified (Apple 2006, Ball 2007, Clarke et al. 2000, McLaughlin 1994, Fergusson 1994, Radice 2013, Bobbitt 2002). Despite some misgivings, successive Conservative governments and the New Labour administrations continued the process of reshaping institutions and amending teacher practice to fit with NPM social order.

The 1990s saw the English government mandate that NTs spend two thirds of their post-graduate ITE programme time in schools, rather than universities (Hobson et al. 2009b). The introduction of government specified competencies (Teacher Standards) (DfE 1992, DfE 1993) which monitored and assessed NTs accompanied the longer school placements (26 weeks out of 39). They also placed emphasis on teaching experience and the role of the mentor in supporting NT development. Through governing regulation and systems, such as CATE and Ofsted, ITE practices were being monitored and scrutinised against government expectations. The ITE landscape thereby became pressurised, with each institution developing practice to outperform competitors. Although theorising about the context of the USA, Apple's (2016) ideas of modernisation draw parallels with the UK government's emphasis on the school setting and practical learning that meets government-set ITE criteria. He focuses on the complexity and instability of conservative modernisation, which seeks to reassert cultural authority and interlink education with a limited set of economic goals. Correspondingly, Furlong et al.'s (2000) work comments on changes to education policy during the early 1990s, noticing a sharpened emphasis on practical training, with a new inspection framework developed by Ofsted.

The diversification of school types and the role of the SBM, schools and universities in ITE were further altered by Labour governments (1997-2007). LEA power and autonomy continued to reduce during this time as New Labour promoted the managerial style of leadership influenced by the education private sector and advocated management authority, rather than collegiality, to establish a school's purpose and ethos (Jones 2016, Stoker 2017, Avril 2016). Schools became individual institutions which developed unique identities and specialisms through customising their professional values and priorities to suit their students' needs, and those of the community. Schools were given greater autonomy in decision-making, including the training experiences of NTs, in an education system designed to be 'fit for the 21st century' (Abbott, Rathbone and Whitehead 2012). Successive New Labour governments, which echoed Conservative belief in competitiveness as the key to progress, steered education towards processes mirrored in the private sector (Jones 2016).

To maintain the close partnership between marketisation and education, the Learning and Skills Act of 2002 introduced government funded academies which had contributions given from financial and industry sponsors; these sponsors were given control of school governance as they were removed from the LEA system (Jones 2016). Sponsors and independent bodies could create an ethos formed on their visions and priorities, such as being faith-based or skill-based (i.e. life sciences, entrepreneurial). Specific values were applied to some academies which were formed on a distinct set of principles that could be employed at a trust-wide level (in the case of Multi-Academy Trusts), thus creating a unique selling point. There was a sense of modernisation in 2002 from then Secretary of Education, Estelle Morris, who supported school freedom to manage their affairs and develop an individual 'identity' (Morris 2002) and specialism. However, the extent of this freedom is questioned as academies saw the government in control 'steering at a distance' (Whitty and Wisby 2006:46), as they were run by government approved sponsors, outside LEA control.

New Labour administrations continued the fragmentation of ITE as the private sector and charities began to contribute to and influence ITE, resulting in the creation of school-led ITE programmes such as Teach First in 2002. Teach First is a social enterprise charity that coordinates an employment based two-year ITE programme which leads to QTS. By the time of their defeat in the 2010 election, New Labour had created a new educational market, influenced by Conservative legacies, with central principles of ability, aptitude and individualised provision.

This approach was an alternative to traditional forms of teacher education as the private sector transformed how ITE could be conducted. The 2010 White Paper (DfE 2010) was seen to value the school-led ITE and craft of the classroom teacher above theoretical aspects endorsed by university-based teacher educators (DfE 2010). Crucially, it endorsed increasing school-led ITE. Michael Gove, then Secretary of State for Education, and Minister of State for Schools Nick Gibb both valued this approach and rejected HEI influence on, what they viewed as, a practical-based profession. Gove emphasised teachers' behaviours and strategies rather than their attitudes and intellectuality (DfE 2010). He aimed for teachers to have stronger

forms of discipline, directly from school managers and indirectly through Ofsted, resulting in tightened control and regulation (West 2015, Wright 2012, Bailey and Ball 2016). Through the Academies Act (2010), the Cameron-Clegg Coalition government attempted to increase the number of institutions converting to academies by offering self-funding and self-management academy status to any good/outstanding school or forced academisation on those that were deemed to be 'failing'. This promoted autonomy within high performing schools, but not in forced conversions to academy chains as these were seen as takeovers that reduced autonomy. There was a move away from centralised systems to individual institutions (a system of small systems or clusters of schools), leading to increased pressure on school staff to meet government criteria in ITE, teaching and learning and educational attainment targets.

An important Coalition policy move included the creation of 500 Teaching School Alliances (TSA) which saw leadership over ITE taken from universities (Whitty et al. 2016, West 2015, Wright 2012). This was a key policy change for realising the government's ambition for half of NTs to be educated on school-led routes, which were designed to meet teacher supply needs and have since been reinvented as the main means of putting schools in control of ITE (Whitty et al. 2016, West 2015). TSAs removed the delivery of ITE from the sole preserve of HEIs and to "outstanding schools who work with other schools to provide excellent support and training and development to both new and experienced school staff" (DfE 2018c:5). A TSA priority includes coordinating and delivering high quality school-based ITE (DfE 2018c) and they develop practice-based learning through a collaborative approach to ITE, spreading best practice that is led by schools, for schools (DfE 2019a).

TSAs were established and marketed as a critical vehicle used to enhance the quality of teaching in schools that have been deemed 'failing' and are subject to government control as the DfE oversees the application process. TSAs act as a government measuring tool as they lead on; the training and professional development of teachers and headteachers; providing and quality assuring ITE in the area; identifying and developing teachers for headships and deploying national and

local leaders of education to support schools, all within a national network (DfE 2010).

The introduction of the School Direct programme in 2012 acted as a further step in the gradual shift of teacher education from tertiary providers to school providers (DfE 2011b). School Direct and Teach First were among the new educational programmes for school-led ITE that were established, quickening the pace of the creation of a marketised landscape of ITE. School Direct in particular gives schools more influence over the way teachers are trained. These programmes were fluid in their approach to the field, working with other organisations, alongside established formalised bodies. They are run as a partnership between a lead school and an accredited teacher training provider (DfE 2014b) and are designed by schools/programme coordinators but awarded QTS by HEIs. These projects were managed and funded by the state and other private companies and could bypass established teacher training programmes through their own unique and tailored leadership and ITE course (Jones 2016). This directly impacted on schools who had to adapt to deliver new programmes that were unfamiliar.

The School Direct 'Get involved with teacher training' DfE publication (2014b) puts emphasis on the role of the SBM and acknowledges this as crucial to the progression and development of NTs. The SBMs should work in partnership with universities to create a school-based practical approach to training, with the SBM's position and responsibility viewed as key. Thus, the SBM role becomes much more prominent within government legislation, as they are regarded as invaluable to an NT's experience.

The introduction and spread of school-led programmes also affected university student numbers and financial stability and continues to be a controversial and problematic issue in the current climate of ITE (Brown, Rowley and Smith 2014, Hanley and Brown 2017). The increased emphasis on school-based ITE coupled with the introduction of School Direct threatened the financial stability of Faculties of Education in HEIs. They were less able to plan strategically which contributed to increasing trends of a casualised workforce and possible losses in staff with research knowledge and skills (McNamara and Murray 2013).

Marketisation led to competition between HEIs through the delivery and success of their teacher training programs. Equally, schools and staff felt pressurised to meet government-set criteria in order to perform within the state regulated ITE market. Although the majority of trainee teachers chose HEI-led programmes between 2011-2016, some lost virtually all core numbers and became dependent on School Direct contracts for survival (Whitty et al. 2016). To further their move from a centralised workforce towards a marketised approach, the Conservative government (2010-2015) abandoned the allocation system for School Direct that it had put in place, and instead proposed that all providers could recruit as many trainees as they wished until the national cap had been reached (Whitty et al. 2016). HEIs faced a competitive market and fought for student allocations, and financial stability, by improving school partnerships in order to recruit NTs to their institutions.

Between 2017-2020 the HEI-led dominant position in the ITE landscape dipped, with 55% of NTs choosing to take a school-led route in 2019-2020 (DfE 2019c). ITE Census data shows that although only 28% of new entrants chose these routes in 2014/15, there was an increasing trajectory towards school-led ITE that peaked in 2016/17. During 2016/17, 56% NTs chose to enrol on school-led programmes, although this dropped and stalled to 53% between 2017-2019 (DfE 2014a,DfE 2017a,DfE 2018a). In 2019-2020, school-led programmes hold the majority over ITE, although HEIs still recruit high numbers of trainees on PGCE, Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) and undergraduate courses (e.g. BA Hons Education). Within school-led ITE there is an increased emphasis on the schools and SBMs to deliver high quality ITE in conjunction with the affiliated university who remain responsible for awarding QTS. The government promotes SD as affordable as schools can adapt to become sites of professional learning where tailored training can be delivered by their own staff, thereby increasing school and sponsor control.

Critics argue that marketisation has transformed the state-maintained education system into one of competition and strategic planning with taught knowledge valued largely for its connection to educational performance (Valenzuela 2005), rather than the value attributed to the child. This then leads to an 'economy of performance' and a manifestation of the audit culture (Stronach et al. 2002) that favours free-

market capitalism, and thus a form of neoliberalism emerges. Neoliberalism has shaped a radical transformation of the schooling landscape in England as the state's role is diminishing whilst private sector involvement spreads (Ball 2009, Martin and Dunlop 2019).

Parallels can be observed between the for-profit school system and marketised state-education system, which helps to shape the direction of the competitive ITE landscape. The independent schools' marketised sector is subject to performance measures and their ability to advertise and promote their institution (Martin and Dunlop 2019). While most for-profit schools (70%) use Ofsted as a school inspectorate, some choose the Independent Schools Inspectorate or Schools Inspection Service (DfE 2016c) and will be inspected every 3 years (Martin and Dunlop 2019). These schools are subject to similar inspectorate requirements as state-maintained but exist in a highly competitive environment as education is a commodity. Parents choose the best service providers based on school data, performance results and reputation. This competitive system is heightened as private schools have greater resource inputs (i.e. expenditure per pupil) and are generally selective in their pupil intake which may contribute to greater academic achievement (Green 2017, Green, Allen and Jenkins 2015).

Critics argue that the move towards school-led ITE reveals policy makers selectively drawing on evidence to support already held views. Governments steer and maintain control from a distance through their misrepresentation of research to support political ends (Ertas and McKinght 2019, Fontdevila and Verger 2019, Tsang 2012 and Henig 2008). In 2012, Ofsted reported 47% of outstanding ITE practice was achieved in HEI-led provision, with only 23% of outstanding practice found in school-led ITE (Jackson and Burch 2016). Additionally, the House of Commons Education Committee (2012) commented that the loss of university influence on ITE would impoverish provision as established school-university partnerships based on theory and research produce the best training outcomes (Jackson and Burch 2016). Despite this, the Coalition and Conservative governments initial teacher training implementation plan was uncompromising towards school-based learning. The developments were strongly tethered to views that a school-led approach was best,

despite Ofsted findings around issues such as recruitment targets, higher costs and lower retention rates of alternative routes (Allen et al. 2016).

Maguire (2014) also highlights the influence of government preference and ideology over ITE policy. She proposes that much of the reforms to ITE in England are amalgams of long-standing policies that have been reworked to fit with discourses of markets, efficiency, competition and globalising 'necessities'. This draws on Ball, Maguire and Braun's (2012) work which argued that education policy frequently involves the production of hard policy texts that represent, document and illustrate what is desirable to do.

> 'These textual artefacts are cultural productions that carry within them sets of beliefs and meanings that speak to social processes and policy enactments – ways of being and becoming – that is, forms of governmentality' (Ball, Maguire and Braun 2012:122).

Maguire argues that education policy works by producing sets of ideas that become 'part of the taken for grantedness of the way things should be done' (Maguire 2014:774). Here, Maguire references Foucault's (1980) general politics of truth and the theory that policy texts are constructions and productions of versions of 'truths'. Specifically, Maguire highlights the schools White Paper 2010, its companion piece 'The case for change' (DfE 2010) and the follow-up paper, 'Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: An improvement strategy for discussion' (DfE 2011). She argues that these policy proposals are an attempt to displace and erase any alternative memories of becoming a teacher (Maguire 2014). For Maguire, these texts reshape ITE policy, promoting practical-led ITE to suit the Coalition's rhetoric.

Perceptions of the 'problem' of teacher education are also influenced heavily by the media. The shift in policy towards a school-led approach was directed by the beliefs of politicians and amplified by the abuse of alternative voices in what Zeichner describes as an 'echo chamber' (Zeichner and Conklin 2017). Ideas are amplified or reinforced by repetition from journalist and media sources in an enclosed system where competing views are censored. This move has been described as 'symbolic annihilation', a concept developed by Tuchman (2000) and Spencer (2013), that is

usually applied to the study of the media. This theory argues that the absence of representation, or underrepresentation, of some groups of people is a means of maintaining social inequality (Spencer 2013). Symbolic annihilation is relevant to discussions on ITE and teaching practice as its current public status is reproduced and reinforced by 'the effects of processes of omission, trivialisation and condemnation' (Spencer 2013:303). Spencer argues that these processes are being reproduced by the media in how teacher education is perceived (Spencer 2013). Therefore, it is suggested that only certain voices were being heard in the policy landscape and 'policy as discourse' (Jackson and Burch 2016) created its own reality as political beliefs, rather than evidence, shaped the direction of UK education policy. In creating a popular perception of a crisis in schooling, where social justice orientated educational projects and the LEA were deemed a product of the 'loony left', the media assisted in changing the views of the public and politicians making key policy changes. Through demonising teachers and teacher educators, the media played a significant part as isolated incidents were much publicised in a 'discourse of derision' (Ball 1993).

Overall, as marketisation has influenced the ITE landscape the role of the SBM, and all actors involved in school-led programmes, has become more significant through increased school control and responsibility to deliver ITE in a competitive setting. Various governments have set criteria and frameworks to be adhered to that increase the pressure on schools and teaching staff to perform and excel in compliance with league tables and other performative measures. Whether this renders the emerging system of school-led ITE as a largely practical occupation with little influence from HEIs is debatable, and will be discussed in the following section on professionalism. However, within an increasingly fragmented system, local school ITE and mentors are charged with ensuring compliance in relation to government Teacher Standards' (TS) (see Appendix 1). As new types of schools and ITE routes are developed by interested parties, businesses and charities, concepts of professionalism and practices change. This is largely due to individual stakeholder priorities and initiatives that they wish to incorporate within the new structures. I will consider this in a later section of this review, alongside how partnerships

develop between institutions. The impact of the 'practicum turn' on schools, universities and the role of the SBM cannot be underestimated as marketisation has drastically changed the pathways and criteria that shape what it means to train as a teacher in England.

2.3 School and teacher influence on ITE

This section considers how ITE policy changes affect the practices of learning to teach in school and the role of the SBM. As a result of policy reforms, the development of the profession in recent years has shifted from 'licensed' to 'regulated' autonomy (Apple 2007). This shift affects the position of teachers and schools as surveillance was placed on teaching practice and the quality of student education and ITE provision. Under conditions of licensed autonomy, Apple claims that teachers 'are basically free within limits to act in their classrooms according to their judgement and ''professional discretion'' (Apple 2007:185), with the freedom to make decision and act responsibly (Furlong et al. 2000, Berry 2012) within their working environment. However, there are concerns that claims for autonomy are more related to professionals protecting their own interests and avoiding accountability (O'Hear 1998a, O'Hear 1998b, Lawlor 1990).

The move to regulated autonomy can thus be seen as a move to controlled autonomy, which Ball (1990) described as prescribing to the logic of industrial production and, critically, the co-option of teachers into a system of self-discipline. Teacher responsibility and oversight is decreased through using systems and frameworks that are government controlled, such as TS, lesson plan frameworks and descriptors of what constitutes a 'good' lesson according to Ofsted recommendations. The erosion of teacher autonomy offers the government the opportunity to vaunt the possibilities of freedom, while maintaining a direct hand and oversight over teachers' professional duties and practice (Berry 2012). This reduces the authority and influence of the school and SBM, within school-led ITE. These circumstances prompt the need for my study which considers the limited contribution that SBMs can make to ITE as despite their status as professionals, they lack autonomy over school-led ITE provision.

Through stronger government guidelines, inspections and a system of performance-related pay measured by pupil progress, the teacher workforce feels increasingly pressured and deprived of autonomy (Warner 2015). This diminution of teacher autonomy is tied to a reductive view of curriculum and pedagogy that is consistent with the demands and expectations of market ideology that requires the production of measurable outcomes (Berry 2012).

Autonomy can be defined in a multitude of ways; for example, it can be understood as a person's 'control over work' (Abbott, Tyler and Wallace 2006:4). Equally, it can be seen as 'the amount of freedom a worker has to schedule their work and to determine the procedures in carrying it out' (Evans and Fischer 1992:1171). It can also be viewed in terms of 'pedagogical autonomy' when 'the system does not intervene in teachers' acts and assumes they are fully competent in their work' (Eden 2001:97). Autonomy implies scope for professional judgement and trust (Sachs 2001) and is granted in exchange for the assumed specialised knowledge of practitioners (Lundström 2015). This includes the freedom to choose teaching methods and content, within limits defined by legislation, alongside the responsibility for professional development. As the marketised emphasis of Conservative ideology was implemented and competition between institutions developed, more stringent expectations were put upon teachers to meet with Standards. Teacher autonomy over curricula gradually shifted as issues surrounding TS, capability and student progress were raised. Subsequently, teacher control was lessened and coordinated by the state. With this in mind, it is questionable as to whether the move towards school-led ITE has afforded schools more power and influence over the profession. As the impact of this shift on schools is widely debated, my study is well-placed to make a valuable contribution as I speak directly to the question of autonomy and power over ITE.

At first glance, it appears that teacher and school control over ITE increased significantly, highlighting the importance of teaching practitioner's current knowledge and professional practice to aid NT development. Lave (1996) argues that teaching becomes learning in practice through apprenticeship, experienced through increasing levels of participation, rather than specific techniques. Through this focus

on practice, the status and knowledge base of the teaching profession is reduced as professional identity is reconstructed (Corcoran and O'Flaherty 2018) as a result of teacher socialisation or the "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie 1975:61). This occurs as a result of the extensive amount of time NTs spend working closely with their SBM through the apprenticeship model (Corcoran and O'Flaherty 2018). Thus, the concern is that the professional preparation of teaching is focussing on a practical 'apprenticeship' rather than inducting NTs into a research-informed approach to critical enquiry in the classroom (Douglas 2017). The Sutton Trust EEF teaching and learning toolkit (Higgins et al. 2016) illustrates this concern as academic education research is summarised into practical, manageable forms (Higgins et al. 2016). The toolkit supports teachers to make informed decisions through adopting an 'evidenced based' approach. The toolkit encourages an apprenticeship style of learning as it provides strategies for teachers to employ, rather than relying on their experience and professional knowledge. These recommended strategies include:

- Within-class attainment grouping involves organising pupils within their usual class for specific activities or topics, such as literacy.
- A collaborative (or cooperative) learning approach involving pupils working together on activities or learning tasks in a group small enough for everyone to participate on a collective task that has been clearly assigned.
- Using more specialised programmes which are targeted at students with specific behavioural issues.
- Oral intervention strategies including:
    - targeted reading aloud and book discussion with young children
    - explicitly extending pupils' spoken vocabulary
    - the use of structured questioning to develop reading comprehension
    - the use of purposeful, curriculum-focused, dialogue and interaction.

Wrigley and McCusker (2019) express concerns about the toolkit's strategies and approach regarding the risks associated with simplifying complex academic research into accessible information. This approach, although accessible, clear, and quick to use, may invite misinterpretation and lacks teacher reasoning or depth of engagement with academic enquiry. As a result, the toolkit appears to be both crude and amateurish as it fails to recognise the complexity of education and pedagogy (Wrigley 2015). For Wrigley and McCusker (2019), the most significant problem with the toolkit is that the selection process for source documents takes place on technical grounds, without seriously considering underlying theories, the context, or whether the interventions are sufficiently similar to the pedagogical theory and knowledge underpinning them. As a result, the toolkit inadvertently reduces teacher control as practitioners no longer hold authority over the professional knowledge base of teaching and also undervalues the professional knowledge and theoretical reasoning behind teaching practice and strategies.

The emphasis on increasing the time that trainees should spend in school, coupled with the increased number of ITE routes (including School Direct, Teach First and the assessment only route), reveals the diversification of ITE provision away from universities. Equally, this exposes the increased governmental control that influences the standard and expectations of England's ITE provision. Increasing time on placements also highlights the importance of school-based teacher educators and places value on their role. As McNamara and Murray (2013:14-22) note,

> 'since 1984, all successive governments have legislated to make teacher training more 'relevant' to practice in schools and more focused on the 'practical' knowledge of teaching", resting on the assumption that "more time spent in schools inevitably- and unproblematically- leads to better and 'more relevant' learning'.

This shift is significant to the autonomy of teachers, and SBMs, as the relevance of the mentor role was highlighted and incorporated into the national school inspection framework (Ofsted 2019b).

Supplementary supportive measures that the Coalition government (2010) and Conservative governments (2015-2020) have initiated to aid ITE are key when considering teacher control and the SBM. Government oversight increased through additional mechanisms of support that are created and measured by the DfE. National Leaders of Education (NLEs) and Specialist Leaders of Education (SLEs) were introduced in 2014 (DfE 2014c, DfE 2018c) to help improve educational outcomes by supporting vulnerable schools, tackle underperformance in coasting schools and lead improvement. The government assigns experienced middle leaders and headteachers based on their specialism related to one or more of the four areas of Ofsted (Appendix 2, DfE 2014c). Through these intervention systems, government control can exist within school-led ITE routes as coasting/failing schools are provided with a School Improvement Offer that utilises these resources. These outside bodies develop ITE provision within the school in line with government priorities, thereby relinquishing some control from SBMs and programme leads. As TSAs, NLEs and SLEs shape the direction of ITE provision and focus on specific interventions, an academy's distinctiveness is lost and SBMs are subject to the rigour and scrutiny of these agencies.

The purpose of the support systems that have been created by government is uncertain. In one sense, these externally employed bodies challenge and weaken the status of the SBM and devalue the practice of school-based staff who feel comparatively less knowledgeable. These bodies are seen as the authority and 'expert' in the teacher education field, furthering government scrutiny over ITE and measuring the success of school-based pathways. Contrastingly, they are also viewed as agents to be relied upon and help further the SBMs understanding of their role. Here, they become a support system to further SBM power and influence as they illuminate their responsibilities and help them to develop professional knowledge.

Although the focus of this research is on school-based programmes wherein schools often design their own ITE courses with input from HEI partners, it is necessary to investigate how HEIs maintain a role in the development of school-based ITE. When

considering marketisation and school-led ITE, it is important to explore how school-HEI partnerships are framed and developed.

The Carter Review (2015), Conservative government consultation report (DfE 2018b) and the Twiselton Review (DfE 2019d) advocated strengthening school-HEI partnerships and endorsed the need to develop a clear ITE framework. The role and definition of a mentor has evolved through government policy and ITE training. The Carter review was an advisory report to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of ITE courses. Endorsed by the Conservative Government and Michael Gove, then Secretary of State for Education, Sir Andrew Carter led the government Review of Initial Teacher Training in 2015, signalling the recognition of TE as a 'policy problem' in England (Cochran-Smith 2005). The Carter Review focuses on the need for regulation, rather than further deregulation. It rests on the central tenet of having strong partnerships, with schools having overall control but with suggestions from university partners (Mutton et al. 2017), thereby not abandoning SBMs to feel the full responsibility of an NT's progress through a programme. The review endorsed school-HEI collaboration and suggested that effective partnerships require a critical mass of expertise, a shared vision and clearly defined roles between universities and schools. The government response to this was mixed, with many recommendations being taken into consideration, although some were rejected. The Secretary of State responded to the recommendation to commission a sector body to develop a framework of core content of initial teacher training (ITT) (Carter 2015) by commissioning an independent working group of expert representatives to develop a framework (DfE 2016a).

The report also welcomed the recommendation to develop national standards for mentors (Carter 2015), which the Teaching Schools Council developed (DfE 2016b). The Mentor Standards focussed on 5 key areas: Personal qualities; Teaching; Professionalism; Self-development and working in partnership (DfE 2016b:10). They are intended to uphold a certain standard of practice amongst mentors and encourage continuing professional development (CPD) through developing partnerships with stakeholders. However, the ability to support ITE delivery and engage in dialogue with partners is subject to mentors' involvement in and

understanding of the school-led pathway itself. This may be limited if SBMs are not consulted on the programme's content or delivery. Equally, Mentor Standards, although recommended to improve quality of provision, do not guarantee a benchmark of mentor practice as they are not statutory and do not need to be adhered to by a school.

Crucially, the government rejected (DfE 2016a) the review's recommendation to build on the development of school-led ITE through the DfE working in collaboration with the sector (all those involved in ITT) to strengthen what had become a complex and confusing system of training (Carter 2015). This was due to the Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition parties having different positions on this recommendation (DfE 2016a). As a result, partnership became a contentious issue between HEIs and governments, as there was a decrease in HEI control and influence over school-based ITE.

Politicised policy making continued to affect the role of the mentor, and how ITE training is situated, through a further Conservative government proposal in March 2018 (DfE 2018b). This consultation put forward that QTS should be awarded following a two-year induction period as a new teacher (DfE 2018b). This was due to the belief that "An extended period would provide new teachers with more opportunity to develop their professional practice and embed the benefits that the core components will offer" (DfE 2018b:12). In response to the consultation, the government stated that QTS would continue to be awarded at the end of ITE. However, it was agreed that they would extend the induction period for NTs to two years, "providing more time for teachers to develop their knowledge and skills" (DfE 2018b:9). This required SBMs to dedicate more commitment to NT observation alongside their own professional responsibilities.

More recently, the government has produced a policy document outlining ITE requirements, the ITT Core Content Framework (DfE 2019d), which was developed in consultation with members of an expert advisory group. This group was chaired by Samantha Twiselton, from the Sheffield Institute of Education, and includes members from Teach First, the Teaching School Council, and National Association of School-based Teacher Trainers (DfE 2019d). The make-up of this group shows that

this document also favours school input on ITE and values the contributions made from current practitioners, although members from Institutes of Education within HEIs are also included. The group endorse the framework as establishing and contributing towards a "3 or more year structures package of support for future generations of teachers" with "mentoring and support from expert colleagues form(ing) a key element" (DfE 2019d:3). The importance of the practical experience, and SBM input, on an NT's professional development highlights the focus on the 'practicum', rather than HEI-led taught sessions. Equally, the group refer to "Expert colleagues" as "Professional colleagues, including experienced and effective teachers, subject specialists, mentors, lecturers and tutors" (DfE 2019d:5). Here, the 'expert' in the field of ITE is considered as those individuals working within it, including school practitioners and SBMs. This gives an indication of the value that the advisory group places on current, practicing teachers and the important contribution that they make to an NT's development.

The ITT Core Content Framework sets out two types of content: "Learn that…" and "Learn how to…" (DfE 2019d:4-5) thereby making clear reference to the inclusion of two types of learning. The first is a requirement for NTs to engage in high-quality evidence and research so that as new entrants to the profession, their learning is underpinned by the evidence of what makes great teaching (DfE 2019d). 'Learn how to…' references NT's entitlement to practice key skills and be given opportunities learn from expert colleagues as they apply their knowledge and understanding of the evidence in the classroom (DfE 2019d). Therefore, the ITT Core Content Framework promotes NTs using research to inform their practice but pays tribute to the positive impact that practical experience and working with mentors and colleagues can have on NT development. The framework also focuses on the benefits of school-based learning, including having:

> 'multiple opportunities to rehearse and refine particular approaches; Observing, discussing and analysing with expert colleagues and interrogating their knowledge; Receiving clear, consistent and effective mentoring from expert colleagues' (DfE 2019d:5).

Twiselton has commented that the document emphasised a focus on subject knowledge and the curriculum, in line with the new Ofsted framework (Ofsted 2019a), and that it aimed to improve the consistency of SBM support (Lough 2019). The 2019 Ofsted framework moves away from emphasis on school outcomes and focuses on the quality of education (Ofsted 2019a). Dr Chris Jones, an Ofsted specialist advisor for teacher apprenticeships, outlines that:

> 'Ofsted's new four key judgements rebalance what we look for in an inspection, focusing on the substance of the curriculum and supporting leaders and teachers… The framework puts the curriculum at the centre of inspection to ensure young people and adults receive the high-quality training and support they need to improve their knowledge… It looks in closer detail at what the provider chooses to offer, how well the curriculum is ordered and structured and whether it is taught well'.

> (Jones 2019)

The framework focuses on the curriculum as a structure for setting out the aims of a programme of education, exploring the intent, implementation and impact of knowledge and skills (Ofsted 2019a). It outlines that "the curriculum lies at the heart of education" (Ofsted 2019a:4) and to make this successful, "teachers need solid knowledge and understanding of subject(s) they teach. They need to know how to teach that subject and, more generally, how to teach" (Ofsted 2019a:9). Teachers skills are valued here, and subject specific knowledge is a key aspect of the framework.

Furthering Carter's review, the ITT core content framework, focuses on the importance of curriculum, practical experience and the role of the SBM in ITE. However, it gives equal weight to the importance of university expert advice, indicating a need for partnerships between institutions. Despite this, cross-institutional collaboration is notably lacking in the make-up of the advisory group commissioned to develop the framework as of the eight members on the panel, only two were HEI academics.

Herbert et al.'s (2018) study explores the nature of school-HEI partnerships and identifies what underpins the future sustainability of relationships. They found that the success of a partnership was often dependent on the willingness of partners to communicate. Equally, the sustainability of a partnership was challenged by cultural differences between schools and universities, leading to resistance and communication breakdowns (Herbert et al. 2018). As suggested by the advisory reports explored above (Carter 2015, DfE 2018b and DfE 2019d), without a shared vision, clearly defined roles and willingness to partake in partnerships, collaborative working involving expert advice from both HEI and school representatives cannot come into fruition.

An additional policy move from the 2019 Conservative government that explores school control is the implementation of the ECF (Early Career Framework) (DfE 2019b) that is due to be trialled from September 2020. This initiative is outlined as a fully funded 2-year package of structured training and support for early career teachers, with dedicated time given to NTs to focus on their development. This strategy was developed in line with the government focus on teacher retention and quality, as attrition rates have been at the highest five-year 'wastage' rate (loss of teachers) that has been recorded (Foster 2019). The initiative funds and guarantees 5% off timetable in early career teachers' second year of teaching, time for mentors to support early career teachers and fully funded mentor training (DfE 2019b). However, there are few details on how this initiative is supported or quality assessed. The government is clear that the training and support should complement ITE provision but that it is not an assessed route, nor should its standards be considered as an assessment framework to be judged against (DfE 2019b). With this initiative, however, comes further government control over teacher development as schools are given guidance about what they should be offering new teachers (DfE 2018b).

The government commissioned a select group of experts to develop the ECF and advise on how schools should deliver professional development (DfE 2018b). However, as with the Core Content framework, this group is largely made up of private ITE providers and those within school-based teacher education. As only two

members were HEI-based, there is a clear sense of whose knowledge the Conservative government most values in ITE. Although this implies further school control over extended ITE, universities remain influential and lead the authorship of ECF materials for the early roll out of this programme.

With this analysis in mind, it is worth noting that although the new ITT Core Content Framework (DfE 2019d) and the Carter Review (2015) endorse and recommend effective school-HEI partnerships and utilising all stakeholder expertise, they operate on the assumption that schools involved in ITE are undertaking this work with a university partner (Mutton et al. 2017). However, this is not a government requirement and many NTs spend most of their training period under school direction, with universities only providing accreditation (Brown et al. 2014). The amount of ITE training that a university delivers on a school-led route is "determined by the training programme". As the accredited ITE provider, the only HEI requirement is to ensure that the content, structure, delivery and assessment of the programmes are designed to enable NTs to meet the standards required for QTS and includes subject and curriculum knowledge (DfE 2020). According to these guidelines, there is no statutory obligation for HEIs to deliver any aspect of the programme, although considering their duty and position as the accredited provider, it is clear why some may request to be included in the training schedule. School-HEI partnerships leading on SB ITE programmes are not mandated by the government, which could lead to partners working in silos and a disjointed form of ITE in design and practice.

Although new, practical ITE pathways hold promise of schools directing NTs and shaping the pathway of professional preparation, they hold little control in terms of the overall direction of professional development policy. Despite the neo-conservative emphasis on stronger control over curricula and values, there is some concern regarding how much control schools, and the programmes themselves, have over these pathways. 'New managerial' proposals install rigorous forms of accountability in schooling at all levels (Apple and Aasen 2003). Contrastingly, Douglas' (2015) view of School Direct, and other SB ITE programmes, is optimistic as he sees them as schemes which give schools more control over recruiting, training

and guiding their own teachers. He believes school-led ITE promotes more time for NTs to learn 'on the job' with schools providing more of the training in-house.

However, as I showed when exploring the marketisation of ITE, a more realistic view of these reforms is to see them in line with broader trends internationally, where governments aspire to 'intervene in order to have greater influence, if not control, over the form and content of ITE more directly than in the past' (Furlong, Cochran-Smith and Brennan 2013:2). Although Furlong (2013) claims that reforms to ITE in England over the last 30 years have shifted control of pre-service teacher learning from the university to the school classroom, government power can be viewed as filtering through these structures, with schools being compliant in their domination as well as participating in the power structures themselves (Perryman et al. 2017). This can be seen through Teacher Standards', Ofsted's investigation of ITE programmes, ITE content specifications, regular quality assurance of SBM practice, observations, and annual reviews of NT progress.

To conclude, although school-led models of ITE appear to have afforded teachers and schools more control and power, this is contested. Outside agencies and government policy influence and contribute heavily to these programmes and although there is a devolution of control to school level, this is mostly regarding responsibility over delivery rather than ITE design and evaluation. When exploring the policies and government systems in more depth, there is a lack of trust in school judgement and authority within the teacher education system. School-led ITE programmes are managed in conjunction with government criteria and standards and can be aided through government funded expert staff and initiatives. These support measures are able to dictate standards and SBM practice as they are employed to further develop SBM practice and ITE provision. Thus, there is an appearance of further school control over ITE following the move to an ostensibly more practical and school-led system, but this isn't necessarily the case. School improvement schemes, although aiding NT progression and ensuring strong ITE provision, can be seen to devolve authority and control from schools/teachers back to central government.

2.3.1 The impact of school control on English ITE programme policy

The shift to school-led ITE inevitably led to changes in ITE programme specifications, structure and design. In particular, the responsibilities of the SBM in English schools have become more intense and explicit within school-led ITE programme guidance, as they become more crucial to an NT's development. The following section considers how school control and the SBM role have changed through a comparison of HEI-led and school-led ITE programme documentation.

At a policy level, HEIs and programme guidance offer quality assurance and regulation for each ITE route, although this can differ for School Direct as the programme's content is subject to HEI and school partner discretion. When analysing the school-led ITE SBM's responsibilities, see Appendix 3 (HEI1 2017c) and Appendix 4 (TeachFirst 2017), there is some crossover and similar responsibilities with the HEI's PGCE guide for the subject mentor, see Appendix 5 (HEI1 2017b). Responsibilities of weekly observation, mentor meetings, designing timetables and evaluating NT progress are comparable between HEI-led ITE and the school-led programmes within this study.

However, the level of responsibilisation between routes differs as school-led programmes require the SBM to take on a more 'hands on' approach, as is exemplified when considering the interaction with UTs and regularity of university-led ITE sessions. The SD programme included in this study affords each NT 1.5-3 hours of UT contact (HEI1 2017c). This is significantly less than a typical PGCE programme, which allows for six weeks of UT critical enquiry and support, alongside weekly university-led professional practice and subject pedagogy sessions (HEI1 2017a). One moderation visit and one joint observation with the SBM is required per PGCE placement (HEI1 2017a). In contrast, Teach First participants' attend five HEI-led training sessions throughout the programme, with UTs only expected to observe the NT three times. The SBM is required to undertake at least nine observations (TeachFirst 2017), which is significantly more than the HEI but not surprisng as the NTs are employed by the schools they are training in and therefore present in the school on a full-time basis.

School Direct SBMs provide regular support through weekly mentor meetings with only four HEI-led training sessions included in the programme outline, see Appendix 6. The Teach First Mentor Handbook (TeachFirst 2017) outlines that the SBM provides the "most critical support as (they) lead all in-school support and development for participants" (TeachFirst 2017:5). Pressure on SBMs increases as they are responsible for NT progress and, alongside PMs and UTs, enabling NT success (TeachFirst 2017). Again, as the NTs are employed as full-time members of staff, the pressure on the SBM is more keenly felt as they are their main support throughout their training year. School-led ITE programme policy require SBMs to provide the daily support for NTs, plan collaboratively, support with assignments and act in a coaching role if required. This differs to the HEI-led PGCE programme which includes weekly meetings with UTs, HEI-led ITE training sessions and regular observations by the UT.

Despite the increased responsibilities for SBMs on school-led ITE pathways, it is crucial to acknowledge that these tasks relate to the SBM's daily support and physical presence. Within HEI and ITE policy documentation, SBMs are rarely mentioned in conjunction with academic assignments or developing practice through engaging with specific models of professional learning. Although this may be an unwritten expectation, the lack of reference to SBMs engaging with or training on theoretical conceptual issues gives the impression that the role has a practical, administrative purpose.

The SBM is more responsibilised within school-based ITE programmes due to the lack of stakeholders that contribute to NT's training; the SBM is the main contact for the NT as the NT-UT relationship is less established. With one termly UT observation required on all ITE programmes within this study, NT progress and development falls largely on SBMs. However, this role is practical as they outline the requirements to achieve QTS and guide NTs towards Standards; there is less empowerment of the SBM as they lead on the administrative side of the SB ITE programme and have no control over programme management or delivery of ITE training sessions.

Overall, the SBM role has changed somewhat within the practical school-led ITE setting compared to PGCE/HEI-led routes. For Teach First SBMs, there is a higher

expectation to be a visible presence for the NT over the academic year as the programme structure only outlines 12 HEI-led training sessions. The rest of the training is completed practically, within the school that the NT is employed by and on their one-week contrasting secondary school placement (TeachFirst 2020). For School Direct NTs, there is a totality of four weeks of university-led training time; the rest of their time is spent in two placements under the supervision of the SBM and PM (HEI1 2020). These programmes include longer periods of time in the practicum than on HEI-led undergraduate/PGCE programmes, which dictate 120 days training in school and roughly two thirds of the academic year (DfE 2020). As is expected on all ITE routes, SBMs must offer daily support, evaluate NT's evidence and approach to Standards whilst inducting them into the practicalities of the school environment. This multi-faceted role can result in varied SBM practice and ITE provision within schools that accept trainees from different routes. Importantly, pressure increases on SBMs who mentor NTs that are employed by the schools they are training in, as they are their main source of support.

2.3.2 Teacher professionalism in school-led ITE

This section considers the impact of the marketised ITE landscape on teacher professionalism, and the effect of government directives and new ITE stakeholders on the profession's status. There are questions raised about the nature of ITE and who holds authority when considering which knowledge is important when learning to teach. For those in favour of school-led ITE, it is accepted that the (education) field is 'broken' (Kronholz 2012) in terms of university involvement with ITE, and a more practical, contextualised approach is welcome. Teacher educators have previously been categorised by officials as 'enemies of promise' (Gove 2013) and archaic. From one perspective, the move to practical-based ITE can be positively interpreted as the government re-professionalising teaching in line with the putative needs of 21st century (Harris and Jones 2017, Hargreaves and Fullan 2012 and Hargreaves 1994). School-led ITE signified that the profession had 'come of age' as schools are responsible for training their own (Hargreaves 1994:23-27). Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) suggest collaborative cultural concepts are endorsed which emphasise the importance of building 'professional capital' within schools through

greater collaboration and cohesion. This 'professional capital' approach embodies teacher-led reform and advocates that teachers should take greater command of school and system improvement. It is a movement from 'power over to power with' where those best placed to improve teaching and learning are given collective responsibility to do so (Hargreaves and Fullan 2012:9).

However, downgrading university involvement in ITE could represent an attempt to dismantle the traditional defences of teaching as a profession (Wilson and Nel 2019, Hudson 2017, Ruohotie-Lyhty 2016, Whitty 2000, MacLure 1993). Teachers are turned into 'technicians' rather than 'reflective professionals' (Paniagua and Istance 2018, Lim and Huan 2017, Collins 2004, Adams and Tulasiewicz 1995), thereby jeopardising their status as 'professionals' as in relating to work that needs special training or education. Jackson and Burch (2016) argue that the Coalition government lack understanding that the easier teaching looks, the more complex and refined the underlying skills of a teacher are - these are not just taught strategies. Consequently, there is a concern that school-based teaching routes have become a guided induction of 'tricks of the trade' (Jackson and Burch 2016), with the University held as a disenfranchised outsider. There is an anxiety that teaching has become a routine and well-practiced set of behaviours to enact, rather than an intrinsic knowledge-based skill and profession that is grounded in theoretical expertise (McIntyre and Booth 1990, McNamara, Jones and Murray 2014a, House of Commons Education Committee 2012, Darling-Hammond 2006 and Furlong et al. 2000).

As a result of Conservative and New Labour demands for control and accountability, critical theorists argue that 'teachers' work is more standardised, rationalised and ''policed'', and teachers' actions 'are now subject to much greater scrutiny in terms of process and outcomes' (Apple 2007:185). This reduces teacher control and discretion and limits their professional capabilities as they cease to make their own judgements (Eraut 1994). Julia Evetts (2008) questions the nature of teacher professionalism as policy changes suggest teaching is at risk of losing the status of taught profession, leading to contrasting concepts of uninformed and informed professionalisms. For Evetts, trust is replaced with performance assessment and

indicators for review based upon target setting and evaluation (Evetts 2008). As more professions are controlled by management, trust in teachers as professionals is questioned as they lack the autonomy to make decisions. Performative systems are characterised by an 'audit culture' wherein teachers' and schools' outcomes are measured against set targets (primarily by quantitative data); thus, the concept of professionalism is altered (Wilkins 2009, Gewirtz et al. 2009, Salvio and Boldt 2009). Teaching is moving in status towards a regulated occupation, whereby members are recruited, guided and controlled according to external rules, values and norms with little room for creative individual thought (Evetts 2008).

Since 2010, the Cameron-Clegg Coalition and following Conservative governments have placed emphasis on compliance with and regulation of a predominantly practical, school-led ITE curriculum, where ITE is viewed as an apprenticeship (McNamara and Murray 2013). Considering this, autonomy and professionalism in ITE and teachers' status as professionals are questioned as central control can represent greater surveillance. It is significant that teacher training and education was, and is, controlled by the Secretary of State for Education. This distinguishes preparation for teaching from that of other professions for which political interference is less marked and occupational autonomy more pronounced (Ginsburg and Lindsay 2004).

The simplistic depiction of NTs developing practical skills in the school and subject knowledge in the university can undercut the professional status of teaching. Although more 'practical' and led by school, critics worry that SB routes have contributed to the reduced status and knowledge base of the profession. The programmes reduce the role of theoretical analysis in the development of critical judgement and training in professional adaptability is minimised (Craft 1984, Smith and Hodson 2010, Douglas 2015). In this way, school-led routes endorse the concept of teaching as a craft (Mutton et al. 2017, Hagger and McIntyre 2006) that is experiential, social and expansive within a cognitive apprenticeship framework (Brown, Collins and Duguid 1989). The apprenticeship model of doing the same as other teachers does not readily provide the analytic capability required to develop generic skills to span a range of institutional settings (Hodson et al. 2012);

ultimately, it can hinder an NT as there are limited contexts they feel able to practice in. This can be viewed as a proceduralist apprenticeship approach to learning, rather than an understanding, orientated approach (Hobson 2003) which is designed to examine principles behind practice, developing informed reflective practitioners (Hobson 2003, Bressman, Winter and Efron 2018, Tang et al. 2019).

Within these emergent 'professional' ITE models, NTs must learn and adapt to the profession quickly as they are exposed to a rapid initiation into teaching (Hodson et al. 2012). Teacher professionalism is therefore at risk of losing its professional grounding and status. The idea of a taught, theoretical subject that takes expertise and training is altered to an occupation of strategies and skills that can be reproduced. This links to the marketisation of ITE that is established through creating multiple school-led pathways to education and create a craft version of teacher professionalism, with a lack of specialised, pedagogical, theory-based knowledge.

As schools share responsibility of ITE with their HEI provider (awarding QTS), school-led models of education become the antithesis of previous systems where local/central state have strong influence. The rise of academies and free schools meant LEA involvement, and a level of democracy, declined as control of comprehensive state education was eroded by privatised education providers with government approved sponsors. For some critics, the power of the teaching workforce and democratic professionalism has steadily been threatened and reduced by government strategies that seek control of the education landscape (Zeichner et al. 2015, Katz and Rose 2013, Leys 2003). Democratic professionalism demystifies professional work and builds alliances between teachers, teaching assistants and external stakeholders, including students, parents and the wider community (Apple 1996, Ginsburg 1997). Democratic, locally controlled education was steadily contracted by an ideal and set of monopolies comprising and encouraging new forms of regulation and control (Jones 2016), managed by the central state. As previously explored, decisions have traditionally been made on behalf of practitioners either by policy or the state (Apple 1996, Ginsburg 1997), and their autonomy is reduced. A democratic professionalism extends teacher's

responsibility beyond the classroom, including contributing to the wider educational system, as well as to the collective responsibilities of teachers themselves in a broader social agenda.

Whitty (2014) counteracts this with the theory that SBMs limited professional knowledge leads to the de-professionalisation of teaching, as SBMs operate with a restricted view of professionalism. This does not signpost a valued profession with teacher knowledge at the heart of education provision and ITE; instead, this idea signals that ITE needs HEI input, research-based practice and theoretical expertise in order to be considered viable as a 'profession'.

Alternatively, there is a more idealistic view proffered by Whitty (2014) that teaching could be undergoing a process of re-professionalisation, whereby the profession meets the needs of a new era. This could lead to a series of 'local' or 'branded' professionalisms (Whitty 2014) developed by the SBM, replacing the 'core professionalism' fostered by university-led provision and thus creating a modernised teacher workforce, with new professional values. This concept of re-professionalisation is relevant to my research, as I will explore the collaboration that can take place between school and university partners. If this is achieved, it can encourage productivity between what hitherto seemed to be binary oppositions (theory and practical) and new knowledge can be generated (McNamara et al. 2014a). This form of professionalism allows for the possibility of combining both theory and practice to re-create teaching as a profession, not rooted in the space of academics or the classroom alone, but within a school-based environment. Here, academics and SBMs can collaborate, negotiating professionalism to combine both profession and occupation and focus on the specific context and priorities for the school, creating 'local' professionalism (Whitty 2014). However, there is a risk that in creating a branded, localised form of professionalism, NTs and the school-led ITE programmes that they embark upon lack the progressive development of flexible, transferable or adaptive expertise (Ball and Bass 2000, Bereiter and Scardamalia 1993, Darling-Hammond and Bransford 2007, Crawford 2007). Thus, there is a fear that where the programme is built on localised knowledge and content suited to a specific setting, NTs cannot develop a wider, professional knowledge base that is

adaptable as they learn through routines and structures and are not well equipped to teach across a range of diverse employment settings (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1993, Feltovich, Spiro and Coulson 1997, Gott et al. 1996).

2.4 Summary

When considering professionalism in education, critics have stated that the marketisation of ITE and government policy relating to achieving QTS has led to a reduction in teacher autonomy, with teachers being turned into technicians rather than critically reflective practitioners (Adams and Tulasiewicz 1995, Sandholtz and Reilly 2004, Townsend and Bates 2007, Webb 2002, Bullough Jr 1994, McNamara et al. 2014a, Mattsson et al. 2011, Corcoran and O'Flaherty 2018, Lamb et al. 2018, Magni 2019, Danilewicz et al. 2019). Unless stakeholders embrace opportunities to explore how school-led ITE programmes can integrate both practitioner and academic knowledge in new ways (Zeichner 2010), the professional status of teaching may be diminished. Although Whitty's (2014) hopes of a re-professionalised occupation are optimistic, much of the literature suggests that professionalism in teaching has been eroded. There is a need to research further how SBMs enact professionalism in the new pathways to QTS enabled by recent policy shifts.

Thus, my research aims to see if professionalism has/is being redefined within the school-led programmes and the spaces it operates in. The role of the SBM and the strength of school-HEI partnerships providing school-led ITE is an area that is under-researched. There is a contribution to be made to the field through the design of this study and its focus on the emerging role of the SBM in ITE in England. Other studies have focused on the impact of ITE on HEIs, such as Mutton et al.'s (2017) deconstruction of the Carter Review or Brown et al.'s (2015, Brown 2016) focus on the challenges for university teacher education that accompany school-led ITE. The developing role of the SBM in maintained MATs and independent schools entering the ITE market is currently under-researched.

Having critically interrogated the direction of travel in ITE policy in England towards schools-led ITE, the following chapter reviews research of the mentor role, the

SBM's knowledge base, and what is expected of them in their role. I consider the utility of the concept of 'third space' in investigating ITE partnerships in new times and the potential of alternative models of collaborative partnership between schools and universities engaged in ITE.

Chapter 3. Learning in the practicum via mentoring

3.1 Introduction

This chapter defines the concept of mentoring and considers the responsibilities and importance of the role of the mentor in ITE. I present what we know about effective mentoring from the extant research base. Although some issues are well-known within the field, such as the lack of time SBMs are able to commit to mentoring (Hobson et al. 2007), I consider wider issues, such as varied mentor practice. With different schools approaching the SB programmes with varying priorities and foci, changes in mentoring practice are likely. I do not adopt an uncritical approach to mentoring. I explore the reported positive effects of mentoring on NTs and SBMs but also the circumstances in which mentoring may negatively impact NT development.

I approach mentoring as a practice-based model of professional learning and draw upon three key theoretical concepts to examine mentor practice - legitimate peripheral participation, professional practice knowledge and 'third space'. Many NTs use the teaching practice of their mentors as a model of endorsed practice to mimic and refer to as they grow professionally and make judgements within the classroom. In this way, the mentor relationship acts as a catalyst that allows the NT to experience a level of initiation into the school community, with the mentor acting as a gatekeeper and guide. The guided apprenticeship models lead to questions surrounding the quality of English ITE and the induction of NTs into the profession. Thus, this study is needed to highlight how varied SBM practice occurs and how this affects NT development.

I am drawn to the concept of 'third space' as a means of exploring change within ITE, school-HEI partnerships and collaborative working. Where manifested with strong intentions and purposeful actions to build partnerships, 'third space' can galvanize new thinking and approaches to ITE. However, such moves need stakeholder attitudes which embrace partner working with an open mindset. I explore international examples of HEIs and schools utilising 'third space' to enhance ITE. These partnerships encourage new knowledge through integration and cooperation,

as seen through models employed by various institutions within Nordic countries (Oftedal Telhaug, Asbjørn Mediås and Aasen 2006, Smith and Ulvik 2014, Van de Ven 2011).

3.2 Mentorship: roles and responsibilities

3.2.1 Defining the role of the school-based mentor

Traditionally, a mentor has been described as "an older person of greater experience and seniority on the world the young person is entering… a teacher, advisor, sponsor" (Levinson et al. 1978:97). The metaphor of travelling can also be attributed to this role, with the mentor viewed as a guide in a journey who points in the right direction, offers support and challenges the individual (Daloz 1983). Although these descriptions are apt for some, as the SBM role has been developed within school-led ITE, it is necessary to view this as a much more specific task, needing further clarification and explanation.

Mentoring can be viewed as a process which makes NTs feel supported and valued, thus inclined to remain in the profession. Mentoring contributes towards retention as it can help to alleviate the reality shock element of teaching (Shaw 2018, Colson et al. 2017, Dicke et al. 2015, Richter et al. 2013). This is achieved through the SBM's role as a colleague, support system and guide. However, alongside these relational, personable skills, the mentor is responsible for learning and growth as an experienced professional. Hobson and Malderez (2013) define mentoring as a one-to-one supportive relationship between a relatively inexperienced NT and a more experienced practitioner (mentor), designed to support development of NT learning and practice. SBMs facilitate NT induction and integration into the culture of the profession and specific school context. Here, the SBM's focus is on developing the NT's professional capabilities whilst welcoming them into the school community.

As school-led ITE routes are separate from HEIs, the design and delivery of the programmes, and the SBM role, are affected (Korthagen et al. 2010, Jaspers et al. 2014). Douglas (2015) espouses that SBMs leading the programme play a significant role that is enhanced from previous routes into teaching. This role has changed within school-led ITE as the time dedicated to NTs, the frequency of communication

and level of SBM support increases (Douglas 2015). Within school-led ITE, the NT's main point of contact for guidance is the SBM. Mentors have the potential to support professional growth and should aim to facilitate and encourage the working conditions needed to achieve this.

Additionally, due to the range of ITE provision available, NTs are positioned as consumers who can select from a confusing array of different pathways. As a result, in any school SBMs may be supporting trainees on different routes and must be familiar with the different content of each programme. This affects their responsibilities as they are required to comply with a range of conditions. Equally SBMs, and the schools providing ITE, must compete within an increasingly complex and marketised landscape to supply teacher education services, often in partnership with a range of different providers. Thus, mentoring is "buffeted by a system driven by targets, standards and assessment regimes" (Lofthouse and Thomas 2014:21) due to performative measures.

The role of the SBM is therefore multi-faceted with responsibilities including being; an educator (listening, coaching, creating opportunities for professional learning); a model (inspiring, demonstrating, making visible teacher qualities); an acculturator (helping mentee acclimatise to professional culture); a sponsor (aiding networking) and provider of psychological support (Bodoczky et al. 1999, Malderez and Wedell 2007, Billett 2011, Wilson 2014, Lofthouse 2015, Vanassche and Kelchtermans 2014). It has evolved to a complex activity as an NT needs varying levels of guidance and support throughout their training. Although mentoring is a "developmental activity, with the emphasis on empowering and enabling (mentees) to do things for themselves" (Clutterbuck 2004:11), invariably the process of modelling and guidance to enable NT's personal professionalism will take unknown periods of SBM time and levels of resource.

Mentoring can reward and retain capable teachers who take up the role to potentially progress their careers (Little 1990, Hymans 2019, Beltman and Schaeben 2012, Harris and Crocker 2003, Campbell and Campbell 2000). However, this is likely to occur when mentoring leads to positive outcomes for the mentor, such as recognition, incentives or financial reward (Simpson, Hastings and Hill 2007,

Lofthouse 2018, Fung and Gordon 2017, Mendez et al. 2019, Grima-Farrell 2015, Henning, Gut and Beam 2018). As SBM responsibilities increase with the move to the 'practicum', the time dedicated to SBM professional development should also increase.

Mentoring should be "supported as the foundation of future professional development practices and cultures" (Lofthouse 2018:2) as they guide NTs towards successful careers. The quality of mentoring practice is crucial as they support NTs in developing professional skills and knowledge and take responsibility, on behalf of the ITE provider, for assessing NT progress towards QTS (Lofthouse 2018). However, Lofthouse feels that mentoring is still an unsupported, vulnerable practice that must be re-imagined as a "dynamic hub" (Lofthouse 2018:253) through which all stakeholders can contribute to the transformation of professional learning practices and educational contexts. This aligns with my focus on collaboration and is critical when considering the SBM's value in the HEI/ school partnership and, more broadly, how mentoring is supported.

The outcome of the mentor relationship and disposition of the NT is influenced by the biography, education, experience, expertise and attitude of the SBM (Tomlinson 2019, Hudson 2016, Izadinia 2016 and Gagen and Bowie 2005). Mentoring can be a supportive strategy for beginning a new job, improving teacher retention by providing a 'serious induction' (Feiman-Nemser and Carver 2012, Carver and Feiman-Nemser 2009) and creating a collegial environment. A benefit of school-based mentoring is the positive impact that can be made on the NT and consequently, teacher retention rates. If NTs feel welcomed and accepted, the SBM has reduced their feelings of isolation and lessened the likelihood of an NT leaving the profession (Feiman-Nemser 2001, Hascher, Cocard and Moser 2004, Maynard 2000, Rippon and Martin 2006, Ingersoll and Kralik 2004, Smith and Ingersoll 2004, Johnson et al. 2005). Mentors can guide NTs into a professional community, providing insight and soft intelligence on social and practical norms. Where NTs feel supported, valued and informed, they are more inclined to stay longer in the profession and the school where they trained (Furlong 2019, Ingersoll and Strong 2012, Callahan 2016, Kidd et al. 2015, Simmie et al. 2017, Spooner-Lane 2017).

Mentors can provide NTs with emotional and psychological support, enabling them to put difficult experiences into perspective, and increasing their morale and confidence (Lindgren 2005, Bullough 2005, Johnson et al. 2005, Marable and Raimondi 2007). This is a form of conventional mentoring, focusing on "situational adjustment to the new school environment, technical advice and emotional support" (Richter et al. 2013:168); here, the SBM's role is to support NTs, collaborate and develop their professional practice whilst helping them to feel integrated in the professional community. McAdams and Pals (2006) suggest that if NTs are afforded the time to discuss their personality traits with the SBM, they will feel better prepared for the classroom. However, this additional responsibility means SBMs providing both professional and emotional support. The SBM's role can thus be challenging as they are considered an emotional support, guide, expert and one who can induct an NT into the professional sphere of teaching.

3.2.2 School-based mentor knowledge and responsibility

The practices of the mentor and their effectivity within this role are linked to the training they have received, their level of involvement with ITE delivery and their partnership with the HEI provider. Beardon et al. (1995) acknowledge that mentors must be trained for their work, and have first class knowledge of their specialist subject, an outstanding record as a teacher and a thorough understanding of successful classroom practice. However, research surrounding school-based ITE (Zwozdiak-Myers et al. 2010, Furlong et al. 2000, Martinez 2004) highlights the need for my study as it suggests that mentor preparation programs often focus on administrative aspects of the role, rather than explaining support mechanisms needed to assist NT professional learning (Hobson et al. 2009a). Concerns regarding the breadth of teacher preparation pedagogy are raised as restricted forms of mentoring, with little training or HEI collaboration, can result in the promotion and reproduction of conventional norms and practices (Feiman-Nemser, Parker and Zeichner 1993). If the mentor does not receive comprehensive preparation, which explores teaching practice and methodology from HEI and school programme leads, the NT is unlikely to develop knowledge of a range of leaner-centred approaches involving pupil challenge (Clarke and Jarvis-Selinger 2005, Sundli 2007).

Literature on mentor professional knowledge explores their understanding and use of theoretical and practical knowledge. Mena et al. (2017) highlight that talking about teaching during mentoring conversations allows NTs to recognise and name practical knowledge (Fenstermacher 1994), professional knowledge (Clandinin and Connelly 1996), and practitioner knowledge (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 2004). This allows the NT to connect these knowledges with their experience and the theoretical concepts introduced in HEI-led training sessions (Mena et al. 2017). However, studies show that this is rare as the nature of mentor conversation is based on practical knowledge and is event structured, practice-orientated and context based (Clarke et al. 2014, Kessels and Korthagen 1996). Thus, there are concerns regarding the depth and breadth of the NT's training experience as all too often, theory remains in the university domain and practice within that of the school (Jones and Straker 2006).

When considering the 'professional knowledge' of teachers, it is useful to draw upon the work of Shulman (1986, 1987), who presented and expounded the construct of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). PCK was introduced as a subcategory of teacher content knowledge, alongside subject matter content knowledge and curricular knowledge:

> "A second type of content knowledge is pedagogical knowledge, which goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge for teaching. I still speak of content knowledge here, but of the particular form of content knowledge that embodies the aspects of content most germane to its teachability". (Shulman 1986:9)

Shulman highlighted that this knowledge, associated with 'the most regularly taught topics in one's subject area' (Shulman 1986:9), includes representations of knowledge (analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations and demonstrations), and student learning difficulties and strategies to deal with them (Hashweh 2005).

Loughran et al. (2012) furthered the work of Shulman and put forward that PCK is an academic construct that is rooted in the belief that teaching requires considerably more than delivering subject content knowledge to NTs. PCK is the knowledge that

teachers develop over time, and through experience, about how to teach in particular ways in order to lead to enhanced student understanding (Loughran et al. 2012). In order to recognise and value the development of their own PCK, teachers need to have a rich conceptual understanding of the particular subject content that they teach. This understanding, combined with expertise in developing and adapting teaching strategies and approaches for use in particular class settings, for particular student cohorts, is purposefully linked to create the combination of knowledge of content and pedagogy that Shulman (1986, 1987) described as PCK.

Hashwah (2005) explores PCK as the topic-specific knowledge that the teacher develops and accumulates, through the process of teaching a certain topic. It includes the topic-specific student conceptions, queries and misunderstanding that are raised in the classroom, combined with the teacher's specific subject knowledge and the pedagogy subcategories that Shulman (1986, 1987) discussed. Importantly, PCK is not set for all teachers in a subject area, or specific to that subject area. It is a particular expertise which has key traits and distinctions that are influenced by the teaching context, content, and experience. It may be different to colleagues working in similar contexts and forms the basis of teachers' professional knowledge and expertise. The development of teaching approaches that respond to a deep knowledge of subject content is naturally built up, transformed and developed over time (Loughran et al. 2012). As a result, it is possible that the knowledge of content and knowledge of pedagogy, making recognition of PCK difficult.

However, PCK is not simply drawing upon a teaching resource or technique because it 'works'; it is a combination of the rich knowledge of pedagogy and content together, which interact with one another so that what is taught, how it is taught and what is created in practice is purposefully constructed to ensure that learning takes place and students engage (Loughran et al. 2012, Abell 2008). In line with this, a central tenet of PCK is that a teacher's use of particular teaching procedures with particular content is for a particular reason.

Teachers at all stages of their careers may lend greater weight to PCK than to research-based theory. Thus, SBMs have a potentially powerful role in ensuring that induction provides the professional learning opportunity for NTs to conceptualise

practice and to contextualise theory (Clarke et al. 2017). However, often mentor experience is perceived as the decisive factor in making classroom judgements. Furthermore, while clearly practice orientated, mentors often have difficulty articulating their wisdom of practice (Shulman 1986), often referring to 'instinct' and experience as 'teaching is a personal thing' (Clarke et al. 2013:373).

In their study of the role of the mentor in professional knowledge development, Peiser et al. (2018) found that mentors are more likely to make connections between theoretical and practical knowledge where there are clearly defined policy obligations or instructions for the mentor to "teach". Where responsibility for 'teaching theory' is not explicitly stated, mentors are inclined to attend to the development of contextual knowledge with a consequent disconnect between theory and practice (Peiser et al. 2018). Similarly, Clarke et al. (2013) found that teacher knowledge is embedded in and aligned to practice and experience which forms their pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). However, this is not to undervalue this knowledge base.

Mentors often focus on practical issues, such as classroom management, drawing primarily on their experience and then replicating strategies with NTs (Lee 2007, Sundli 2007 and Jones and Straker 2006). Struthers (2017) looked at knowledge power within the school-HEI partnership, and noted that the current, well-established model of the 'good teacher' (Moore, 2004) as a skilled (and accountable) classroom technician, fails to support ITE curriculum reform (Connell, 2009; Moore, 2004). Struthers (2017) proffers the view that traditionally the subject knowledge base has largely been the responsibility of the university, offering a depth and breadth of research-informed scholarship that can then be pedagogically orientated for teaching in schools. At a school-level, the knowledge base is much narrower, informed by regulatory requirements of the National Curriculum, along with informed teaching strategies that adhere to the policy expectations of each particular school context. Thus, the SBM's predisposition towards practice-based knowledge and experience has the potential to restrict NT learning and professional development. In focussing on the practical, SBMs may devote insufficient time to pedagogical issues and the promotion of reflective practice (Feiman-Nemser 2001,

Franke and Dahlgren 1996, Lindgren 2005), and neglect their responsibility to deliver a thorough programme of ITE.

Bullough (2005) suggests that mentor preparation needs to go beyond training, as mentors are more than effective practitioners who are able to model good professional practice (Foster 1999, Roehrig et al. 2008). For SBM practice to bear the hallmarks of professionalism through engaging in reflective practice and self-evaluation, mentors must be provided with appropriate opportunities that allow them to actively construct and extend their knowledge base (Jones and Straker 2006). Effective mentor preparation should include planned strategies of how to develop mentor identities and practice via participation in seminars with other SBMs and university-based teacher educators (Bullough 2005). Aspfors and Fransson (2015) also highlight that the type of mentor education that needs to be initiated is "...research informed, long-term, [in order to] develop mentors' (self-) understanding of teaching and mentoring" (Aspfors and Fransson 2015: 85). Mentors need to enhance their skills through conversation, practice, pedagogy and a shared discourse for mentoring (Bullough 2005), as the SBM role and responsibilities have become increasingly complex.

The role of the SBM altered considerably following the shift to school-led ITE in 2011, as responsibility for the delivery of methodology and ITE was placed on the mentor (Lofthouse 2018, Billett 2011). This calls into question the level of expectation on an SBM and how well prepared they are to employ practices suited to this more responsibilised position. Professional Standards and Ofsted expectations are the same across both HEI and school-led pathways in terms of what good teaching looks like. However, ITE curricula and SBM involvement with NT progression to QTS has somewhat changed following the move to school-led ITE. Some SBMs may previously have been mentors on HEI-led programmes and lacked the responsibility for assessment that school-led SBMs uphold (Lofthouse and Thomas 2014). Therefore, the SBM's personal view and understanding of the role is key when considering varied SBM practices and concepts of professionalism between schools.

There is a lack of understanding for what mentoring ought to entail, or what mentors should seek to achieve (Hudson 2016, Ingleby 2014, Bullough 2012 and Hobson et al 2009a) which can lead to SBMs employing non-conclusive methods for scaffolding NT learning and development. This is likely due to the SBM's lack of understanding of the school-based ITE programme, highlighting a need for the development of school explanations and a shared language (Furlong et al. 2006). In some cases, NTs are not seen to be challenged by mentors, as they are given insufficient autonomy or low risk activities due to high stakes assessment frameworks (Heikonen et al. 2020, Cajkler and Wood 2016, Demirbulak 2012, Edwards and Protheroe 2003, Edwards 1998 and Dunne and Bennett 1997).

Consequently, some NTs may not receive a full and realistic view of the profession through ITE and may struggle to manage a typical teacher workload and the various obstacles that accompany NT's initial teaching years. At a national level, this raises a concern that the expansion and endorsement of school-based ITE could lead to an under-prepared workforce that may add to, rather than reduce, the teacher retention crisis in England. The DfE has reported that 15.3% of new teachers left the profession within their first two years of teaching, and 32.3% left within five years (DfE 2019f). Furthermore, attrition rates have been at the highest five-year 'wastage' rate (loss of teachers) that has been recorded (Foster 2019). As the increase in overall teacher numbers since 2010 has not kept pace with increasing pupil numbers (Foster 2019), to lose NQTs and recently qualified teachers (RQTs) as a result of feeling ill-prepared from their training would be highly undesirable for HEIs, schools and ITE programme coordinators.

The SBM's increasing workload is sometimes unmanageable and occasionally leads to difficulties in accommodating NT needs (Lee 2007, Robinson 1999, Simpson et al. 2007, Maynard 2000). I am interested in exploring if SBMs struggle to attend to all responsibilities of their role and how this can impact on the NT's development. Mentoring is most effective when additional non-contact time is given to the SBM (Abell et al. 1995, Lee 2007, Robinson 1999). Equally, it is favourable for mentors/mentees timetables to coordinate and allow for meeting time during the school day (Bullough 2005) so as not to cause unnecessary strain on SBM and NT

time. Hobson and Malderez (2013) studies revealed that mentors are often given insufficient time to carry out the role effectively, especially considering administrative requirements, with partners often not timetabled to be 'free' at the same time. This reveals how limited time and capacity could affect the SBM's practice and ability to fulfil their role to the highest standard.

There is a high expectation of 'expert' knowledge that is bestowed upon the SBM (Douglas 2017). Holmes (2010) argues that there is a considered level of expertise that is found in the SBM, where often mimicry of such teachers can provide the NT with a kind of camouflage to hide or distort their flaws. Equally, within school-led ITE, NTs spend most of their training period in schools under SBM direction, with universities providing accreditation but a relatively small component of training (Brown et al. 2014). Thus, although they may not have contributed to the design of the programme, it is for the SBM to largely lead and direct the NT without university influence.

A further responsibility for the SBM can occur as the teacher educator function has split between either former school-based practitioners now working within a university setting or those still employed in schools with an expanded teacher education role (Reynolds, Ferguson-Patrick and McCormack 2013). Reynolds et al (2013) argue that these adjustments require 'both groups to get out of their comfortable spaces and engage with each other in constantly moving situations' (Reynolds et al. 2013:307). Pieser et al.'s (2019) study relates to this notion of increased responsibility and extended role as they examine how mentors conceptualise their roles and related skills. The authors considered if perceptions varied depending on whether they supported mentees on school-led or university-led routes. Largely, mentors see themselves predominantly in supporting and monitoring roles and feel the pressure of systemic demand (Pieser et al. 2019). However, there was also evidence that senior leaders talk about mentoring in a way that moves beyond supervision and socialises SBMs into the school-HEI partnership, thereby regarding them as serious participants in the learning community (Pieser et al. 2019).

These findings imply that within their role, SBMs must learn to cope with increased responsibility and become adaptable to change as they engage with - and as - teacher educators in a capacity that is foreign to them. However, I question if these opportunities for cross-institutional working are realistic for the SBM. As suggested earlier, although SB ITE appears to empower school-based teacher educators, the level of scrutiny and practical systems that accompany ITE reduces their autonomy. Their influence over the formation and design of the programme is almost inconsequential when considering ITE requirements and general government oversight. My study aims to further the understanding of the SBM role within school-led ITE, their responsibilities and the nature of their work within school-HEI partnerships.

3.2.3 Variance and challenge in mentorship

Mentor practice can often vary as SBMs engage with different school-led ITE programmes as schools have different priorities and foci. Mentors often have other professional responsibilities and roles within the school that can limit their capacity to mentor effectively at all times within the academic year. Thus, mentors often support trial and error learning (Roberts 2019, Mason et al. 2018, Lamb et al. 2018, Sucuoğlu 2018, Franke and Dahlgren 1996). Within this practice, the SBMs often regard NTs as a useful additional resource that increases their freedom to undertake other work, creating tasks that are too structured for NTs so that little to no supervision by the SBM is necessary (Collison and Edwards 1994). Edwards and Protheroe (2004) found that SBMs hand over their classrooms to trial-and-error learning, observe lessons and give feedback as a means of aiding progression, rather than promoting higher-level thinking.

Furthermore, SBMs do not always create an efficient learning environment for NTs due to their teacher loyalties. Their feedback may aim to limit the possible mistakes made by the NT so that the pupils (development) in the class will not be compromised (Edwards and Protheroe 2004). In some studies, SBMs felt that mentoring detracted from their main role of teaching, and that the freedom allowed to the NT was to the detriment of the students learning and educational progress (Evans 1997, Goodfellow 2000, Edwards 1998, Burch and Jackson 2013, Wilson

2014, Lofthouse and Thomas 2014). However, if NTs are not given sufficient autonomy within the classroom their learning about realistic teacher practice will be limited and possibly contradictory to what is taught at HEIs (Collison and Edwards 1994). Thus, trial and error learning can restrict NTs, especially if the SBM is attempting to avoid risks with their students.

Equally, an SBM may favour technical rationality (Wright and Bottery 1997, Thompson 2016, Talbot 2018) or be practically orientated, making insufficient use of critical reflection on the relation between the theoretical concepts from the HEI and the practical principles within the school (Sundli 2007, Wang and Odell 2002, Banerjee-Batist, Reio Jr and Rocco 2019, Garvey et al. 2017). It is common for SBMs to mentor the way they teach, drawing on their preferred activities and practices that suit their teaching persona and style (Martin 1997, Orland-Barack 2001a, Orland-Barak 2001b, Orland-Barak 2002, Orland-Barak 2005, Orland-Barak and Yinon 2005). However, when analysing links between theory and practice, the SBM may rarely explain why they practice as they do and may find it difficult to talk about their teaching (Pennanen et al. 2017, Yates 2017, Beutel et al. 2017, Svojanovsky 2017, Malderez et al. 2007, Jones et al. 1997, Edwards and Collison 1995). SBMs should aim to have interpersonal mentoring skills (Rippon and Martin 2006, Form et al. 2017) that support NTs in acquiring the knowledge that will enable them to teach in ways that are different from how they were taught (Johnson et al. 2005, Borko and Mayfield 1995). This may be achieved through employing an approach of intentional noticing (Mason 2002). This occurs when individuals develop expertise in a complex situation through noticing specific professional practice and questioning its intent or consequence, rather than just accepting practice. This will help to provide a broad knowledge of practice to draw upon. These understanding orientated approaches (Hobson 2003) designed to examine principles behind practice also lead to the development of informed reflective practitioners, which has been the foundation of HEI-led ITE for many years.

Mentoring can also compliment and extend forms of traditional HEI training (Kerry and Mayes 2013) as from an early stage, SBMs can encourage mentees to critically interrogate their concepts of teaching and learning (Edwards 1998, Rajuan 2007,

Langdon 2017). Mentoring can act as a thought-provoking relationship that furthers the NT beyond imitation, observation and feedback. According to Langdon (2017), Lindgren (2005) and Valenčič and Vogrinc (2007), mentors should emulate a broad form of ITE. SBMs should be responsive to NT development through ensuring that the strategies they recommend compliment how the NT learns most productively. The professional expertise and advice that is drawn upon should be varied according to the stages of the NT's development. This will enhance an NT's professional development as their relationship ranges from facilitating early professional learning to mutuality in the professional development of both SBMs and NTs (Fletcher and Mullen 2012, Jonson 2008, Yates 2017).

Mentoring can positively impact the SBM themselves, with many gaining new perspectives and ideas (Abell et al. 1995, Simpson et al. 2007, Holland 2018). Some feel their own enthusiasm for teaching is revitalised and seek to gain further qualifications in education (Moor et al. 2005). This enthusiasm for new academic ventures and credentials is possibly related to increased feelings of self-worth due to recognition from the professional community (Bodoczky and Malderez 1997, Connolly 2018, Holland 2018, McIntyre and Hagger 2018). Mentoring can also lead to developing SBM's knowledge through participation in mentor training courses, meeting with UTs and being given opportunities to talk to others about teaching and learning (Lopez-Real and Kwan 2005). Where collaboration with university partners and other teacher educators has occurred, mentors report learning new and improved teaching strategies (Davies et al. 1999, Lopez-Real and Kwan 2005, Connolly 2018, Holland 2018). Therefore, the SBM role can lead to mentor professional growth and renewed vigour for their career.

Despite these possibilities, research suggests that many mentor preparation programmes are extremely variable in nature and quality (Abell et al. 1995, Taylor 2000, Hobson and Malderez 2013, Bubb and Earley 2006, Hobson et al. 2009b, Bullough 2005, Andreasen, Bjørndal and Kovač 2019). This reveals that despite having a significant impact on the professional learning development of many NTs, school-based mentoring has failed to realise its full potential (Hobson et al. 2009b). This is possibly due to the lack of consistency across SBM training and preparation

with regards to developing their professional knowledge and partnerships with universities.

Smith and Ingersoll (2004) report that where training is not provided, SBMs can lack the appropriate knowledge, skills and characteristics required for the role. This could be a result of funding issues or if mentors are given insufficient additional time to carry out their roles (Hobson et al. 2007). Partnership arrangements between HEI, schools and other stakeholders, such as university teaching schools (Dunk and Haniak-Cockerham 2018), should aim to incorporate; "a strong mentoring programme"; a critical mass of trainees including the use of "paired/multiple placements"; "joint reflection and evaluation between mentor and trainee"; "formalised mentor training" and "mentoring at all levels" (Zwozdiak-Myers et al. 2010:48-104). A lack of mentor preparation coupled with the focus on TS and competencies can result in SBMs failing to encourage reflective practice with critical evaluation and developing professional knowledge (Furlong et al. 2000). According to Zeichner, there is a clear need for a mentoring model that is transformative in nature with mentors becoming reformers (Zeichner 2006).

Overall, the preparation of SBMs and their understanding of the role is vital when assuring quality within ITE. Varied mentor preparations mean that programmes lack consistency and the breadth of professional learning development needed within ITE to prepare NTs for a range of teaching environments. Many critics believe that the SBM role and preparation should be prioritised by policy makers, researchers and teacher educators interested in the support of NTs (Bush et al. 2018, McMahan, Fredrickson and Dunlap 2018, Mena et al. 2017, Spooner-Lane 2017, Hobson et al. 2009a). These views are particularly relevant following the advent of school-led ITE post 2012, wherein the SBM role is more pronounced and responsibilised than previously seen on HEI-led programmes.

3.2.4 The limitations and 'dark side' of mentorship

It is important to consider the alternative argument to school-based mentoring and the possibility of a negative impact on a trainee's development. It is not enough to have a nominated mentor simply to fulfil ITE requirements; instead, NTs should have access to an effective mentor who supports professional growth and is prepared to

take on this responsibility. Literature going back to the 1990s (Jacobi 1991) has contained various warnings about what has been termed the 'dark side of mentoring' (Long 1997), with issues relating to ITE management and SBM responsibility. Alongside this, there are differing conceptualisations across school types regarding the SBM's role, practices and importance.

It has been researched that the mentor role is often understated in schools, as some studies show that due to their unavailability, mentors fail to provide sufficient support for NT's emotional well-being (Smith and Maclay 2007, Oberski 1999, Hardy 1999). In extreme cases, NTs feel bullied by mentors (Maguire 2001), as workload pressures and the effect of increased responsibilities result in negative relationships. Here the differing practices and professionalisms of schools are concerning, as the psychological well-being of the SBM and NT is put at risk. This concern is not exclusive to England, as Beck and Kosnik's (2000) work relating to mentorship in Canada revealed that 'associate teachers' involved in ITE often "seem to be tough on student teachers… giving them heavy workloads and generating anxiety"(Beck and Kosnik 2000:207). Internationally, the mentor's role and preferred professional practice is unclear and so the level of support for NTs fluctuates on school-based ITE programmes. There is also a difference between salaried routes where the NT is employed as a teacher and seen as 'classroom ready' from September, and university-led courses which aim to develop skills across a year-long course (TeachFirst 2020, HEI1 2017a, HEI1 2020)

Hobson and Malderez (2013) attempt to categorise SBM's criticisms or judgements as 'judgementoring', a term only used in relation to school-based mentoring following their study. Judgementoring is defined as a one-to-one relationship where the mentor too readily/often reveals their judgements of NT's planning and teaching, therefore compromising the benefits of a mentoring relationship. Through restrictive feedback and negative judgements, the SBM inhibits the NT leading to a lack of confidence and potentially NTs leaving the programme. This can often be influenced by assessment frameworks, as SBMs refer to these diligently in order to ascertain NT progression (DfE 2011a). Conversely, judgementoring can occur in

parallel with an SBMs personality; if they feel their input is vital to NT development, the SBM may unintentionally make judgements and limit, rather than aid, progress.

If, as suggested by Hobson and Malderez (2013), judgementoring is found within school-led ITE, the SBMs role and practices can be called into question. An overly-critical stance could rest on the mentor's self-belief that there is a 'right' approach to teaching, thus creating clones of themselves (Hobson and Malderez 2013). Narrow mentor practice negates their goal of supporting the NT to develop 'learnacy'; that is, their ability to manage their on-going learning from their own and others teaching experiences (Claxton 2004). SBMs could also become frustrated if NTs make slow progress, as they expect them to be 'classroom ready' quite quickly. However, some SBMs utilise a process of learning whereby NTs draw on research and practical experiences to shape development, which has been referred to as 'judgement in practice' (Alter and Coggshall 2009:3), 'clinical reasoning' (Kriewaldt and Turnidge 2013:104) and 'practical theorising' (Hagger and McIntyre 2006:58, Schön 1983). This developmental stance allows the NT to make their own professional judgements but requires patience and supportive SBM conversations to evaluate these. Here the SBM's 'judgementoring' is replaced with a supportive attitude, that allows the NT to attempt different strategies without fear of being criticised.

Finally, if the SBM's role is not valued by schools and HEIs, their practices and version of professionalism can be affected. Hobson (2009b) highlights school failure to employ thorough mentor selection and training or provide subject specific support and other professional learning and development needs. Bubb and Earley (2006) suggest that policy makers have failed to provide sufficient funding for school-based mentoring, which could ensure that mentors are afforded the training, time and resources needed for this role. Additionally, Hobson and Malderez (2013) argue that schools fail to take mentoring of NTs seriously. Their study revealed that schools do not recognise the importance of NT development as many do not employ rigorous methods of mentor selection based upon a clear criteria including aptitude for role based on prior experience, personal characteristics, expertise and a willingness to assume the role.

3.3 The 'practicum turn' and the school-based mentor

Different educational arrangements for practicum learning are formed by different political, historical and organisational processes (Mattsson et al. 2011). To various extents, there have been significant efforts employed internationally towards moving the preparation of NTs to schools (Zeichner et al. 2015). This can be seen positively as a move from a training model that emphasises the acquisition of skills and mastering of competencies (Sandefur and Nicklas 1981, Peercy and Troyan 2017), to a practice-based model that emphasises participation, engagement and reflection (Grossman and McDonald 2008, Zeichner 2010, Zeichner and Conklin 2017). However, without collaboration and regular dialogue between partners, new forms of ITE may fail to deliver the policy aspirations for re-professionalised practice.

3.3.1 A practice-based model: Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Mentoring can become a model of professional learning and acclimatisation for NTs who are new to the profession and seek to establish themselves as part of the school community. The SBM can offer a level of support that encourages the NT to partake in the community of practice, thereby building confidence through exposure to a range of practices and expertise.

The sociological perspective of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) enables this process as the mentor, who is an established member of the school community, can assist the mentee's movement from 'legitimate peripheral' to full participation within school (Lave and Wenger 1991). LPP is a model of professional learning which acknowledges that learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners, and that the mastery of knowledge and skills requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the sociocultural community practices. This social process includes learning knowledgeable skills as a person's intentions to learn are engaged and the meaning of learning is configured through the process of becoming a full participant in sociocultural practice (Lave and Wenger 1991). Therefore, I will look to LPP as a model that could be used within school-led ITE programmes to integrate NTs into the school community. This tool is useful for assessing both a mentoring relationship and the NT's professional practice at a wider school level.

For NTs who are employees of their schools, LPP can have a positive impact on their social and professional assimilation. As an established member of the school community, the mentor can boost the NT's morale and feelings of acceptance through integration within this environment. However, the NT could feel their skills and knowledge are inadequate comparatively, resulting in increased stress (Tynjälä and Heikkinen 2011). If practicum placements are quite short, the NT may not have the chance to experience LPP which requires an extended period of time to provides learners with opportunities to make the culture of practice theirs, and may leave them feeling isolated (Lave and Wenger 1991).

In Johnston's (2016) study of ITE provision, LPP was compromised by a lack of NT time. To some extent, NTs fit the role of peripheral participants in subject departments. However, they did not fully assimilate in 'Communities of Practice' as they did not belong to the central core of the practice involving the established teachers who have full responsibility for the learning and well-being of the pupils in their classes (Johnston 2016). This study concluded that NTs do not fully engage in LPP as they only join the community for a limited time. They do not have the opportunity - nor are they expected - to move from the periphery to fully mature practice in the centre of community activity. In this sense, they are guests or visitors (Edwards, 1997; Johnston, 2010; Valencia, Martin, Place, & Grossman, 2009).

Another critique of LPP is that the SBM needs to provide the support for the NT to become engaged in the community and if this is not supplied, NTs may not gain access to it. LPP also relies on the NT increasing participation in communities of practice, not just in their personal workspace. An NT must be absorbed in the "culture of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991:95), participating in a community of practitioners as well as in productive activity. If participation is not employed to aid learning, the NT may adopt a broadly peripheral perspective, wherein they gradually assemble a general idea of what constitutes community practice. A broadly peripheral experience lacks specificity in relation to community roles and members and fails to allow newcomers to become part of communities of knowledge and practice (Lave and Wenger 1991).

Evidence of a broadly peripheral experience was found in Bullough et al.'s (2004) study of the university-school ITE partnership. The authors learned that clinical faculty associates (CFAs), whose role was to connect university and school classrooms, enjoyed their work and felt connected to school-based educators. However, the relationship between CFAs and university professors was hierarchical, with university-based faculty suggesting that CFAs should confirm HEI teaching in field-based experiences. As a result, the CFAs created their own group that was distinct from full-time university faculty. Here, an under-developed model of LPP is formed with structures involving relations of power rather than collegiality. My study adds to this debate as it examines SBM practice and the relationships between participating school-HEI partners. I consider if SBMs invite NTs into their 'communities of practice' as colleagues or if they lack the incentive or time to support NT assimilation (Correa et al. 2015, Mak and Pun 2015, Liu and Xu 2013).

A further issue that arises when expecting the SBM to aid LPP is the amount of time they have been members of the community themselves. If the SBM is an early career teacher and/or new to the school themselves, they will struggle to introduce the NT to a professional community of practice that they have yet to feel immersed in (Smith and Hodson 2010, Richter et al. 2013). They may need time develop the professional relationships that are required to help NTs becomes active participants (Schneider 2008, Achinstein and Athanases 2006). In this case, the expectations of the SBM would be considerable; whilst navigating a new schools landscape, they are pressured to assist an unqualified, potentially anxious NT to adapt to the workplace environment, plan and deliver lessons and assimilate into the professional community.

3.3.2 A practice-based model: doings, sayings and relatings and professional practice knowledge

As explored, there are various critiques of LPP that lead me to suggest that there are limitations to this model. However, some of its principles, such as communities of practice, are relevant to my interest in ITE partnerships and mentorship, and thus are referenced in my findings and conclusions. A more appropriate theoretical

resource and model of professional learning for this study is Heikkinnen (2018a) and Kemmis' (2014a) 'doings, sayings and relatings' model, which I now explore.

The 'practicum turn' is related specifically to mentoring as the move to a practice-based model requires further support in the professional preparation of NTs. SBMs and PMs are more involved in this process, with schools taking on more responsibility for ITE in school-based pathways (Furlong et al. 2000, Jackson and Burch 2016, DfE 1992, Perryman et al. 2017, Beardon et al. 1995, DfE 2011b, Hodson et al. 2012, McAllister 2015, Brooks 2000). Drawing on Kemmis, I approach mentoring as a social practice; a specific kind of cooperative human activity in which characteristic actions and activities ('doings') are comprehensible in terms of relevant ideas in characteristic discourses ('sayings'), and in which the people and objects involved are distributed in characteristic relationships ('relatings') (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Heikkinen et al. 2018a). The way mentoring is practiced produces, reproduces and transforms the dispositions of both mentors and mentees. This characterisation of practice illuminates the notion that practices makes sense, or are comprehensible, to practitioners when in the practice. Edwards-Groves (2018) explains that within the specific setting of a classroom, individuals become linked, coherent and interrelated within and through practices. Individuals make sense of practice through participation; they understand, or come to understand, what is being said, what is being done and how to relate to the others present at the time by being present or participating (Edwards-Groves 2018). Participation over time contributes to the development of particular characteristics of practices. Therefore, the SBM's professional practice can affect the mentee and mentor, depending on their view of their role and disposition they uphold.

When considering the doings, sayings, relatings model, it is pertinent to draw upon the theory of "practice architectures" (Kemmis and Grootenboer, 2008, Kemmis et al. 2014b). This theory suggests that human behaviour, or practice, evolves through the arrangements of time and space within a given "situated" context (Hemmings, Kemmis, and Reupert, 2013). Practice architecture theory extends the theory of doings, sayings and relatings (Kemmis et al. 2014a) and represents a systematic way of understanding and demonstrating the conditions in which the social, physical and

political world exists. This theory is inherently social and cultural, and emphasises that practices occur in, and are enmeshed with, places. It pushes beyond an accepted or normative form of education practices by allowing us to "get at" the density, porosity and nuances of practical work (Grootenboer et al 2017). Practice architectures theory puts forward that practice is continually shaped by the historical and cultural conditions of a specific locality during any given moment, and not simply located within a particular setting (Kemmis, 2012). This theory encourages one to look beyond the individual, and to include consideration of systems factors that maintain or hold practices in place, and which would need to be addressed to enable change (Cleland and Durning 2019).

Understanding and investigating the practice architectures of pedagogy enables a different view of teaching to be explored, that provides a more extensive view of the realities of the nuanced work that teachers do. Through exploring pedagogy in relation to practice architectures, it is conceptualised as a social practice. In this sense, pedagogy is not a bounded, consistent entity, but a concept where performance is embodied in enacted practices that are socially, dialogically, ontologically and temporally constituted, and ever-changing. In terms of my exploration of the doings, saying, relatings model (Kemmis et al. 2014a), practice architectures relates to the central importance of moving beyond considering pedagogy as method to a view that regards pedagogy as socially constituted (among people), dialogically formed (through language and communication), locally situated (in particular places) and as accomplished in real-time happenings (in a real-time flow) (Edwards-Groves 2017).

Specifically, the theory suggests that practice is the result of three interdependent arrangements: cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political. Examining how these features link and interact offers the opportunity to highlight how existing practices come into being, are encouraged but also constrained. Accordingly, this presents the opportunity to generate new "knowing-in practice" questions, such as what kinds of social and material arrangements facilitate knowing, learning, workplace and innovation (Brown and Duguid, 1991).

These interdependencies can be explored further, with reference to doing, sayings and relatings (Kemmis et al. 2014a). Firstly, the cultural–discursive arrangements are the resources that constitute the language and discourse of practice. There is an element of semantics associated with this process as they capture the "sayings" characteristic of a given practice, through the language that is used in "describing, interpreting and justifying" behaviour (Kemmis et al. 2014b:32). The material–economic arrangements of the physical space relates to the contextual conditions and resources that form the activity and work of practice. These arrangements are those that enable and constrain the "doings" of practice, as they define "what can be done amid the physical set-ups" of practice locations (Kemmis et al. 2014b:32). The social–political arrangements mediate the social relationships between individuals. These arrangements guide the interpretation of roles, rules and organisational function through shared understandings of power, cohesion, collegiality and practical agreements (Kemmis et al., 2014b).

The value of practice architectures is found in emphasising that practice involves the orchestration of people and objects, within settings that are spatially and temporally sensitive (Kemmis, Edwards-Groves, Wilkinson, and Hardy, 2012). It can be understood that practice architectures transform over time, creating (practice) traditions that encapsulate the histories of practice (Kemmis et al., 2014b). This can then inform educational judgements and policy about what pedagogical change is possible within different scenarios. From this theoretical perspective, changing practices requires changing the understanding, concerns and skills of individual participants. For this to occur, the practice architectures that hold existing practices in place will inevitably change.

When considering the 'doings, sayings and relatings' model, it is important to note that although Heikinnen et al. (2018b) write from the Finnish context, exploring mentor practice within University Schools, it is relevant to the UK context. A key consideration of this research is the impact of mentoring practices on NTs and how these can be explorative or, potentially, restrictive depending on the 'doings, sayings and relatings' of the mentoring relationship. Mentor Standards in England are not statutory (DfE 2016b), and thus there is scope for different mentoring practices

within school-led ITE. Kemmis et al. (2014a) suggest that if mentoring is practiced as supervision, then a mentor is likely to develop the disposition of a supervisor or agent of the state (Kemmis et al. 2014a). This possibly leads to a less interactive, personal approach which focuses on formal Teacher Standards' and fails to develop the self on a more personal level. If mentoring is viewed as support, a mentor is likely to develop a disposition to be a helpful professional colleague and guide (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Kemmis et al. 2014b), and the mentee will want to continue to develop professionally, drawing on insights and knowledges beyond required Standards and ITE provision. Finally, by practicing mentoring as collaborative self-development, mentor pairs are likely to develop dispositions towards engagement in a professional community committed to individual and collective development (Kemmis et al. 2014b).

For many, the move towards the practicum links to the need for a professional teacher to "demonstrate an increasingly large repertoire of personal as well as professional qualities, knowledge, skills and understandings" (Mattsson et al. 2011:3); qualities which Mattsson et al. (2013) argue cannot be developed from one form of either university or school-based ITE programme. This precise, personalised and more in-depth knowledge of the teaching profession, or professional practice knowledge, is gained from varying experiences taken from the practicum. It has different characteristics, follows varying routes and is constructed in different ways from generalised to propositional knowledge (Lave and Wenger 1991). It is the knowledge of how to act wisely and instinctively based on being participants in a community of practice, and is dependent on the interactions among certain individuals, in a particular context and within a certain structure (Mattsson et al. 2011).

Professional practice knowledge is formed through praxis. Praxis is a particular action that is morally committed, orientated and informed by traditions in a field. It is the kind of action that people are engaged in; a process by which a theory, idea or skill is engaged with, applied, enacted, embodied or realised (Kemmis and Smith 2008). When acting based on praxis, a practitioner will consider the circumstances and demands that confront a specific situation and then, taking a broad view of

what is best to do, they will act. Praxis is a dialectical process where intentions and value are considered. Praxis refers to practitioners 'doings, sayings and relatings' which take into account values they have seen or learnt (Mattsson et al. 2011). Thus, professional practice knowledge, as formed through praxis, is largely based on phronēsis (the disposition to act wisely and prudently) during the practicum rather than epistēmē (the disposition to attain knowledge and contemplation of truth). Epistēmē is often given high priority in academic tradition, hence NTs are required to demonstrate their knowledge through academic writing/coursework (Mattsson, Johansson and Sandström 2008). In this tradition, theories are often abstracted from practice as NTs reflect on certain situations and consider how these could have been dealt with, thereby decontextualising experiences to become generalised knowledge. The aspiration of practical reasoning and learning through the practicum is to develop a practical wisdom and disposition towards phronēsis, which develops the professional and personal outlook of the NT.

Within this study, I will draw on the concept of professional practice knowledge and the practice-based model of 'doings, sayings and relatings' to analyse how NTs engage with practice and how/if they are encouraged by SBMs to develop a disposition to act prudently based on what they have seen and learnt within the school environment. Although I was present during some observations of NT practice, the majority of my data is based upon interviews, observing mentor meetings and observation feedback sessions. Therefore, although I did not often observe NT practice directly to see the model of 'doings, sayings and relatings' in action, I can refer to SBMs and NTs references to practical reasoning and judgement, professional practice knowledge and SBM guidance through modelling to analyse and draw upon this model of professional learning. Professional practice is heavily dependent on professional wisdom; that is, practicing discretion and reasoning through decisions based on experience and knowledge (Brunstad 2007). For an NT, experience and knowledge are both limited. Thus, the model of 'doings, sayings and relatings' offers a means of creating and developing practical reasoning in partnership and through the SBMs guidance.

From varied mentoring experiences, NTs may develop different dispositions and teaching practices leading to different versions of professionalism, such as compliant technician, reflective practitioner or an activist professional (O'Kelly 2020, Zeichner 2019 and Sarı and Yolcu 2017). Varied forms of professionalism can then produce a range of practices and ideas across the teaching body. This is significant to this study as there may be implications for ITE programmes as a result of divergent school contexts, mentor orientation, approaches to 'good' teaching and the school's capacity to lead ITE in partnerships with HEIs.

Unfortunately, if the SBM fails to see the importance of their role, or simply cannot afford the time to support the NT, their approach becomes one of 'clinical supervision' (Rorrison 2008) that assists NTs to achieve QTS. Alter and Coggshall (2009) summarise a 'clinical practice profession' as the knowledge demands made on the practitioner, whose work requires the use of evidence and judgment (rather than pure technical skill), and is conducted within a community of practice operating with shared standards. Thus, employing clinical supervision and practice to achieve QTS is risky, as it assumes that an NT has the experience and knowledge to make reasonable judgements, despite this often being their first teaching experience. Equally, this practice is not in-keeping with the physical space of the classroom 'as the nature of the teaching profession is that much of the work is done in isolation, away from peers… the tacit knowledge that is developed may never be enunciated or interrogated' (Kriewaldt and Turnidge 2013:105). Clinical supervision thus implies a distanced approach to mentoring that does not have the level of SBM reflection and analysis that NTs may need throughout their training year and the early career stage (Foong, Nor and Nolan 2018, Wright 2017, Sharma 2018, Farrell 2016, Grima-Farrell 2015).

3.4 'Third space' theory and school-HEI partnerships

The level of autonomy that practice-based ITE has afforded teacher educators is highly contested, as explored in the previous chapter on the English policy context. For teachers, SBMs and school partners to feel that they a level of influence and control over the design and implementation of school-led ITE pathways, there needs to be a sense of co-creation and collaboration that enables all partners to give input

and feel valued (Burn and Mutton 2015, Douglas 2015, Zeichner 2006, Hagger and McIntyre 2006, Fletcher and Mullen 2012, Jaspers et al. 2014, Kemmis et al. 2014a). However, this is not always seen across the ITE field, nor do the government TS and policies allow for the mobilisation of teacher educators and specifically SBMs. Thus, in contrast, this investigation draws on Bhabha's (1994) version of a 'third space' as a tool to explore the possibility of enabling productive partnerships in an open place of 'hybridity'.

Bhabha's (1994) work coined the term 'third space', which emerges from a consideration of power and identity within society in the postmodern, postcolonial era. In particular, it was an imagining of a cultural space that gave voice to minority people and acknowledged the hybridity of cultures in defiance of ethnocentric traditions (Waterhouse et al. 2009). Cultural hybridity is an in-between place which brings together contradictory knowledges, practices, and discourses. Here, understanding can be appropriated, translated, reformed and read anew (Zeichner et al. 2015, Waterhouse et al. 2009). Moreover, cultural hybridity represented in the third space is transformative, and is conceptualised in relation to the 'borderline conditions' that exist there (Bhabha 1994). Bhabha urges the acknowledgement of 'a sense of the new as an insurgent act of cultural translation' (Bhabha 1994:10), and suggests that 'by exploring this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves' (Bhabha 1994: 56). From this, the theory of third space lends itself neatly to studies of contexts and situations in which different cultures may conflict, converge or transform.

Ideas about a third space have inspired research and exploration in many fields, including geography, education and drama (Richardson Bruna 2009: 225). It typically resonates with workers seeking social justice and the advancement of disadvantaged groups (Waterhouse et al. 2009). This study explores and examines ITE partnerships against the framework of third space, focussing specifically on the work and role of the SBM within this partnership. It utilises third space theory as it is generative and has potential in exploring the collaboration and relationships that exist between ITE partners. Overall, third space theory is a sensitising concept that I will use to examine how new mentoring relationships are enacted.

Third space theory involves a rejection of binaries such as practitioner and academic knowledge, and theory and practice. It also involves the integration of what are often seen as competing discourses in new ways (Zeichner et al. 2015). In this sense, third space becomes a model in which hybrid identifications are possible and where dialogues between cultures that were previously seen as separate can evolve and new ways of working and thinking can come into existence. Thus, the third space is a way of describing a productive, reflective space that creates new possibility. It is an 'interruptive, interrogative, and enunciative' (Bhabha 1994: 103) space of new forms of cultural meaning and production blurring the limitations of existing boundaries and calling into question established categorisations of culture and identity.

As previously explored, the dominant model of practice in teacher education is that NTs learn theory at the university and apply it in teaching practice in schools. With this comes the marginalisation of practitioner knowledge in the university sphere, and of academic knowledge in schools (Zeichner et al. 2015). As a result, NTs go to schools to 'practice' what they learnt at universities, and these are thus seen as two separate entities.

Bhabha views hybridity as enabling 'the spaces of resistance (to be) opened at the margins of new cultural politics' (Bhabha 1994:33), although he acknowledged that liberation between cultural identities can only be achieved after social and individual identities have been partially surrendered or altered (Bhabha 1994). New cultural politics in school-led ITE arise as schools are given more dominion over NT preparation. As HEI and school representatives adapt to this new position and cross-institutional collaborative working, their new cultural identities should be managed as new voices are included in the conversations surrounding this change to ITE provision. The development of school-led ITE offers the opportunity for hybridity between these two separate spaces, and this study furthers conversations surrounding third space as I explore how it can be used as a tool to enable a shift in identity. Applying the third space model aids my thinking and clarity around the potential to create new learning spaces in education, though networked, bridged and dynamic partnerships, and issues that accompany this.

The theory of third space allows me to explore how joint work is accomplished in particular ITE settings through learning in the context of everyday experiences of participation in the world (Bhabha 1994), to develop provision, and consider role of the SBM within this partnership.

There are numerous recent research studies which incorporate Bhabha's version of 'third space' to their work and consider its effect on ITE (McDougall and Potter 2019, Jang and Kang 2019, Jackson and Burch 2019, Williams et al. 2018, Potter and McDougall 2017, McNamara et al. 2014a and Schuck et al. 2017). Williams et al.'s (2018) study explores the utilisation of 'third space' as teacher educators consider and reflect on school-university partnerships. They reflect on the professional learning they gained from school-university partnerships which focussed on the professional experience component of an undergraduate ITE course. The study found that the collaborative nature of the partnership helped the authors reassess the purposes of professional experience in ITE and their role within this as generative, professional relationships were established. They argue that despite the challenges, school-HEI partnerships are essential to the successful implementation of productive and sustained professional experience for pre-service teachers (Williams et al. 2018).

Jackson and Burch (2019) also develop and utilise 'third space' theory in their study on university partnerships with school-based teacher educators (SBTEs). This showed that a partnership model between institutions which incorporates third space theory can bring about a shift in SBTE and NT practices. For this to occur there needs to be a 'boundary broker', that is, someone who brings together different perspectives within the context of designing workshops for NTs. This person should act as a "liminal inside-outsider constantly faced with the challenge of how to make the practice of one community relevant to another" (Kubiak et al. 2015:82, Jackson and Burch 2019). Without this individual and cross-institutional thinking, school-led ITE routes may fail to encourage a personal, ontological and conceptual shift in the SBTEs' ITE practices and classroom teaching (Jackson and Burch 2019).

'Third space' theory has also been used in recent studies to explore digital learning (McDougall and Potter 2019, Jang and Kang 2019, Potter and McDougall 2017). In particular, Shuck et al.'s (2017) study use the metaphor of 'third space' to envision what can be achieved through mobile learning and how this can untether the learner from formal institutional learning, giving scope for learning to be conceptualised in an expanded variety of places, times and ways. The implications of learning in the 'third space' for teachers and students suggests that the teacher role and curriculum structure need to change to achieve the potential of mobile learning (Shuck et al. 2017). These studies provide a critical commentary of current education issues, drawing on 'third space' to enable and further learning in the digital age. In these cases, 'third space' acts as a tool to develop educational opportunities for students and evolve teaching through adapting media resources.

'Third space' theory has utility in exploring how newly responsibilised SBMs and UTs can support NTs through engaging in theoretical, practical, personal and official discourses to facilitate NT learning (McNamara et al. 2014a). The challenge when employing this model in the new English policy context is in opening the dialogue and engaging school-HEI partners in new ways. Although these parties have worked in partnership for years on HEI-led programmes, the dynamics of these relationships shift in school-led ITE programmes as school involvement and ownership over programme design, content and delivery increases. Furthermore, school-led ITE policy has no explicit requirements regarding HEI collaboration. Despite this, HEI involvement is preferable as schools and ITE programme designers can draw upon their insight and experience of ITE provision. For collaborative planning to occur within school-led ITE, actors should be willing to engage in meaningful conversations, and potentially adapt their views on ITE by being open to co-produce new ways of working together as academics or in-service teachers.

Oldenburg (2001) endorsed the concept of liberation from cultural restriction and acknowledged the need for a 'third space' where individuals can come together as equals; this proffers visions of 'levelling' as partners surrender their outside status and work on the basis of equality, valuing each individuals input. Engestrom and Kerosuo (2003) explore 'levelling' further through the concept of horizontal

expertise, whereby the knowledge and understanding of each professional is recognised and treated with equal value and importance. Vertical expertise, or the concept of higher and lower forms of knowledge, is set aside and activity systems (schools and universities) overlap to aid NT professional learning. If 'third space' can be used as a place of cultural hybridity where horizontal expertise "gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation" (Bhabha 1994:211), it then lends itself to creating new models of school-led ITE programmes and partnerships.

However, university-based teacher educators and schoolteachers may hold biases towards their areas of expertise. Where this is the case, progressive discussions cannot be guaranteed as dialogue is hindered by ideas of professionalism (Whitty 2006, Evetts 2008) and partners' different views of what matters in school-led ITE, following the shift from university-led provision (Adams and Tulasiewicz 1995, Salvio and Boldt 2009, Jackson and Burch 2016). Before this shift, school-based educators had a less central role within partnerships providing ITE. It is therefore understandable why previous operational norms and hierarchical structures wherein HEIs devised and regulated ITE programmes may affect new ways of partnership working.

The interaction between HEI and school professionals, and how they view their counterparts, is crucial to this study. The concept of 'third space' is useful as it holds possibilities for revised partnerships and collaborative working. Occupying a space 'between' competing cultures achieves cross-sectoral working; for teacher education, this holds the potential for SBM and university representatives to learn collaboratively, facilitating NT's education. Williams et al. (2018) and Jackson and Burch's (2019) studies illustrate the qualities of Bhabha's (1994) version of 'third space', through the overlapping work of teacher educators, NTs and SBMs in HEIs and schools. However, this concept of 'levelling' and 'hybridity' may not be employed by the participating schools and HEIs involved in this study. If this is the case, the concept of 'third space' may be considered as idealistic and unachievable between institutions that run in parallel, separate spaces within the ITE sphere.

Where 'third space' is seen in practice, individuals from both sectors may come together to design and influence the school-led programme. Teachers may be encouraged to gain knowledge and develop their expertise as autonomous professionals through theoretical learning and action-based research. This would encourage the idea of hybridity as individuals occupy and move across both physical spaces and institutions. In addition to this, school principals and ITE leaders could encourage SBMs to play a key role in curriculum design and NT assessment. This may create a sense of levelling for teachers who are trusted as experts, alongside their colleagues from HEIs and within the school's leadership structure. Finally, in practice 'third space' encourages separate stakeholder to meet and discuss NT development through the various criteria that they are assessed against. Through open communications, the quality of the practicum would be strengthened as all knowledges would be valued. There would be emphasis on teacher knowledge with their live experience of pedagogy and classroom practice identifying them as professional experts. Thus, I am keen to use the concept of 'third space' and bring it to bear on the case of mentoring in ITE.

These ideas inform my research questions through considering how newly responsibilised SBMs support NTs. My study contributes to an understanding of how school-based mentoring and school-HEI partnerships are facilitated, and under what conditions. Furthermore, I draw upon the concept of 'third space' when considering the partnerships that exist between HEIs, schools and the programmes. This study explores how utilising third space can help to explore professional models of mentoring including doings, sayings and relatings (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Heikkinen et al. 2018a).

A problematic concept within this study relating to 'third space' is the idea of 'partnership', how it is produced and for what purpose. For theorists Zeichner, Payne and Brayko (2015), the problem with ITE does not lie in the manner of the training and how it is enacted, but in the democracy and hierarchies that come with the process of training NTs. My study contributes to an understanding of school-based ITE as it concentrates on the SBM's collaboration with ITE partners. My analysis of the partnerships and communication between institutions providing SB

ITE provides an insight into an aspect of this area that is under active development; specifically, who is included in the existing partnerships between institutions to support NT development, and how the SBM is placed within this. I focus on the relationships and communication between certain partners, which results in particular stakeholder voices being heard in school-led ITE design, curricula and management.

Zeichner et al. further the concept of altering and adapting identity as they argue for 'transforming' (Zeichner et al. 2015) the system and recasting who is considered an expert in the field. A shift in thinking is needed regarding whose knowledge and expertise counts in ITE (Zeichner et al. 2015), which can only occur when university faculties cross institutional boundaries to collaborate with school-based staff. Zeicher et al.(2015) believe in the power of third space; a place where UTs, SBMs and NTs can come together and cross boundaries in order to produce reasonable agreements and creative solutions (Zeichner et al. 2015). However, arguably this form of democratic teacher education is less achievable within a school system which lacks LEA influence, such as with MATs and free schools. The ability to shift knowledges and recast who is considered an expert is reduced through internal governance control and authority.

Fundamentally, there is a risk that partnership serves as a phrase to describe what should be enacted in institutions, rather than what is. Partnerships could also be simplified to describe the organisation of the programme, rather than the structures involved in the programme's expression and educational thought. In their critical reading of the Donaldson Report on teacher education in Scotland, Kennedy and Doherty highlight the issue of a 'panacea approach' to ITE whereby policy panacea acts as a policy solution (Kennedy and Doherty 2012). This theory stems from Lasswell's (1970) earlier work which argued that panaceas do not start from the identification of a particular, definable problem and do not follow what might be seen as a traditional, technicist approach to policy development (Lasswell 1970). They do not identify the problem, consider a range of solutions, agree which is 'best' within the contextual parameters and then outline how the success, or otherwise, of the policy proposal might be evaluated (Kennedy and Doherty 2012:838). Panaceas

have a 'cure all' nature and short-term appeal yet are problematic when considering clear and sustainable policy outcomes. There is a concern that English school-led ITE policy could mirror that of the Donaldson report as 'partnership' can become a guise for what is occurring between institutions. The concept of partnership gives a sense of collaboration and togetherness. However, in practice within ITE, the phrase may simply pay lip service to this idea as it is simplified to describe programme intentions, rather than the actual internal actions and communications that occur. To consider how stakeholders and programme leaders approach 'partnership' and develop relationships is crucial to this work. I seek to contribute to this through my focus on third space and the partner collaboration that may/may not occur, how this is executed and under what conditions. My research design allows for deep analysis and focus on the partnerships and relationships that exist within school-led ITE. In evaluating and exploring how these relationships are viewed by the participants, I can establish if and how 'third space' is utilised within ITE provision.

'Third space' has the potential to provide a constructive collaborative framework, through using the practice-based model of doings, sayings and relatings, with insights from LPP (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Lave and Wenger 1991). If the practice of mentoring includes producing and reproducing the beliefs of the mentor and involves their 'sayings' being incorporated in the programmes 'relatings' or discourse, evidence of third space working can be conceived. Here, mentor knowledge is valued and emphasised within the ITE programme though joint working and hybridity. 'Third space' can be utilised within LPP through engaging in sociocultural practice and participating fully within school communities. LPP sees agency placed on the mentor to introduce and acclimatise the NT into the professional workspace. The SBM's work is valued as the NT develops through engaging in the school community, as well as through UT support. Thus, 'third space' can create a common moral purpose and joint responsibility for improving NT learning through these models, resulting in securing new solutions and possibilities for high-quality school-based ITE (Jackson and Burch 2016).

Additionally, 'third space' theory has utility in exploring the collaboration and relationships that exist between university tutors, programme leads and SBMs. My

study investigates if school-HEI partners choose to 'alter' (Bhabha 1994) identities and work to achieve a level of 'horizontal expertise' (Engestrom and Kerosuo 2003) in their collaborations. Through examining partnerships against the framework of 'third space', this study explores the collaboration that can, and may not always, occur between ITE partners. This contrasts with previous studies which focused on cross-institutional work and relationships. In contrast to Williams et al. (2018), my study considers school-HEI partnerships whilst incorporating the concept of 'hybridity' (Bhaha 1994) and 'levelling' (Oldenburg 2001) of identities, achieved by moving away from previous restrictions. Furthermore, unlike previous studies (McIntyre and Hobson 2016), this research focuses specifically on the school-based mentor's partnership with HEIs. My critical analysis of education policy focussed on moves to promote school control over ITE, but which incorporates collaboration with HEIs. I consider the status of the SBM within ITE programme partnerships, the value of their work from partner perspectives and if they are enabled to cross institutional boundaries and collaborate with HEI staff.

'Third space' lends a focus on agency and interpretation, allowing for exploration of how joint work is accomplished in particular settings, and what is co-produced through collective activity. Moje et al. (2004) view 'third space' as 'a space of cultural, social and epistemological change in which the competing knowledges and discourses of different spaces are brought into 'conversation' to challenge and reshape' (Moje et al. 2004:44). This study furthers the conversation surrounding 'third space' and assesses how it can work as a tool to enable a shift in identity and allow for levelling and hybridity. I consider and explore how/if this space is used to develop SBM mentoring practices and ITE provision and how the design and implementation of SB ITE programmes is facilitated between stakeholders. My methods focus on gaining these insights in programme design and enactment close up, over a full academic session. It is to the concept of collaboration in practice through international modelled examples that I now turn in addressing the potential of 'third space' theory to teacher development.

3.4.1 Utilising 'third space' theory: international models

The 'practicum turn' is evident across different countries, including the USA
(Zeichner et al. 2015, Zeichner 2014, Kretchmar and Zeichner 2016), Norway (Smith
and Ulvik 2014, Ulvik, Smith and Helleve 2009, Mattsson et al. 2011), Sweden
(Mattsson et al. 2011, Dysthe and Engelsen 2004) and Finland (Heikkinen et al.
2018a, Dharmadhikari 2015, Sahlberg 2010, Välijärvi and Heikkinen 2012). These
different approaches to practicum have different historical bases and represent
different views on how professional practice is best nurtured (Eilertsen and Strom
2008, Haugaløkken and Ramberg 2005, Kvale, Nilsson and Retzlaff 2000, Lave and
Wenger 1991, Lindstrom 2008, Ponte 2007, Van de Ven 2011, Wenger, McDermott
and Snyder 2002, Mattsson 2008a, Eraut 1994, Eraut 2007, Eraut 2009, Mattsson
2008b). For NTs, practicum experiences are an introduction to the nature of
teachers' work, and their induction into communities of practice (Wenger 1998), but
these experiences differ considerably in terms of time, support and emphasis on the
practicum between policy makers. They also differ in their utilisation of 'third space'
and the partnerships that exist between schools and HEIs.

England is not alone in marketising school education in Europe; Sweden also uses
criteria and standards as forms of assessment, and has free schools (Mattsson et al.
2011, Dysthe and Engelsen 2004). HEI initiatives and movement towards the
practicum were also developed concurrently in America (Feiman-Nemser 1990). The
Anglo-American market model that I have previously explored differs from the
Nordic approaches I now examine, and thus two contrasting positions and
approaches to ITE emerge internationally. The American market model introduced
what has been called by Zeichner and Ellis '2.0' college programmes. These focussed
on replacing the university/theoretical element of ITE with practice, thus
deregulating and liberalising the system and allowing new ITE providers to enter the
marketplace (TEE 2017, Kretchmar and Zeichner 2016). As seen in England,
supporters of 2.0 programmes contributed to reforms through policy makers,
creating 'echo chambers' (Zeichner and Conklin 2017) which aimed to introduce
variety in ITE provision. Criticisms of this system are similar to those of English ITE
marketisation. Stitzlein and West (2014) argue that 2.0 programmes focus heavily on

discrete classroom management, techniques and measurable outcomes. Subsequently, Kretchmar and Zeichner (2016) suggest that the reformed ITE system and 2.0 programmes view teachers as technicians, wherein test scores are the sole indicator of a teacher's success within the marketised landscape.

The following section focuses on the utilisation of third space and inventive approaches to partnership in Nordic models of teacher education. Using international examples, I bring the influence of the national policy context on practices in ITE into sharper focus. These approaches have been regarded as examples of social democratic welfare regimes with certain unique qualities (Esping-Andersen 2013, Hort 2014) and the Nordic model is viewed as an ideal for school development internationally (Oftedal Telhaug et al. 2006, Schubert and Martens 2005, Hill 2010, Holm 2018). Relating to the focus of this study, it is interesting to note the Nordic approach to a shared partnership between state and schools and how this can be compared to England's model. Similarly, Whitty et al. (1998) argue that the Nordic model of teacher education echoes elements of the neoliberal/right wing policies that emerged in New Zealand, the USA, Australia and Great Britain during the 1980s. Globalisation and free markets resulted in economic competition between nations and technical and instrumental goals were prioritised at the expense of national and social unity (Oftedal Telhaug et al. 2006, Dovemark et al. 2018).

As in England, the central state is no longer supreme in each of the five Nordic countries, giving ground to an ideology of market control. However, unlike England, the Nordic model of society is based on cooperation and compromise, with a special balance between the state, the market and civil society to meet the demands of international market competition and sustain public support (Oftedal Telhaug et al. 2006, Hansen et al. 2019, Dovemark et al. 2018). The Nordic model of ITE is a composite of two large European models; the Anglo-Saxon, which emphasises economic liberalism and competition and the Continental model which emphasises the large public sector, social welfare and security (Oftedal Telhaug et al. 2006, Hansen et al. 2019, Dovemark et al. 2018, Jørgensen 2018).

I look to these models as key comparisons to consider in relation to England's context of teacher education. These international examples utilise the concept of 'third space' in some form, demonstrating innovative ways that school-HEI partnerships can be formed and developed for collaborative ITE learning. Both England and the international examples that I explore use marketisation, however Nordic countries retain a stronger public sector influence. Therefore, presenting these international models helps to inform how national policy context can influence ITE practices.

At a general level, collaborative partnerships are used to improve relationships between institutions across Norway and are encouraged through government support. This involves utilising Dialogue Conferences that encourage cross-institutional thinking and problem solving. These are structured to identify problems, analyse practice and practice architectures and develop theories to improve practice (Mattsson et al. 2011, Wilkinson et al. 2010, Ahmad, Gjøtterud and Krogh 2016, Rönnerman et al. 2016, Westbury, Hopmann and Riquarts 2012, Kemmis et al. 2008), thus helping to understand the practice of teachers and building solutions in partnership. Alliances between HEIs and schools lay the foundation of Dialogue Conferences as collaborative thinking is utilised. Thus, a professional model of ITE emerges as there is dedicated space and time for stakeholders to develop through engaging with practitioners in other fields.

Another professional model of ITE encouraging partnership and collaboration takes place in Malmö and Stockholm, through joint assessment of the NT into the teaching profession. Government administrations and ITE providers encourage NTs, SBMs and local practicum supervisors to meet and engage in assessment dialogues based on a recently introduced model for assessment, which uses scoring rubrics (Mattsson et al. 2011, Dysthe and Engelsen 2004) that combine criteria with descriptive standards. Third space is incorporated here as separate stakeholders are encouraged to meet, discuss and navigate the criterion to assess NT progress as a unit, rather than as individuals. Here, elements of an audit culture and market model of standard-based assessment intertwine with collaborative practice between different partners, who are viewed as peers. Thus, there is an element of horizontal

expertise and levelling that proffers equality amongst peers (Oldenburg 2001, Kerosuo and Engeström 2003). This encourages professional development at all levels and stages of seniority, with SBMs contributing to the design of assessment models. This position suggests the transformative potential of ITE and the Swedish government's priority of hybridity and levelling amongst those involved in ITE, subsequently encouraging pride and empowerment within the profession.

These international models of school-led ITE provide insight into how stakeholder collaboration, regular dialogue and a joint approach are associated with a transformative model of ITE. They highlight how various aspects of ITE can intertwine and institutions can utilise third space, thus allowing for a high standard of academic learning and professional development. Within these contexts, teaching is not conceived as a short apprenticeship that can be learned on the job, but as a profession that is taught and well-informed by various stakeholder knowledges, all of which are considered valid within their own right. The structure and content of ITE evolves as the concept of hybridity and levelling is endorsed at both a national and regional level, therefore allowing for a dynamic space of collaboration to exist amidst 'new cultural politics' (Bhabha 1994:33).

As yet, there are no clear system-level models of practice, policy guidelines or relational guidance within England's school-led ITE policy that encourage partners to work together as seen in the examples provided. However, there are University Teaching Schools and a University Schools Model (Dunk and Haniak-Cockerham 2018) in some Universities in England (University of Birmingham and Manchester Metropolitan University) which incorporate cross-institutional working with schools. However, these are not universal models and do not exist in every university's School of Education. Where they are in practice, these systems create and build on partnerships between institutions by valuing collaborative paired placements and the UT-NT relationship as an aid to NT progression (Kazim et al. 2014, Dang 2013, Nokes et al. 2008, Sorensen 2014). The lack of government regulation and direction concerning partnerships reveals that this is not a necessity or expectation of school-led ITE, which could then lead to schools and HEIs acting in a singular, separate manner and thus diverging from the Nordic models explored above.

I will use the international professional models of ITE as sensitising approaches to collaborative planning, design and implementation within school-led ITE programmes. Specifically, I will draw upon these examples to consider how the concept of 'third space' can be utilised to enable cross-institutional working, as a means of enabling productive, collaborative outcomes for ITE. With these in mind, within this study I consider how/if English pathways are as transformative and well-adapted as these international approaches appear to be.

3.5 Summary

School-led ITE routes have the potential to significantly alter the role of the teaching professional and the level of responsibility that an SBM has on an NT's development. However, if no clear guidance or differentiation is made between traditional HEI-led and school-led routes, there is a chance that SBM practice will not alter, although the responsibility they hold over assessments and NT oversight has increased (Lofthouse 2018). These findings and speculations signify that although the SBM role has altered following the shift towards the practicum, their significance and status may not have been adjusted accordingly by policy makers and schools leading on ITE. This issue could potentially lead to an underdeveloped and unappreciated SBM workforce, whose role is uncertain and variable between sites, thus informing RQ1. This question considers how the 'practicum turn' affects the SBM and I have discussed in detail how, in terms of national policy direction, this role has changed. However, to fully explore this question I need to consider how these policies are enacted in practice through examination of the SBM's responsibilities and their understanding of the role. This relates to RQ2 which looks at the differing mentor practices between schools. Here, a lack of direction could affect the SBM, mentor relationship and the ITE programme.

Through utilising the model of 'doings, sayings and relatings', NTs can develop their teacher identities and feel confident in their judgements and practice (Heikkinen et al. 2018a, Kemmis et al. 2014b). Furthermore, when employed as full-time teachers on school-led ITE programmes, NTs can develop as members of the school community though LPP (Lave and Wenger 1991) and establish themselves as colleagues, rather than simply being seen as trainees. However, this may be more

difficult for NTs on the School Direct route who complete two school placements and so have less time to assimilate into the school community. In the marketised landscape, the more thorough an SB ITE programme is, the more successful the school, programme and HEI will be in securing NTs. The need for interdisciplinary work between school-HEI partners is thus crucial when creating a resilient and solid ITE programme. Where this occurs, there is opportunity for a new practice-based model of ITE to emerge that offers a different insight than previously seen on HEI-led programmes. However, if there is no collaboration between stakeholders, it is possible that school-led ITE programmes will simply imitate previous HEI-led pathways, reproducing their programme content and practice and with no real thought to the underpinning educative principles or local policy direction.

Within this study, I will be looking for shifts in participants' outlook and their ways of working to explore the contextual conditions needed to create and support school-HEI partnerships, and how the SBM role fits within this setting. If the concept of a third space and notions of levelling and hybridity are employed, there can be a sense of collaboration and partnership between all stakeholders, thus leading to SBM authority and influence over ITE (Bhabha 1994, Oldenburg 2001, Whitty 2006, Evetts 2008). Where this does not occur, there is a risk of only certain voices being heard within partnerships, and across the ITE landscape.

One aim of this study was to gain new insights into SBM practices. I have explored and utilised theoretical concepts to inform my research questions regarding how the role of the SBM is defined and practiced in the school communities included in this study. If the school does not value and highlight the mentor's key role in this process, there may be evidence of limited collaboration and hybridity wherein the potential of mentoring, and value of teacher educator knowledge, is not fully realised. This research is keen to consider how/if working in new landscapes and with new actors has re-professionalised participants' mentoring practice with inventive stratagems and partnerships being formed. Alternatively, I am keen to establish if, within my participating cases, a version of ITE is being produced which does not quite fulfil its own criteria, nor allow for full, extensive development of NTs.

Chapter 4. Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores my study's methodological framework. I explain the logistics of collecting data across two school sites over an academic year, consider site selection and outline the participants of the study. Following this, I present my data collection methods and how my research design considered ethical issues and participant welfare. Finally, I reflect on my positionality and reflexivity as a researcher, considering my past experiences and interests, and explore how these have influenced this study.

4.1.1 Methodological framework

A quasi-ethnographic approach was suited to this research as it took the form of a prolonged qualitative study aimed at exploring cultural phenomenon reflecting knowledge and meaning of a cultural group (Creswell 2013, Creswell and Poth 2017). I aimed to explore the SBM's role following the 'practicum turn' and how their professional practice and responsibilities have been affected. As ethnography explores 'the nature of a specific social phenomenon' and is characterised by 'unstructured data', a small number of cases', 'interpretation of meanings and functions' and 'participant observation' (Atkinson and Hammersley 1994:248), it suits my research design including two schools, three ITE pathways and seven SBMs. However, I did not become a full, participating member in either school setting as I was always considered a visitor, albeit one that was familiar to the participants. Consequently, I was unable to consistently "study the people in naturally occurring settings… involving the researcher participating directly in the setting, if not also the activities" (Brewer 2000:172).

I joined two school communities on a part-time basis for an academic year and therefore, could not permanently integrate myself into either setting. However, I felt it more pertinent to gain in-depth insights across both schools and understand individual participant perspectives, rather than strictly adhere to a full ethnographic method which was not achievable given the logistics of my study. As participant observation remains ethnography's core defining feature (Berg and Lune 2012,

Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, Holloway and Wheeler 2013, Holliday 2016), I kept this as my focus and ensured that although I could not be resident at both school sites permanently, I was deeply invested in the participants' interactions and reflections. Over the course of one academic year I integrated myself into the school communities as a non-participant observer through regularly attending staff briefings, observation feedback sessions and mentor meetings. This involved attending one-hour meetings for seven mentor partnerships across two school sites, over a 35-week period. I also attended every SBM's one-hour observation feedback session, which amounted to 35 hours of observation.

Seidman (2006) argues that time taken to make separate visits and introductions to each participant can lead to mutual respect, open communications and familiarity between interviewee and interviewer. The time dedicated to each school was therefore crucial to exploring roles, attitudes and partnerships within each context and building strong relationships. It was important to integrate myself into the school setting, so that participants' responses were, as far as possible, natural and honest. This was difficult as an outside researcher entering a school community. My ethnographic approach was key as sustained immersion within the school communities lead to more genuine participant responses. Schutz (1967) also examines the importance of respect and seeing the participant not as an object or a type. I aimed to develop mutual respect and reciprocity with all participants, in order to gain honest views and opinions.

My weekly presence within the school communities helped to breakdown any barriers existing between myself and the participants which resulted from my status as a university-based researcher. My relationship with the participants felt as organic as their own mentoring partnerships, resulting in a strong working relationship by the end of the data collection period. This is evident as I have continued to communicate with both schools who have invited me to share findings with their respective SLTs to help amend and, hopefully, improve their ITE provision.

My research study incorporated elements of an interpretivist approach. Knowledge produced through this paradigm is socially constructed rather than objectively determined (Carson et al. 2001:5) and perceived (Hirschman 1985, Berger and Luckmann 1966:3). As my study involved direct observations and interviews, my findings are based on the participants' viewpoint, rather than my preconceived ideas of what to expect. For interpretivists, reality is multiple and relative (Cova and Elliott 2008, Tadajewski 2006, Carson et al. 2001, Shankar and Goulding 2001, Hudson and Ozanne 1988). Therefore, I allowed participants to present their interpretations of experiences and took each version of reality as valid, although this reality was subject to change depending on the participant.

The interpretivist researcher has some prior insight and interest in the research content. However, they will assume that this is insufficient when developing a fixed research design, due to the complex nature of what is perceived as reality (Hudson and Ozanne 1988). Throughout the study I remained open to new knowledge, which developed through participant interactions. The interpretivist belief that humans have the ability to adapt, and that no one can gain prior knowledge of time and context bound social realities (Hudson and Ozanne 1988, Gummesson 2000) resonates with my aim to be open to varying realities and social constructs relating the SBM role and perceptions of professionalism.

4.1.2 The different school contexts and school-led ITE pathways

It was important to consider the characteristics of institutions when choosing and negotiating access to the schools that would be involved in this study. The two schools that were chosen offered a range of school-led ITE pathways which I felt would present different experiences and insights into mentor practices. Both had a range of curriculum/subject opportunities for NTs and different specialisms which would attract a variety of potential NTs. The two schools had contrasting student cohorts and school capacity, with School 1 being a much larger, mixed-sex school. Their shared partnerships with HEIs also differed as School 1's was well-established whereas School 2's was in its infancy in terms of developing relationships between ITE stakeholders.

I contacted the schools and organised participation in the study through already established links with the university, which made introductions relatively straightforward. The criteria for site selection included access to a range of ITE pathways, subjects, NTs and institutions of contrasting size, intake and previous experience of ITE provision.

School 1

School 1 is an academy that is part of a larger MAT located in North West England. It is a mixed secondary school and sixth form college and has just over 1,300 students on roll. Around 11% of pupils have Special Educational Need and Disability (SEND) status and 40% are registered as pupil premium and eligible for free school meals (FSM). In 2018, 50% of GCSE students achieved at least a grade 4 in English and Maths (SLT2.1). The school has engaged with school-led ITE pathways since 2011 when they employed their first Teach First NT. Following this, they became the lead training school as part of their SCITT for School Direct in 2014. On average, the school has 11 school-based NTs per academic year. NTs who undertake Teach First are employed by the school as unqualified graduate teachers. NTs on the School Direct route are student teachers and train within the school for 1.5 full school terms as one of their two school placements.

School 2

School 2 is an independent school and sixth form college for boys aged between 7-18 located in North West England and has just under 1,600 students on roll. 10% of its pupils are registered as SEND and 14% receive full or partial bursaries, which is based on the total income of the student's household. No pupils receive free school meals. In 2018, 100% of GCSE students achieved at least a grade 4 in English and Maths (SLT3.2). The school introduced its bespoke ITE programme in 2017 and has now completed two full cycles of this course. On average, there are three NTs enrolled on the programme per academic year. NTs who undertake the independent schools ITE programme are employed by the school as unqualified graduate teachers.

4.1.3 The participants in this study

Table 1. Participants' in the study

7 SBMs	1-4: School 1
	5-7: School 2
7 NTs	1-4: School 1
	5-7: School 2
3 SLT	SLT1 and 2: School 1
	SLT3: School 2
4 UTs	UT1: HEI2
	UT2: HEI2
	UT3: HEI3
	UT4: HEI1
1 PM	PM1: School 1
	(SBM5 also PM at School 2)
Total participants- 22	**Total school sites- 2**
	Total HEIs- 4

All of the participants included in this study were given individualised participant information sheets that provided information on the motivation and procedures of the study to allow them to give informed consent. The forms presented the risks and benefits of taking part and ensured that the information provided to participants was fully documented from an ethical and legal perspective. The participant information forms were concise and clear. All of the participants signed consent forms at the beginning of the data collection period, and none withdrew from the study at any point.

The participants from School 1 all volunteered to take part in this study after their PM explained the research topic and asked which of the eleven SBMs of that academic year wanted to take part. Four SBMs and their NTs took part in the study from School 1. These participants were aware that they could withdraw from the study at any stage and could ask questions throughout the data collection period. Two senior leaders (SLT1 and 2) were involved in the study, one of which was the newly appointed headteacher of the school (SLT 1). Three UTs affiliated with School

1 participated. UT1 and UT2 were tutors on the Teach First programme and UT4 was the programme lead for School Direct. School 1's professional mentor also participated in the study (PM1).

School 2's participants also volunteered to take part in the study after the PM had outlined the research focus and participant involvement. Three SBMs and their NTs took part in the study, which was 100% of mentor pairs involved in the ITE programme. The participants were aware that they could withdraw from the study at any stage and could ask questions throughout the data collection period. One senior leader took part in the study, who held responsibility for professional development within the school (SLT3). UT4 was the programme lead and participated in the study, as did the PM who also acted as the SBM for an NTs.

The participants were all key people to this study as, to some degree, they were involved in the formation, design, supervision and implementation of ITE and their varied responses provided wide-ranging data over a period of time (Flick 2018, Abdalla et al. 2018, Fusch, Fusch and Ness 2018, Campbell et al. 2018). I could also easily ascertain the regularity of participant contact with partners, and to what extent they agreed with colleagues about the various aspects of the programme. It was important to record what SBMs chose to attend to in their meetings as this revealed how they prioritised their responsibilities and what they valued.

4.2 Data collection schedule

Data collection occurred within the restricted time period of the academic year from September-July, and I collected information using a number of methods over a constant period of time (Creswell 2013, Creswell and Poth 2017). Table 2 (below) outlines how frequently I communicated with each participants and which data collection method I used.

Table 2. Regularity of participant contact

	Weekly/ fortnightly mentor meetings, each lasting one hour	Observation lesson feedback meetings, each lasting one hour	Semi-structured interview, each lasting 30 minutes	Fieldnotes/ informal conversations
SBM	All meetings recorded and transcribed	All meetings recorded and transcribed-termly	Two interviews recorded and transcribed (September/July)	Weekly conversation and notes transcribed (over 35 weeks)
NT	All meetings recorded and transcribed	All meetings recorded and transcribed-termly	Two interviews recorded and transcribed (September/July)	Weekly conversation and notes transcribed
UT	All meetings recorded and transcribed (one UT was present in one meeting)	All meetings recorded and transcribed (one UT was present in one meeting)	One interview recorded and transcribed (July)	Two informal conversations. Notes were transcribed (September/June)
PM	Not present in any meetings	Not present in any meetings	One interview recorded and transcribed (July)	No informal conversations.
SLT	Not present in any meetings	Not present in any meetings	One interview recorded and transcribed (July)	No informal conversations.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) explain that multiple realities also depend on other systems for meanings, hence I used a number of different sources alongside my data collection methods to generate meaning from my data. I gathered an archive of school-level ITE documentation to understand the different school contexts, ITE design and content, the expectations of the SBM and the various NT portfolios of evidence that were being created throughout the year. The documents included are recorded in Table 3:

Table 3. Documentary data sources
- School 1 prospectus, 2017-2018, 20 pages

- School 2 prospectus, 2017-2018, 18 pages

- School 1, code of conduct, 3 pages

- NT 1,2,7, student portfolios, 50-70 pages

- HEI1 Subject Mentor guide for PGCE students, 2017-2018, 10 pages

- HEI2 Teach First, Mentor Handbook, 2017-2018, 56 pages

- HEI1 Subject Mentor School Direct handbook, 2017-2018, 10 pages

- HEI3 School Direct Subject Mentor handbook, 2017-2018, 15 pages

- HEI3 PGCE Mentor handbook, 2017-2018, 77 pages

- HEI2 Teach First mentor training PowerPoint

The three university partners in the school-led ITE pathways that were involved in this project were one first wave post-1992 university (HEI1), one red brick, late 19th Century university (HEI2) and one second wave post-2000 university (HEI3). I looked at the different HEI's mentor guidance and handbooks in relation to the SB ITE programme and also their PGCE mentor handbook as a point of comparison when considering SBM expectations, responsibilities and roles. The concept of professionalism, and how it is interpreted between sites and partners, is a focus of RQ3. Consequently, I explored the NT's training programme and taught sessions, alongside analysing the mentor practices and advice that I observed in weekly meetings. I created an archive of all programme and institutional documentation, that was kept anonymised and secure throughout the research process.

My quasi-ethnographic study involved using a range of methods alongside participant observation. This was due to external restrictions and the nature of my study, which led to a slightly different approach than that of a usual school-based ethnography. My schedule and time within the school sites was organically decided, depending on timetabled mentor meetings, HEI visits and timetabled observation. I considered the patterns of the academic year and when my observations/meetings would be most useful in showing developments in practice over time. I decided to attend every observation feedback meeting each half term. These showed significant changes in foci in line with NT's progression i.e. moving from planning (September), to behaviour management (October), to differentiation (February).

For any communication I shared, I adopted a conversational, flexible approach of active listening wherein I was sensitive to participant responses. I tried to capture the sense of participants' perceived reality through my use of open questions and also allowing participants thinking time whilst being sure not to make any quick judgements.

The cross-case study comparison method (Ridder 2017, Baskarada 2014, Tetnowski 2015, Yin and Campbell 2018, Byrne and Ragin 2009) focused on the differences between school context, the perception of the SBM role and how/if they collaborate with university partners. I focused on the activity of school-based mentoring and which NT training sessions were made in collaboration with HEIs. My position as a non-participant observer allowed for access to SLT and PMs, thereby gaining insight into their understanding of the school-led ITE programme. My research involved a cross-comparison of the PMs and SLTs perception of the SBM role and ITE documentation on mentor training and practice. The case study provides a descriptive account of the entities' experiences and/or behaviors kept by the researcher through fieldnotes, interviews (conversational) or observation (Patton 2002), and thus I employed these methods for my data collection.

4.3 Data collection methods

A key goal of my research was to understand and interpret the meanings in human behaviour, rather than generalising and predicting causes and effects (Alase 2017, Kivunja and Kuyini 2017, Hammersley 2016, Fossey et al. 2002, Neuman 2002, Hudson and Ozanne 1988). As previously discussed, it was important for me to understand participant motives, meanings, reasons and other subjective experiences which are time and context bound (Alase 2017, Ormston et al. 2014, Ritchie et al. 2013, Neuman 2002, Benzies and Allen 2001, Hudson and Ozanne 1988), and explore individual realities. These varying experiences helped to inform my research questions and revealed how the role of the SBM is perceived and enacted in school-led ITE. All data collection methods were receptive to capturing meanings in human interaction (Black 2006) and make sense of what is perceived as reality (Carson et al. 2001) to achieve clear representations of the participants' experiences of ITE. I used

the qualitative data analysis software package NVivo to store and manage the data I collected. This system held my fieldnotes, transcripts from observations and semi-structured interviews, and texts from ITE and HEI programme documentation.

4.3.1 Semi-structured Interviews

Interpretivists adopt personal and flexible research structures (Carson et al. 2001) and avoid rigid structural frameworks, hence the interviews I conducted were semi-structured, so as to give space for adaptation and personal response from participants. Kvale (1996, 2003) notes that interviews are more powerful in eliciting narrative data and allows researchers to investigate people's views in greater depth, therefore giving my participants the space to qualify their perspectives and sense of reality as "an interview is a conversation, whose purpose is to gather descriptions of the [life world] of the interviewee" (Kvale 1996:174). To allow for fluid and open descriptions of experience, it was important to create open questions (Appendix 7), thereby giving participants the space to respond and engage productively in the conversation.

I interviewed each SBM and NT participant twice for thirty minutes within the data collection period, once at the start of the academic year (September) and once at the end (June). I chose to conduct two interviews as I am aware that learning to teach is a developmental process and so it was important to collect participant perceptions at both the beginning and end of the ITE process. I interviewed every other participant (PM, SLT, UT) once at the end of the academic year for thirty minutes in order to establish their understandings and reflections on the school-led ITE programme following its completion.

The researcher and her informants are interdependent and mutually interactive (Hudson and Ozanne 1988, Edirisingha 2012, Jardine 2009, Lloyd 2009, Griffiths, Thompson and Hryniewicz 2010), and it was important to explore the SBM's reality, how they understand their role and their relationship with UTs, rather than using preconceived notions and drawing on these. I helped to construct the professional knowledge base and personal biographies of the participants' through the interview

encounter (Appendix 8) to ascertain their personal sense of professionalism and understanding of their role. My topic guides (Appendix 7) were based on themes generated from the literature, data and research questions. Within these, I referred to HEI/ school partnership, the formation of the ITE pathway and if/how collaboration was achieved between the two parties. I asked questions relating to SBM mentoring practice, advice and the expectations that each SBM had in relation to their ITE pathway. These topics also related to their concept of professionalism and how the school led, created and organised the NT's training across the programme's outline. Alongside open questioning, I invited participants to extend and elaborate on their responses and discussions to avoid misunderstanding or varying interpretations.

The two interviews that I conducted with the seven NTs related to their SBM's practices and their mentoring relationship. I also focused on their interpretation of the perceived relationship between the school and university, and how/if this directly affected their experience. I asked if they would make any chances to the ITE programme's design and content, and if there were any aspects that particularly stood out as positive or negative. I also enquired about their relationships with UTs, PMs and SBMs and if there was anything that they found challenging or useful from these relationships. In addition, I wanted to ascertain how the NT was supported throughout their training year, their understanding of professional practice knowledge and their perception of the school-HEI partnership and level of communication between stakeholders.

The interview that I conducted with the 2 PMs, 4 UTs and 3 SLT staff in July focused mainly on the collaboration that occurred with school partners and how this affected the planning and delivery of the ITE programme. I attempted to ascertain how involved the UT was in the design and implementation of the SB ITE programme and the different school-based participants perspectives on collaboration. I also aimed to explore the participants understanding of the school-HEI partnership, what form this took, how regularly communication was shared and which stakeholders were involved in this. I asked questions relating to the training sessions of each ITE

programme, exploring if these run in a similar fashion to traditional university-led courses, or if they are significantly different in their approach to ITE (Appendix 7). I transcribed all responses full verbatim, including pauses, laughter and moments of hesitation. This was done to ensure attention to detail and to fully record the nuances and views of the participants.

4.3.2 Fieldnotes

Taylor et al (2015) recognise that everything that occurs in the field is a potential source of data, and that fieldnotes represent the raw data of participant observation. Thus, researchers should strive to write the most comprehensive fieldnotes possible. The fieldnotes that I recorded throughout my research were thorough and descriptive, based upon the interactions that I witnessed between participants. I also made notes from my analysis of schools, HEIs and SB ITE programme documentation, observations and interviews that I conducted. My fieldnotes also recorded the informal conversations that I participated in that contributed to my research. It was then necessary to organise this voluminous raw data into readable narrative descriptions with major themes, categories, and illustrative examples extracted inductively though content analysis (Patton 2005), as analysis of these ideas proved fruitful to my enquiry and developed my understanding.

Van Maanen (2011) describes fieldnotes as gnomic, shorthand reconstructions of events, observations and conversations that took place in the field. They are composed as notes to oneself and are the "secret papers of social research" (Van Maanen 2011:224), therefore it was crucial that I used descriptive and not evaluative words (Taylor et al. 2015) to describe settings and activities in thorough detail, so as to easily remember the situation that occurred. This proved useful when recounting details within my study, particularly as the fieldnotes were often not recorded by dictaphone, unlike the interviews and observations I conducted. I worked with this data over the course of the academic year, referring back to previous notes, reviewing and adding to these in light of new observations that I made. This ensured that I reflected fully on all informal comments that related to my

RQs over several months and allowed me to see how participants viewpoints changed or were reaffirmed over a period of time. Throughout the data collection period, participants were fully aware that I was making fieldnotes during informal conversations. There was no area of this work that was covert and participants could review these at any time to assess my accuracy and interpretation of communications.

4.3.3 Observations

Observations offer insights into interactions, processes and behavior that goes beyond the understanding conveyed in verbal accounts (Ritchie et al. 2013), therefore I observed every formal NT observation lesson and the evaluative feedback sessions that followed these. Participant observation remains ethnography's core defining feature (Berg and Lune 2012, Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, Holloway and Galvin 2016) as data from observations consists of detailed descriptions of people's behaviors, actions, activities and a range of interpersonal interactions and organisational processes that are part of observable human experience (Patton 2005). It was useful for my study to observe the behaviors of the SBM, both with the NT and the UT (when present), as a means of exploring RQ2 and the practices of the SBM. All observations were conducted within schools as participant observation data should be gathered in a natural environment which engages natural behavior (Bogdan and Biklen 2007). This allowed me greater insight into SBM practice and the professional knowledge and guidance that they draw upon when mentoring the NT.

Observation provides rich data and understanding that would be missed by other forms of data collection (Ritchie et al. 2013), and thus I observed, recorded and transcribed every weekly/fortnightly mentor meeting that took place over 35 weeks for each mentor pairing. This furthered my understanding of the SBM role, professional practice knowledge and priorities when supporting NTs. I also observed, recorded and transcribed every half-termly observation feedback session and attended fortnightly staff briefings and departmental meetings at both schools (thirty meetings in total). This amounted to a total of 245 hours of mentor/staff

meeting transcripts and 35 hours of observation feedback transcripts. These transcripts were full verbatim and totaled over 400 pages. Logistically, I dated these in separate half-termly folders, indexed them using my coding frame (see Appendix 9), highlighted key references and sub-categorised them within the qualitative data analysis software package NVivo. Ritchie et al (2013) note that observation is rarely used as the single qualitative method of data collection; it provides greater understanding of the phenomenon being studied, to verify other findings or to provide additional explanation. For this study, the information, and data that I gathered from observations helped to clarify and further my thinking from other data sources as the natural exchanges and conversations that took place represented the personal realities of the participants.

4.4 Analysis strategy

The coding frames (see Appendix 9) that I used when analysing transcripts from observations, meetings and interviews were generated and revised from key themes. The university and SB ITE programme documentation that I included was also textually analysed through the same process.

I approached the analysis of my data with the notion of flexibility and in the knowledge that ideas may change during this process (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003). I was aware that I needed to be open to these changes but also mindful of my research focus. In order to adhere to this, my aims and research questions were written in front of me throughout the coding process to help me focus on what I needed to know and why (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003). Coding is a systematic method employed to condense extensive data sets into smaller, analysable units through the creation of categories and concepts derived from data (Lockyer 2004) which suited my research project as I collected a range of data over the course of the academic year.

The process of creating codes was meticulous as I collapsed and expanded nodes and ideas in order to develop my themes and consider how best to respond to my research questions. Some of these codes were pre-decided, based on the focus of

my research, such as mentor responsibility and mentor partnership. These were developed from my research questions and influenced by the review of extant literature. I initially started with nine key themes which were broad and far reaching, including: the teaching profession, trainee development and theory versus practice.

New codes were developed throughout the data collection process and were based on emerging themes from the data itself, generated in vivo during listening. Coding can be employed to expand on, reinterpret and open up analysis to previously unconsidered analytic possibilities and aid the generation of theories (Strauss 1987). I revised and added to my coding frames frequently. As I was open to different individual realities and interpretations of an experience, my data led to thought-provoking themes that I had not considered when devising my research questions and exploring literature. I found that different data gathered on similar issues alluded to the differing realities and experiences of participants. This then offered further depth to my understanding of the SBM role, the issues of professionalism and the collaboration, or lack of, between partners. If participants referred to a certain idea regularly, I became aware of its importance, such as with power and authority in school-HEI partnerships. These ideas were repeatedly referenced and signposted as key issues for SBMs. Therefore, this became a code and incorporated into my theme of 'third space/ partnership'.

Following my fieldwork, I realised that my initial categories lacked depth and specificity and I amended these to become more precise (Appendix 9). Once I had established clearly defined codes in a specific framework of themes, I coded my data accordingly using NVivo. I then chose specific examples which were the strongest illustrations of key themes to include in my data presentation and findings.

This coding strategy helped me to link different aspects of data, which I then considered in terms of having common properties (Lockyer 2004). When categorising my data, I tried to find the similarities and differences between the responses of participants in interviews, whilst establishing any inconsistencies or incoherence occurred between them. The regularity of references made to a certain theme helped me to categorise these in order of importance, and then consider the

concept indicators that emerge in relation to my literature review, contextual knowledge and theoretical framework, as categories of codes may be theory-driven, data-driven, derived from research literature or based on intuition (Lockyer 2004).

I looked for 'repeating ideas' which occur when different participants often use the same of similar words of phrases to express the same idea (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003), as these shed light on research concerns. For example, when participants spoke about pressure, timescales and frequency of mentor meetings, I linked these ideas under the theme of 'Role of Mentor' and code of 'Mentor time' (Appendix 9). This strategy helped me to ascertain which ideas occur across groups and which were limited to certain participants. These repeated ideas then became key themes e.g. school-HEI partnership, as participants regularly referenced the regularity of their communication with partners. Third space theory was a key theoretical concept that I wanted to draw upon in my research and so I focussed on data concerning opportunities for collaboration and the nature of this work.

It was also important to acknowledge anomalies and contrasting ideas that emerged from the data, in order to develop and refine my theoretical framework. These diverse accounts were a result of a number of different influences, such as the school's ethos and policy on professionalism (Miles and Huberman 1994). The differences in SBM's opinions became particularly apparent when discussing the training they had received for their role and their specific responsibilities. In this sense, the categories/ codes obtained in semi-structured interview were not prescribed values but explore through themes and remained embedded in their contextual position (Lockyer 2004).

The system I used to identify the varying participants in terms of role, school and design can be seen in Table 4:

Table 4. Participant identification codes

Role	School	Pathway
SBM 1-7 NT 1-7 UT 1-4 PM 1 SLT 1-3	1 2	1- Teach First 2- School Direct 3- Independent Schools' programme
Example: Larry- SBM1	School 1	1- Teach First

Larry is SBM1. He works in School 1 and is a Teach First mentor. Therefore, the code when referring to Larry is SBM1.1.1 (see Appendix 8 for participant profiles and individual codes).

4.5 Ethics

This research study went through various procedures to be considered viable and ethically sound. Initially, I submitted my research plan and application to seek approval for my study to be accepted. Following this, I ensured that all participants were thoroughly aware of the purpose and nature of my research. This study included 22 participants and so to avoid adverse reactions or misconceptions, I took the following precautions. I assured anonymity to all participants and provided participant information sheets so that each participant was fully informed about the study. I highlighted that they could choose to withdraw from the study at any point and assured them that I would make no judgements on them, their role within the school/university or their personal feelings. Finally, I allowed participants to review any transcripts that they had personally been involved in, although no participants requested to have sight of these. If participants had asked to view a transcript, I would only have given them access to data that featured them and restricted all access to other participants' data.

To safeguard the confidentiality of all participants, I recorded all interviews and transcribed all conversations personally in full verbatim, using pseudonyms. Following the completion of my research project and Manchester Metropolitan University's three-year timescale of holding data, I will dispose of all data in line with ethical and data protection requirements. Participant confidentiality has been

safeguarded throughout the study and my procedures for handling, processing, storage and destruction of collected data match the Cadicott principles, the Data Protection Act 1998 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2018 and BERA guidelines (2018). All data was stored safely, anonymised and given a research code known only to the researcher to ensure participant anonymity. A master list identifying participants to the research codes data was held on a password protected computer accessed only by the researcher. Hard paper/recorded data were stored in a locked storage area, accessed only by researcher and electronic data was stored on a password-protected computer known only by researcher. The data collected was only used for this study and will be disposed of securely after a period of three years in line with Manchester Metropolitan University procedures, BERA ethical guidelines and the Faculty Research Governance and Ethics Committee's (RGEC) recommendation. I kept ethics in constant view over the course of the research study and this was of paramount importance throughout the data collection period, when transcribing all data sources, storing data and in all aspects of writing involved in this study.

There were a number of potential ethical issues that could have affected this study that I anticipated and took account of when recruiting my participants. I used gatekeepers that were school-based to invite appropriate participants to join the study. These gatekeepers acted as intermediaries between myself and potential participants and controlled my contact with participants. Participants were provided with clear information about the research so that they could make a reasoned choice about whether or not to participate, so as to avoid any misunderstanding about the study's focus.

When developing the participant consent form, I addressed a number of potential ethical issues. Firstly, I allowed the participants to reserve the unconditional 'right' of withdrawal at any stage. In particular, I wanted NTs to feel reassured that if they were stressed or underperforming on the ITE programme, they could choose to withdraw. I informed SBMs that they could stop interviews, observations and participation in the project if they felt the NT was feeling emotional upheaval and

distress. I also stated in the consent form that participants reserved the right to refuse to answer any questions. They could also refuse to let me observe and transcribe any meetings that I was scheduled to be present in. If a participant chose to withdraw, I outlined that they should inform me directly or through the gatekeeper. The participant was not required to provide a reason for this choice.

I assured participants of full anonymity within the consent form and allowed them to review all responses and transcripts at any stage to ensure they agreed with the accuracy of the data collected. I also reassured participants that I would keep anonymity when reporting back to managers on my findings, so as to avoid ill-feeling if the data reflected negatively on the school/ ITE programme. No participant elected to withdraw at any stage during the data collection period.

4.6 Positionality and reflexivity

As a researcher, it is important to consider my interest in the study's topics and why this was of value to me and to the wider field of ITE. Through this process, it became clear that my research was driven from past experiences that were accompanied with my own opinions and bias. My interests formed the foundation of this research project and helped to guide and craft the topics and areas of interest. As Janesick (2000:385) notes,

> "the qualitative researcher accepts the fact that research is ideologically driven. There is no value-free or bias-free design. The qualitative researcher early on identifies his or her biases and articulates the ideology or conceptual frame for the study. By identifying one's bias, one can easily see where the questions that guide the study are crafted."

For me, there is no bias-free design in my study's conceptual framework, content and research questions as I come to my research as a former English teacher who taught for five years in an academy in North-East Lancashire. I trained on the school-led ITE programme Teach First and experienced a positive mentor relationship with my SBM and UT. However, during my time as a trainee and SBM, I became aware of many Teach First and School Direct participants who had less positive mentor

experiences. This was often due to the school's lack of awareness of the level of responsibility and commitment that is needed form SBMs within school-led programmes.

Following this, I became an SBM myself and had first-hand experience with the challenges of communication between ITE partners, although the UT I worked with was receptive to joint observations and collaborative working. I was therefore interested in the role of the SBM and how partnerships between universities and schools within school-led teacher education can enable or hinder NT progress and possibly lead to alternative career decisions. In this sense, my approach to this research was one of positional reflexivity (Agee et al. 2011, Macbeth 2001), as this leads the analyst to examine place, biography, self, and other in order to understand how they shape the analytic exercise. A positionally reflexive view of the field indicates a disciplined view and articulation of one's analytically situated self and has directly autobiographical and sometimes nearly clinical attachments (Agee et al. 2011).

Especially in educational studies, positional reflexivity has become insinuated into the very methods of qualitative methodology (Macbeth 2001:38) and was useful to my research as it encouraged me to engage in self-referential analysis to understand how biography, place and the positioning of self and other shape the research process. I recognised my motivations and that the research is 'as much the researcher's story as it is the story of organizational participants' (Cunliffe, 2011: 415). Equally, acknowledging my positioning in relation to others gave context to my position, voice and my perception of the research topic and questions, therefore enabling the audiences' understanding of the findings (Agee et al. 2011). Positional reflexivity, therefore, as a further form of self-reflexivity, encouraged me to recognise myself as an integral part of the research project (Alvesson et al., 2009). It was through this recognition that I acknowledged my initial position, and how this shifted throughout the research project.

My experience as an NT, teacher and SBM meant that I had a clear position when first embarking on this research. Due to the positive experiences of collaboration that I had seen and been involved in through my career as a practitioner, and in line

with the English ITE policy trajectory towards school control and collaboration between partners, I initially expected to find dynamic, collective school-university partnerships from this study. I expected to see a productive interaction within a third space that supported leveling and hybridity (Bhabha 1994, Oldenburg 2001). Suffice to say, my findings do not sit neatly within this expectation and as a result, my position on ITE, partnerships, the SBM and professionalism changed dramatically throughout the course of this research.

As a former teacher and SBM, my experience was rooted in concepts of 'good' practice, how best to engage students and the key elements that constitute building the self as a teaching practitioner including soft skills, knowledge, teacher persona, teaching style and personal classroom management strategies. My position as a former practitioner might affect my approach to data discussions and analysis. I may draw upon my previous experience to examine mentor practice and the effect on NT confidence, skills and preparation towards becoming fully qualified and consider the nuances of teaching practice that may not be known to a researcher without teaching experience.

As a semi-ethnographic researcher, I wanted to adopt the strategy of "making the familiar strange rather than the strange familiar" (Van Maanen 1995:20) as "when ethnographers share many elements of a culture with the natives under observation, they may find it hard to notice the more taken for granted aspects of the culture itself" (Prasad 2005:81). As a previous teacher and SBM, complete objectivity was not attainable nor could be expected considering the context of the qualitative study. I aimed to limit bias through presenting experiences as individual realities, endeavouring to be dispassionate in my encounters and asking further questions for clarification to avoid misrepresentation of individual perspectives.

In this study, I used reflexivity as a tool to build on my own knowledge as a previous SBM in order to further my study and understanding of the ITE field. In addition to prospective reflexivity, the study became retrospectively reflexive as my opinions of the SBM role, professionalism and partnership altered throughout the study. As a researcher exposed to new contexts and ITE partnerships, my perspective changed from what it had been as a teacher trained on a school-led ITE programme.

Sandywell (2013) asserts that reflexive practice never returns the self to the point of origin, linking with Attia and Edge's (2017) ideas that reflexivity is a developmental approach in that it establishes a metaphorical sense of movement. This relates to my study as a developmental approach is "open to the possibility of shifting insights, emergent goals and evolving methods in the pursuit of findings more significant than those initial research questions might have foreseen"(Attia and Edge 2017:36). This study questions how/if collaboration occurs between universities and schools to aid NT professional development, how this takes place and under what conditions. To establish an accurate account of these partnerships, I adopted a partly reflexive approach which Attia and Edge (2017) characterise as comprising two interacting elements: prospective and retrospective reflexivity (Edge 2011). Rather than seeing such influences as insider/outsider, gender or ethnicity as potential contamination of data to be avoided, prospective reflexivity seeks to help researchers grow their capacity to understand the significance of the knowledge, feelings, and values that they brought into the field (Attia and Edge 2017). As a reflexive practitioner, I am aware of my previous insights into the topic and the position I now hold as a researcher, rather than active SBM in the ITE field. Through analysis and data collection, my views have altered, and my findings have developed my understanding of SB ITE.

A level of bias was always to be expected as my experiences and school-led ITE training informed my topic choice and interpretation of literature. This also guided the formulation of my RQs, focusing on how the role of the SBM has altered and been adapted by school-led ITE providers. I acknowledge that I can never be totally uninfluenced by my biography and that I approach this research with personal ideas of what constitutes a 'good' model of ITE. However, throughout this research I worked to reduce threats to validity through a range of methods. First, objectivity was approximated through open-mindedness and being part of entirely different school communities to my own. Through including new and unfamiliar contexts, school types and participants, I aimed to keep an open mind throughout the study. Ratner (2002) reasons that objectivity negates subjectivity as it renders the observer a passive recipient of external information, devoid of agency. I felt that I could

remain reflexive as I aimed to be impartial towards the participating schools and can look at their practices and ITE pathways as an outsider. However, occasionally during the research, I made some value judgements e.g. what constitutes 'good' NT practice. Although I feel it is important to acknowledge that I had previous experience in the field of ITE, this research was undertaken through a full-time scholarship. I was no longer a teacher and I progressively adopted a researcher identity, thus distancing myself from the classroom.

I also reduced the threat to validity through conducting research in schools I was unfamiliar with, in a different geographic context to where I taught, and included mentoring in a range of subjects, not just my teaching specialism of English. I hoped that within a new environment where I had no emotional or professional attachment I could remain, to an extent, uninfluenced by personal feelings or opinions. I feel that I achieved this as best as I possibly could when representing and analysing accounts shared with me. I tried to account for bias through writing extensive fieldnotes and working within a new environment where I have no emotional or direct professional attachment.

4.7 Summary

I used the methods detailed in this chapter to generate data based on my interpretation of qualitative data acquisition and analysis in the literature. Accordingly, I systematically categorised the data I collected in order to present it and enable interpretation. Developing a coding frame and using a range of different data collection methods helped to shape the direction of my study and reduce threats to validity. This also helped to narrow my key ideas and give a clear focus to my investigation and areas of interest. I employed the idea of using multiple realities (Hudson and Ozanne 1988) which enabled me to remain open to individual stories and avoid interleaving these with my own preconceptions.

The approaches and processes that I have outlined ensured that my fieldwork was carried out ethically and that the data collected was sufficient to draw conclusions based on my research questions and contribute to the field of ITE.

Chapter 5. Data presentation: Relationships and communication

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data, evidence and queries surrounding relationships, communication and power between partners involved in the SB ITE programme. The concept of 'partnership' is contested as it can be both instrumental and procedural (restricted), or fundamental and transformative (expansive). For different participants, this definition changes. Generally, PMs and university-based ITE programme leads feel that their partnership is expansive, collaborative, and unifying. However, for the majority of SBMs, the partnerships with HEIs are restricted as they are uninvolved with the planning, delivery, and design of the SB ITE programme. The one anomaly is SBM1.1.1, who feels that he has an expansive partnership with UT1.1.1 due to the longevity of their relationship. It is important to acknowledge these differing interpretations of partnership when reviewing the data, as this helps to frame the context of a participant's response and outlines their position when referencing 'partnership'.

First, I consider how the three different pathways, including Teach First, School Direct and an Independent Schools' ITE programme, are created, who is involved in this process and how much involvement the school, and specifically the SBMs, have in this. This addresses RQ3: the level of communication and strength of partnership that is shared between HEIs, programme leads and schools. This is further explored in the following section which considers the frequency of communication between SBMs and university partners and how this varies across the participants' experiences. Following this, I focus on partnership work (process and practice) and explore the notion of collaborative professionalism in these settings considering how a 'third space' model is employed by ITE partners. If this concept is not utilised, I consider how frequent the communication is between stakeholders and which voices are most sought after in school-HEI partnerships. This leads to a clearer understanding of the collaboration that takes place when creating SB ITE and the contextual conditions that create and support ITE partnerships.

I consider the concept of mentoring as a social practice through the model of 'doings, sayings and relatings' which produces, reproduces and transforms the disposition of both mentors and mentees as the individuals understand practice through participation (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Edwards-Groves 2018). Analysis of this data relates to mentor style and practice, further addressing RQ2 relating to how mentoring practices differ between settings. This informs RQ1 regarding how the role of the SBM has changed following the shift towards school-led ITE post 2010, and how varied programmes are compared to traditional HEI-led routes before and after the introduction of School Direct.

5.2 Teacher education programme design, logistics and collaboration

This section explores to what extent UTs, PMs and SBMs are involved in ITE course content, design and implementation, the nature of the partnerships between these actors and who are the most active participants. This data analysis also considers issues relating to programme logistics that have been raised by participants. It focuses on SBMs attitudes towards aspects of professional knowledge that they feel are neglected by their school or the university, and the perceived benefits of a localised school-specific programme. Participants positionality differs as the schools are at different stages in engaging with ITE. School 1 has a longer trajectory of involvement with the SB ITE process as the Teach First programme started in the school in 2011 and School Direct in 2014. In comparison, this was the pilot project year of School 2's bespoke ITE programme, thus creating the curriculum was a new experience for actors from both institutions.

In School 1 the planning and course design of School Direct seems heavily reliant on the partnership and positive communication between UTs and the school's programme lead (the PM). The person with control over the entire programme within the school was Tash (PM1.1.2), who was under pressure to provide an ITE school-based programme which was acceptable to external verifiers. Although the SD approach is praised for its practical 'on the job' training by school leaders, there is a sense of distance here as,

> *"I have less knowledge of SD and how it works, it's good for recruitment and they experience real school- there's no illusions."* (SLT1.1.2).

SLT1.1.2 championed the route for providing insight into the profession and a realistic teacher placement experience. However, her comments infer a lack of insight into the course coordination and systems within her institution. This calls into question the programme's quality assurance processes and School 1's internal management structures.

School 1's SBMs felt uninvolved in the planning process of SD and a discord surrounding university PFL (subject knowledge) days:

> *"with SD the process isn't clear. It's wishy washy. Not set in stone. They have uni days but from what I hear, it's not easy to see how relevant it is to our NTs day to day professional life"* (SBM1.1.2-Larry).

This was Larry's first year as an SD SBM (although previously he had mentored on other programmes), and he felt the course lacked clarity, direction, and communication between partners. He thought that NT sessions were disconnected from the daily practicalities of teaching, thereby positioning Larry as separate to the HEI and with a different role within the partnership. Equally, there is a consensus that SBMs have little influence over the design and delivery of school and HEI ITE sessions:

> *"I have no input into how the course is run or the topics that are covered in sessions- both in-house and at University. I'm not involved in the NTs final grading for QTS."* (SBM4.1.2-Clara).

Clara also felt that there were issues with the logistics of sessions and teaching priorities:

> *"I have not been involved with the design of the course. Some sessions are timetabled at bad times of the year. More development of this needed in line with school priorities"* (Clara).

Although not mentioned directly, there is an implication that Clara felt SBM involvement would aid the design of the course as they could advise on appropriate

timings and key moments for subjects that the PM may be unaware of. SBMs are positioned as a point of delivery, rather than actively designing, reviewing, evaluating and adapting the programme. Communication is paramount here; if SBMs were aware of topics covered or key moment in the NTs schedule there could be a more collaborative approach between the key actors.

In contrast, Teach First's ITE pathway is a nationally designed programme with a shared handbook for participants and SBMs across each region. For SBM1.1.1 in School 1, there was a more personal approach from the UT affiliated with the school than the TF programme itself. SBM1.1.1 felt that although the support from the UT was strong and consistent, TF was focussed on its national mission and strategy more than its individual NTs:

> *"The structure from the university is good and support is good. They have systems to back them up. With the university its three times a year for a review, and I do double observations. So, it's a lot of contact. With TF itself, less so. With TF there's a big element on reflecting on lessons. The uni support is better than TF and more of a partnership"* (Larry-SBM1.1.1).

Larry and Lucinda (UT1.1.1) both use university systems that have been designed with TF initiatives and practical implications in mind. Although reflection is crucial to the development of an NT, Larry felt his advice as an experienced professional was also important, and his subject-specific support was necessary. Lucinda agreed with this, and highlighted that the TF programme was changing and moving away from various support structures within the school and a reliance on the TF tutor:

> *"SBMs and support are important and help you grow, and I think we may have left an element of that. It's crucial"* (Lucinda).

As the TF tutor becomes the main point of contact for an NT, the SBMs role is less prominent, leading to a lack of formal in-house support. This may happen because as TF grows nationally, it aims to have similar values and training across the country. Too much individual SBM involvement and input could divert from its core values or the NTs training foci, such as self-reflection in conjunction with the charity's goals.

According to Ron (UT2.1.1), this has occurred as TF are attempting to centralise systems further:

> *"there has been a gradual realignment of roles and as each 3-yearly TF contract has been negotiated, TF has been keen to take an increasingly active role in SB ITE. Training of and liaison with mentors was under the UTs jurisdiction, but TF introduced their own mentor training delivered by Teach First Leadership Development Officers (LDOs)"* (Ron).

This suggests that school-HEI partnerships may begin to wane as contact is limited and TF introduce their own training programmes. The implications of this change in TF policy and programme design could add a new element to a marketised sector, with schools given choice over mentor training, ITE pathway and the level of contact they maintain with HEIs, thus limiting university influence. Less personal involvement from UTs may result in deteriorating relationships with SBMs and NTs. Ron felt that previously, the UTs role had been more 'hands on', with a more active teaching aspect, however the time they spend with participants has lessened:

> *"We have 7 full days of the 5-week Summer Institute. We used to see them on placements but now we don't go at all. We do all our teaching at uni. Prior to retirement we were involved in the planning and delivery of most of the programme. Some was designed at a national level with input from local tutors. Now there is a lack of UT input and we do not oversee this"* (Ron).

Previously "the content and programme of visits was settled at university, as was the review process" (Ron), as a close NT relationship was formed through interaction and training. Although this may have differed following TF changes to the programme, Ron was keen to highlight that the academic aspect of the course remained under university jurisdiction, as they provide accreditation:

> *"subject studies planned locally, often adjusted and revisited in light of NT feedback and expressed need. Academic assignments were planned by the tutor team"* (Ron).

Despite restrictions on UT involvement and the limited time dedicated to subject studies, these sessions are based on NT need and UT professional judgement, thus giving a sense of a programme with academic principles and basis.

For School 2, much like School Direct, there was a sense of collaborative spirit when considering the formation of the programme, which was initiated by the school. This was seen most clearly between the university programme lead and SLT:

> *"It was a collective effort between the sectors and horizontal in the approach that we work together. We looked in a theoretical way at how we wanted to design ITE, then went to the university with our ideas and they were very receptive. It's strong in terms of devising liaising over who was leading it but also refining it as we go forward"* (Nathan).

Rosie (UT4.2.3) also felt that there was a communal effort between partners as they aimed to reach the goal of a collaborative pathway into ITE that would work for all:

> *"A steering group of representatives from two key schools and uni representatives designed the course. We tried to make something shared, where all voices were heard. In all collaborations, compromises are important, but the people around had a huge amount of personal interest and wanted it to work"* (Rosie).

Both participants revealed mutual respect and a shared vision, with a strong partnership that aimed to reach a shared goal. Initially, this programme was run as a pilot for the course of one academic year and involved three independent schools. Although there were areas to be improved upon, there was the impression that the other actors would be receptive to these ideas and willing to amend structures and processes. However, issues of communication occurred between others participating in the programme, for example, some UTs were asked to deliver a session to a group of NTs they had never met: "it wasn't ideal but we were short-staffed"(Rosie).

Generally, the data shows elements of weak partnerships between HEIs and schools as they work within their own spheres. Across all ITE programmes there are

concerns around prioritising workload and pressures on time as teaching priorities and assignment schedules clashed, thereby highlighting operational issues and logistics. There were also questions raised over course management and delivery, for example, the Independent Schools' programme relied on universities to cover certain aspects of the course without communicating this to UTs. For TF, UTs were not afforded enough time, thereby limiting their contact and personal involvement with NTs. This reveals a weakness to school-HEI partnerships with each institution focussing on its own delivery of ITE, unaware of the implications for their counterparts. There is also a sense of miscommunication and difficult relational dynamics as logistical aspects of the course were not discussed or managed between actors.

Finally, the school-based programmes had senior leadership and design issues which affected the standard of ITE provision, as seen with School Direct. This was partly due to the newly appointed headteacher (SLT1.1) at School 1, who was still acclimatising to her role and understanding the needs and ITE offers within her school. As a result of this, the PM took control of the programme and senior leaders had limited knowledge of the course and its coordination, raising questions over its validity and the school's line management system.

5.3 Communication about school-led ITE programmes between partners

This section explores how communication within the various pathways differs between participants due to their roles and level of involvement in course design and implementation. When related to the 'doings, sayings and relatings' model (Kemmis et al. 2014a), this can affect the SBM and NT's disposition as mentors enact practice based on their knowledge of the ITE programme. Using this model, mentors link and endorse this knowledge to NTs through practices, making their version of teaching practice and professional knowledge interrelated with the NTs (Edwards-Groves 2018). This can lead to practical issues relating to responsibility for NT development, observations, and academic assessments.

Five SBMs (of the seven involved in this study) felt that university ITE programme content and timings needed to be adjusted, with more emphasis placed on practical

training than academic learning. They believed that this would allow NTs to develop their practical knowledge on aspects such as classroom management and dealing with low level disruptions and difficult student behaviour. In particular, School 2's SBMs highlighted this need as these issues were rarely experienced within School 2's selective student cohort, and therefore NTs do not develop these skills in their everyday work (SBM5.2.3, informal conversation- fieldnotes). UT4.2.3 explained that,

> *"Our units we wanted to make suitable for university teachers but with some sort of school focus. Internal management was difficult as it was a brand-new programme- we borrowed some from the Professional Development Programme, but some were new"* (Rosie-UT4.2.3).

HEI-based programme leads expected UTs who delivered similar sessions for other ITE courses to redeliver these for the NTs on the Independent School's programme. This led to confusion for UTs as there was a lack of clarity about the school-led course and an expected level of NT knowledge and experience.

There was also a feeling that the programme needed to be more bespoke and that UTs should develop sessions that were unique to the sector:

> *"The sessions need to be more catered to issues in the independent sector, with people from school leading, not university. They need to realise the challenges are different here. Also, clarity with timings, organisation of uni days. I was sometimes passed from pillar to post"* (Rob-SBM7.2.3)

SBM7.2.3 felt uninvolved in the process of designing the programme and was unsure who his university link was, leading to confusion and frustration as he struggled to get answers from university staff when concerns were raised. He felt that it would be beneficial to work with all mentors participating in the programme because, as teachers working within the independent sector, their students faced different challenges in comparison to the traditional PGCE course. There is a concern that if this were to happen, this ITE programme may only produce NTs suitable for the independent sector, rather than members of the national teaching force who are equipped to work in different school contexts with different student cohorts.

SBM1.1.1 also raised concerns about limited the communication concerning ITE programme content and logistics. SBM Larry found the Teach First ITE systems difficult to manage and lacked understanding about how the course was designed and the ITE content of the TF 6-week training programme. This affected his mentor practice as he was unsure what professional knowledge to draw upon or introduce to his NT:

> *"The partnership Teach First is a bit different… They are not clear on their systems and I don't know what they do in their summer institute, and therefore what I need to cover with my NT* (SBM1.1.1).

Larry also commented on difficulties with the programme's reporting systems which impacted on his ability to access and complete administrative tasks concerning NT development. During mentor meetings, Larry frequently referred to the administrative technical systems that he found challenging. Larry had attempted to contact Teach First as he struggled to use the online systems that stored his NTs evidence, progress, and targets but with little success as he received no response. This gave the impression that rather than working in partnership, the school and ITE provider were two organisations that existed separately with little communication:

> *"I need to speak to TF; they haven't got back to me about BlueSky (online performance management and CPD tool). I have emailed three times. I have no idea how to record your progress"* (SBM1.1.1).

Issues regarding Teach First ITE course content and design were also raised by two of the participating NTs. The NTs voiced concerns about the level of university input on the programme and felt that the amount of HEI-led sessions given to trainees needed to be increased. They preferred these sessions to those provided by TF, as they focussed on behaviour management strategies, advice on upcoming assessments and a range of teaching and learning activities:

> *"it's about 65% TF, 35% input from uni. And I would have preferred it the other way around. We need more university days"* (Jenny, NT1.1.1, reflecting during a mentor meeting).

"I agree with the TF vision, I don't need to be reminded of it constantly. The focus needs to be spent on practical info… The school centred approach has its merits but the whole TF programme could benefit from less TF propaganda and more uni input. Too long is spent on well-being and vision and far too little time spent with the UTs" (Laura- NT3.1.1)

These NTs would have preferred university training to TF sessions held on vision and self-development. Laura also expressed concerns about the front-loaded approach to ITE in that she felt it had been rushed with a lack of UT input, resulting in a stressful introduction to her teaching career:

"You send in someone who has 5 weeks of rushed and compacted training and two hours of personal experience into a classroom, on a full timetable. It's hard and it increased my resilience" (Laura).

UT1.1.1 shared Laura's concern, acknowledging the pressures that NTs feel as a sole classroom teacher, with students reliant on them to progress:

"TF and SD are very pressuring. PGCE is more moderated, it allows NTs to develop in contrasting environments. The qualification should allow people to make mistakes. Almost have a lack of accountability in order for them to develop" (Lucinda-UT1.1.1).

Although this may develop an NTs independence, resilience and give a realistic experience of teaching, there is concern that NTs may feel pressure from mentors and subject faculties for their students to progress. Despite the potential positive impact on the school's educational performance and attainment, the SBMs, UTs and TF tutors need to "change the mindset associated with some NTs" (UT1.1.1, observation feedback session with SBM1.1.1), as their accountability for students' progress takes precedence over their own ITE development.

Some NTs felt that the HEI-led taught aspects of the School Direct programme were needless and lacked originality of content. In contrast, NTs from other programmes desired more university input. Caroline (UT3.1.2) described university sessions and PFL days as insightful and useful as,

"the training is done by classroom teachers and you get a variety of experts. It can be small groups too, who give support to each other. At PFL days they meet other trainees, not just from their alliance. Our model can accommodate small scale and then PFL is larger" (Caroline).

There is a suggestion of innovation in these sessions, with 'experts' leading and expanding the NTs professional knowledge. This implies that school-based practitioners' knowledge is most valued within school-led ITE programmes within this study, and by the HEI programme leads overseeing the course. Caroline indicated that expertise resides in classrooms and that she looked to these professionals to develop NT knowledge. This illustrates policy moves that reposition ITE within schools and away from HEIs. However, this enthusiasm for collaboration and cross-institutional working was not shared by NT4.1.2:

"I learnt 25% of teaching at uni. It comes from being on the job. I learnt everything with my mentor- there wasn't much from uni that my SBM hadn't taught me before. It was supposed to be an enhancement of subject knowledge but really it's something you learn on the job" (Katherine-NT4.1.2).

Although advice from UTs and SBMs should be coherent and complementary, Katherine implied an element of duplication between institutions. Katherine struggled to see the benefit in what she was being taught by university tutors and saw a large crossover between that and her SBM's advice, indicating a lack of communication between partners and highlighting the lack of SBM input in course design. Katherine viewed professional learning in association with the practicalities of daily teaching experience and saw more value in classroom experience than in a university-led training session.

Overall, the three pathways differed in their rationale, design, and use of school-HEI partnerships. The Independent Schools' programme was designed in collaboration with the university and leaders within School 2, creating a bespoke model. The content of the School Direct programme was overseen by UT3.1.2 but the frequency and timings of school sessions were determined by PM1.2.1. In contrast, Teach

First's taught sessions were nationally designed to follow its ethos and values. Participants had a nationally shared handbook and university-led sessions were designed to follow similar topics and prepare NTs for the same assessments. However, each route uses the SBM as a key support system for its NTs. Generally, NTs felt that SBMs advice was valuable and that the practical ITE training sessions involving behaviour management and lesson planning/delivery were the most useful, whether provided by school or HEI.

5.4 Developing specific school professionalism

How professionalism is understood between the school-based ITE partners is a key point of analysis within this research project. Approaches to professional practice alter through ITE programme design and mentor behaviour and becomes tailored to a specific setting. The following section reviews how professionalism is interpreted in ITE and programme policy. IT also consider how professionalism is developed through course content and through SBM and UT advice to NTs. It considers the school/programme expectations of teacher professionalism and how this is interwoven into the school's ethos and within the ITE pathway. This addresses RQ2 concerning each pathway's content, design, and delivery.

As schools take responsibility for the training of NTs, a form of local professionalism is cultivated as participants' experience specific training within school. Generally, SB ITE nurtures NTs to develop skills and professional attributes that are suited to one school/context. NTs experienced individualised systems and an ethos of local professionalism with schools tailoring specific topics to their intake and cohorts, especially when NTs are school employees. In this sense, schools are 'growing their own' workforce to suit their needs and priorities. This gives NTs a unique insight into localised context, resulting in retention at NQT level, as seen in School 1 as:

> "*they (NTs) know what to expect and know the systems. So that's good. And the school can retain people.*" (Linda-SLT1.1).

Here, Linda praised SB ITE for its focus on specific school systems, thereby incentivising NTs to remain within their placement school. Although School 1 had only been offering SD for the past two academic years, they had retained 86% (5

teachers) of all the NTs who trained there (SLT1.1.2), indicating that an opportunity to work in a known, familiar setting is attractive to prospective NTs.

School-led ITE affords schools the opportunity of creating and moulding teachers to fit their style and systems, creating a specific professionalism that caters for the school's needs. School 2 focused on gifted and talented (G and T) training and rarely referred to SEND, as over 80% of the cohort was 'more able':

> *"our focus is on more able training and pushing students to achieve… we are streamlined but we do have lower ability, at which stage a lecture teaching style is encouraged so that the students are definitely receiving all the information they need"* (SLT3.2.3).

SBM5.2.3 noted that "our NTs focus on what they need here. In their contrasting placement and at university they see other skills to develop so they can mix and match" (Gary-SBM5.2.3). Similarly, when assessing NT6.2.3's areas for improvements, SBM6.2.3 advised that:

> *"We need to look at SEN and using it. You don't have many, but you do teach to different abilities. That will do. You don't need to know techniques, just demonstrate low ability teaching"* (Mathew-SBM6.2.3, mentor meeting).

This illustrates Gary's point; as an independent school with a specific teacher/lecturer style and few behaviour problems, in-house ITE training sessions focus on gifted and talented teaching more than SEND and teaching to low abilities (Gary) as School 2 is streamlined and separated by ability. This is problematic as additional needs does not equate with low ability, leading to concerns about the understanding of SEND within School 2 and how NTs develop SEND knowledge and teaching strategies. To this effect, Mathew noted during an informal conversation that Abdul (NT6.2.3) had little experience of differentiation as less than 10% of students have SEND status within the school (SLT3.2.3). To counteract this in his NT portfolio, he focused on lower ability teaching to evidence having 'a clear understanding of the needs of all pupils' (DfE 2011a:12). Misconceptions risk being developed here as there is no consideration that a SEND student could also be G and T. The NTs professional understanding is developed by their school, for the needs of

its specific students. As a result, NT training is narrowed to fit with school priorities, potentially limiting their ability to work in a broader context and their understanding of inclusion.

School 1's School Direct ITE curriculum content is set over the academic year, with emphasis placed on certain topics that are designated to more than one training session (Appendix 6). In comparison, the university's training schedule and contribution to NT development was more focussed on the assessment aspect of the PGCE qualification, with some training on developing subject specific knowledge, although this was not a priority in terms of frequency of sessions (Appendix 6). School 1 had logistical control over School Direct as the PM managed the programme content, giving prominence to school priorities, such as SEND training. This results in localised NT training in a specific context with different foci. Tash (PM1.1.2) explained that as PM, she adapted sessions to fit the school's needs, working closely with the UT to ensure accreditation:

> *"There's a generic list of training topics for ITE courses but we amend it for our school. I will add other elements to make it more localised/ school specific. We tailor our sessions with the strengths of our staff, so it can be localised and specific. We put things in that we find useful. A lot is fed from the Carter review and tells us what we should have on an ITE course. We have a higher proportion of EAL (students with English as an addition language), so have extra sessions"* (Tash).

Although the course must meet HEI criteria, Tash was free to amend certain aspects to suit School 1's needs, while SBMs have no influence over this. For example, School 1 focussed on specific behaviour management techniques in line with their policies that would not be applicable to other schools. Each department had a 'quiet working room' for student removals which were heavily relied upon, which other schools may not have. For School 1, there was "a focus on behaviour and low-achieving, disillusioned boys with heavily practical activities to engage them. They are a key focus for our NTs to succeed in the school" (PM1.1.2). This would raise issues of validity, however Caroline (UT3.1.2) explained that:

"We developed a plan together, we have certain criteria to be covered, whether at uni or in school. My job is to check they've covered everything university requires. I need to see that these are met physically, within portfolios. The PM pulls the plan together for me to check. I don't attend the session because I know what's happening on the programme… quality assure it all and check everything is being covered. I've been to one session, but I know they are quality assured by the PM. She has feedback forms that I see, so we know its good quality. PMs create based on what we say needs to be included, and they can choose the order. So, each programme has a different timeline of events and is flexible" (Caroline).

Despite Caroline's reassurances, SD's design and content does raise questions about school-led ITE originality as, through UT3.2.1, Tash borrowed HEI training content and adapted aspects to suit her school. This also shows that the SBMs hold a position of delivery, rather than co-creators. As they support NTs daily, they may have more insight about what topics are needed to stretch their development, but their opinion is not sought, implying their lack of value to the pathways by programme leaders.

University associates and tutors acknowledge that SB programmes develop more specialised professionals who are suited to certain institutions as UT1.1.1 believed that "Schools want to mould teachers into a certain type. SB route has a branded feel" (Lucinda). The shift towards practical-led ITE creates distinct programmes as schools relish the opportunity to harvest teachers who understand their systems inherently and develop their practice to fit the school ethos. This differed to Lucinda's previous experience as a PGCE mentor for a HEI-led programme as the content and delivery of activities and topics remained broad, thus preparing NTs for varied teaching environments (Lucinda). As the UT and School Direct lead, Caroline (UT3.1.2) explained that,

"We would never override the school as they work there. The alliances cover everything but not in the same order and give priority to certain things. That's the beauty of it. The programme leads do it themselves to make sense to them (Caroline).

She viewed the opportunity for schools and mentors to prioritise aspects of training as positive for both the school and NTs as "they have the current experience… they know what needs to be covered" (Caroline). However, HEI tutors offer breadth of training, and a vast knowledge and experience of schools as previous practitioners and UTs that NTs can draw upon (Caroline). The localised professionalism that develops results in more emphasis and responsibility on schools to deliver sessions that are specific to their needs and local context, thereby creating a branded/localised programme.

Clara (SBM4.1.2) also acknowledged that SD training sessions are often personalised to suit the priorities of the school and academy trust:

> *"there are sessions about teaching as a whole that they can carry forward, but the majority are about this area and school- such as specific school behaviour management policies, SEN priorities within the school (low reading ages) and using Standard English as dialect affects student writing here enormously"* (Clara).

Although within her role as an SBM she aimed to keep her advice "general and applicable to many contexts so they can take skills with them on their professional journey" (Clara, informal conversation following a mentor meeting), Clara acknowledged the school's aim to develop teachers that will fit in with their protocols and adapt to suit their needs. She noted the high quantity of EAL and SEND sessions, as there is a large proportion of these groups within School 1, and that often self/subject development are secondary to these as it is expected that these topics are covered at university (Clara). This was illustrated further in data collected from staff briefings: "you must focus on differentiation and meeting the needs of weaker students"(PM1.1.2) and School 1's INSET (In-service training) days: "our focus of the year is to improve our literacy policy and to reduce the gap between pupil premium boys and high-performing girls"(SLT1.1). Moreover, subject knowledge development, teacher presence, marking and moderation rarely feature in SD training sessions (Clara), implying that course content is not far-reaching or broad enough to fully develop NT's as practitioners.

There is also a concern about the diversity of student groups that NT's teach when employed full-time in their school, and the pressure that this puts on universities to deliver sessions that will broaden NT expertise. Helen (SBM2.1.1) explained that,

> *"we try to teach to the top, but she doesn't have top sets… so really there isn't any G and T training. I hope the university provides this"* (Helen).

NT2.1.1's development was stilted due to the limited range of students she encountered. Helen was concerned that Amina had little training or experience of teaching of G and T students and would struggle to adapt her style to suit this cohort.

Similarly, SBM6.2.3 relied on the HEI to lead on topics that he struggled to address when mentoring:

> *"They need further Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) training and to have a clear understanding about this. Use and evaluate in the Teacher Standards' implies you need to use skills… we do not often utilise SEND training within our teaching practice as we only have a cohort of 3% SEND. We rarely adapt activities to suit needs, as there aren't many within the school. Of all the Standards, that's the sticking point"* (Mathew-SBM6.2.3).

Like SBM2.1.1, Mathew hoped that the university would improve NT knowledge on any Standards or teacher practices that were not prevalent to School 2, revealing a lack of communication between partners regarding responsibility for content. This also shows a form of localised professional practice being nurtured within the School 2 as, due to the small cohort of SEND students within the school, teaching practice lacked a focus on students with specific needs and rarely encouraged differentiation in teaching and learning activities.

This highlights that the breadth of ITE training provided is dependent on each individual school context. Although university sessions are infrequent, there is a demand on them to produce well-rounded NTs that will adapt to any professional institution, as the schools' focus is often on developing a professional that will meet

their needs. This reveals the limits of a front-loaded approach to ITE as the NTs HEI training is restricted, reducing the learning opportunities for an NT to strengthen broader teaching skills for all national contexts. Classroom strategies are often best developed practically in a classroom, and SBMs Clara and Helen raised concerns about the wider professional context for their NTs and if they would be afforded the opportunity to have practical experience in areas that were not a focus of the school or prevalent for the students that they taught e.g. G and T.

For both school and university representatives, it is accepted that universities provide NT training that can be applied to any schools or contexts that they encounter, as SB ITE focuses on their own priorities and systems. In this sense, the aims and content of HEI activity is broader than that of school-led ITE provision. The university aims to provide differentiated training and activities suited to a variety of contexts, with sessions on behaviour management techniques and subject specific teaching activities. However, these sessions are limited as trainees on school-led ITE programmes have, on average across the three programmes within this study, 15-20 days of designated university-led training sessions. Within this time, HEIs must also lead on another of their key responsibilities: preparing NTs for and assessing the academic assignments that are necessary to achieve QTS. HEI-based educators support NTs with these assessments as they devise the task itself, provide advice and, where necessary, offer support and direction:

> *"we support with the assessments and often our sessions are taken up with questions from the trainees as schools cannot provide this support or advice"* (UT2.1.1).

Caroline thought that the university's role was to provide generic training applicable to any school. She believed that NTs would be able to adapt to settings by adopting the principles of learning provided by the university:

> *The alliances all train in planning and specifics- university provides generic info, so they are being trained individually, or as schools, making them specific NTs to those schools. That's what happens as they go into a new job.*

They learn different routines, standards and expectations of doing things. It was always the case (Caroline-UT3).

Caroline believed that this approach prepared NTs for their first post as a qualified teacher, as they were immersed in one school setting and develop a localised professionalism suited to that context. As the PM coordinating NT training, Gary (SBM5.2.3) viewed the university's role as preparing NTs to teach at other schools, and his role as developing NTs to suit and adapt to School 2's needs:

"You still get an idea of a different school. It's the university's role to train NTs for all schools. It's not realistic for us. NTs subject knowledge for this sector need to be spot on and high- that's more important than behaviour (Gary).

He felt that time restrictions and operational issues meant that school training must be focussed and specific. NTs on placement for 1-2 academic years at School 2 must adapt to suit its specific model of professionalism, including a broad and developed subject knowledge with a focus on pushing G and T students to progress beyond their expected levels (Gary). Equally, they had to aim to meet and contribute towards "high standards are enhanced by a strong academic curriculum and an outstanding programme of extra-curricular activities and trips" (School 2, 2019). However, focussing on subject knowledge enhancement rather than behaviour might hinder an NT in future teaching posts where this is more of an issue.

From this data, it is clear that HEIs play a crucial role in school-led ITE, despite the shift to school control and practical-led teacher education. UTs set, assess, and prepare NTs for the academic assessment towards achieving QTS. However, school-based teacher educators and programme leads afford universities the responsibility of providing a more general view of ITE and the tools for NTs to adapt to all settings. These broad expectations are arguably challenging to meet, given limited training days and meeting time afforded to HEIs within the school-led ITE programme design and scheduled training sessions.

A final concern regarding developing NT professional knowledge is the duration of their second placement, which for Teach First and the Independent Schools' programme was only a week. The criterion of completing a second contrasting

placement in order to gain QTS was set by The National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) in March 2012 in order to extend trainees' knowledge, skills and understanding, whilst providing opportunities to demonstrate how the meet the TS through their teaching. NTs need a variety of experience in schools to meet standards and experience different approaches to teaching and school management organisation to prepare them for alternative workplace settings. In limiting NTs access to alternative systems and policies, SB ITE potentially reduces their ability to teach across different settings and develop a rounded view of the education system.

Larry (SBM1.1.1) expressed a warning to his NT about the specific nature of her training and the limitations that she may face at her second placement:

> *"we have our own system that won't work in other schools. Don't try it at your second placement- it won't work! We give ideals that are general, but every school is individual"* (Larry).

Larry recognised that School 1's systems were tailored and would not necessarily apply to NT1.1.1's second placement. Similarly, Clara (SBM4.1.2) acknowledged that when delivering a session on behaviour, "you must use a specific framework and system". "Although there are strategies that can be used across classrooms to ensure pupil engagement and avoid low level disruption" (Clara), NTs are encouraged to use specific school systems that are created with certain needs and challenges in mind. Thus, at School 1, the impact of an SB ITE programme is of one of specificity and, potentially, a lack of exposure to alternate practices risks provision becoming localised.

Furthermore, for School 2, there is a reliance on the second contrasting placement to develop different skills. SBM5.2.3 (Gary) hoped that NTs development of teaching for SEND/weaker ability students would come at the second contrasting placement. However, as the independent school ITE programme only set this placement as a week, there is a concern that these skills will not be fully established:

> *"we do a discipline session for our schools only- hopefully they get another at their second placement. This experience helps you develop and negates the*

idea that you can only teach at one school if we provide our own training"
(Gary).

Gary felt that the second placement served to address concerns of critics who argue that the independent ITE pathway, or SB ITE, are providing specialised forms of professional training for NTs. It seems that the second placement is relied upon as a remedial exercise to assist in gaining the skills and standards needed for QTS that may be unattainable due to School 2's student intake.

Overall, while achieving common Teachers Standards, a localised form of professionalism is produced as schools have increased control over the ITE programme and place an emphasis on key areas and school priorities. NTs are regularly exposed to these from the start of their SB ITE experience, as shown through School 2's prospectus; "high standards are enhanced by a strong academic curriculum and an outstanding programme of extra-curricular activities and trips" (School 2, 2019). There is a focus on cultural enrichment, coupled with a high academic standard that outlines the Independent Schools ethos, foci and ITE programme's localised professionalism. Equally, at School 1 there were regular references to the school's needs and areas for improvement based on performance data and Ofsted reports in staff briefings and INSET days, which results in specific areas of improvement for staff to focus on. School Direct's programme outline and sessions placed emphasis on inclusive practice for SEND and PP and using literacy within the classroom. This localised approach to ITE potentially results in an NT fully equipped to practice teaching in that school or context, due to their in-depth knowledge and practice of school processes. However, this raises questions over whether SB ITE is more responsive to need rather than adaptive in their professional approach, creating a localised teaching workforce rather than teachers who can work nationally in any given context.

5.5 Professionalism in school policy and SBM knowledge

This section explores how professionalism is conveyed within schools through school-level policy and how/if this informs SBM practice. It considers if these two concepts work in sync or if policy fails to be realised in practice, possibly resulting in

wide-ranging mentorship. School-led ITE mentoring takes place within school culture and is framed by school politics. School policy on professionalism should help to inform what aspects of teaching are encouraged and the school ethos that is engendered through staff work and values. Investigations of the two schools included in this study reveal that there are different variants of professionalism, and different attributes that are favoured by the schools.

The different school policies emphasise different knowledges and expectations /ways of being a professional. The training and CPD that a school encourages alters staff viewpoints on self-development. Thus, the SBM's professional knowledge should be considered alongside staff adherence to policy and self-development as this leads to the different variants of professionalism found within this study. Analysis of the data focuses on where SBMs felt their knowledge was best placed and what aspects of ITE and professional development they most referred to and view as most important to both the progress of their NT and within their role. This addresses RQ2 regarding different mentoring practices and approaches to professionalism between pathways, as well as RQ1 and how the 'practicum turn' has affected the role of the SBM as the NTs main support system.

School 1's vision is cited as 'Realise your potential' (School 1 prospectus) and this concept was reinforced by all participants who were staff members at School 1. All of School 1's SBMs noted the drive to push aspiration amongst their students and expressed that they tried to "promote a keen work ethic" (SBM2.1.1) across their practice and as part of the entire staff body. However, other than this mission statement, School 1 lacked a formal policy on professionalism and desired teacher attributes leading to confusion amongst SLT and staff as there are no set expectations or guidance on the school's professional persona. As the school was undergoing a process of leadership change and development with SLT1.1 being new to post, it was not stable enough in its vision and priorities to support the professional learning of NTs or others. SLT1.1, expressed concerns about the school's capacity to provide a high standard of ITE and CPD. She worried that the system is incoherent and struggles to set expectations or professional values for her staff:

There isn't a policy or code of conduct, and we need to work on this. TS give an outline and aim professionally, but here with specific expectations… there isn't any. There's nothing on principles and non-negotiables, which I want to work on" (Linda).

With no clear focus or specific branding as a staff, there is a concern that quality assurance of teaching and learning or NT development becomes vague and confused. There is little communication between School 1's ITE programme leads and SBMs. Equally, SBMs had limited access to information on providing good teaching practice. Without specific guidance, there is a varied approach to SBM style and actions:

"I do what I think is best and focus on areas of weakness and specific needs of our students. No one has ever told me specifically what to cover" (Helen-SBM2.1.1).

There was no formal school guide for SBMs to follow, although there were university and ITE programme handbooks for reference. As a result, SBMs continued to revert to their own learnt practices that they developed over time. This reflects the journey that School 1 was undertaking to "improve the leadership, culture and education provision" (SLT1.1.1) following the appointment of SLT1.1.1 as the school's new headteacher.

School policy on SBM development, time afforded to professional practice including research and school support differed. SBM3.1.1 did not believe that she developed her practice during CPD and training sessions as she "rarely researches new strategies although I move with the times as specification comes in. I am 'old school' with a strong teacher presence" (Anne). Anne explained that she organises her classroom as 'talk and chalk', acting as a lecturer with little student talk (Anne). Anne did not see the need to develop her practice as her strong presence within the school meant that she had few issues in the classroom. However, she recognised that her knowledge is limited:

"I could do with a recap… it's been 20 years since I trained and so I stick with what I know. I don't give strategies for behaviour as I don't need it" (Anne).

In line with the Teach First Mentor Handbook (Teach First, 2017), SBMs should model exemplary pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) and engage with the mentor development framework. UT2.1.1 explained that this is seen as the integration of subject expertise and clear knowledge, combined with skilled and effective teaching. Exemplary pedagogical content:

> *"explores and trials specific methods when teaching and combines content with pedagogy. They are knowledgeable about their subjects and can teach these clearly and effectively"* (Rob-UT2.1.1).

Thus, Anne's pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) may not be 'exemplary' as she does not engage with trials and new teaching methods to further both her own and NT's skillset.

The SBMs' understanding of practice and knowledge is viewed as a segregated partnership in which they have responsibility for practical elements of teaching practice and differs considerably between participants, revealing wide-ranging practice. They share an understanding of the need to develop an NT's 'teaching toolkit' and invite them to use a range of methods in the classroom, although occasionally this involves the SBMs simply sharing their own planning. However, their reference to critical-based practice and theoretical constructs is lacking.

Education theory deliberates the purpose, application and interpretation of education and learning and is affected by several factors, including theoretical perspective and epistemological position. It hypothesises how individuals construct meaning through actions and experience and how context, setting and interpretation can affect learning. It considers ideas such as social and cognitive constructivism, behaviourism, situated learning, multiple intelligences and the psychology of motivation and learning. However, it seems that most SBMs did not consider theories surrounding different types of learning and behavioural science research in association with theoretical knowledge:

> *"The theory behind this is for universities to teach, not me"* (SBM3.1.1)

> *"I'll stick to the practice, and subject knowledge... I know my approaches to teaching and can deliver those. For anything else, they'd better go to the university"* (SBM6.2.3, informal conversation collected in fieldnotes).

Across the SBM participants included in this study, there was a general understanding that 'practice' is not associated with theory. SBMs did not consider their professional craft knowledge or reference to pedagogical content (Loughran et al. 2012) as underpinned by theoretical understanding. As explored in the literature review (Mena et al. 2017, Jones and Straker 2016, Clarke et al. 2013, Lee 2007, Sundli 2007 and Kessels and Korthagen 1996), many SBMs favour practical, pedagogical teaching content e.g. behaviour management and classroom presence, and do not view this as theoretical.

This may be linked to the fact that SBM4.1.2 and SBM7.2.2 were the only participating SBMs that had studied education more widely than at a PGCE level, as SBM4 had recently gained an MA in Education studies and SBM7 was currently carrying out action research on classroom questioning for a project connected with a nearby HEI. Thus, there is variation when delivering a broad pedagogical ITE pathway as five SBMs isolate the concept of 'theory' as separate to their working practice.

However, SBM practice includes elements theoretical understanding when referencing teaching strategies such as assessment for learning (AfL) techniques and classroom debate, as these ideas are formed by research and trials. For School 1 SBMs, there was a focus on practical advice that takes precedence over theory:

> *"conversations are more about professional development and subject knowledge than theory behind teaching... I wouldn't know where to start"* (Anne-SBM3.1.1).

Anne focussed on developing her NT's subject specific knowledge and felt that she rarely explicitly referred to theoretical concepts underpinning these. Anne was unaware that although she didn't articulate specific theories, her practice did not lack this altogether. When talking about educational theory, Anne felt she lacked the academic knowledge of an expert (Anne), however readily used language of

curriculum and data. SBMs can undervalue their professional knowledge and do not recognise the links they make when theorising practice into craft knowledge. This lack of confidence potentially affects their interactions with UTs, as they have undeveloped theoretical understanding, and highlights that SBMs view theory and practice as distinct and separate areas of professional knowledge. For SBM4.1.2 too, "practical is easier to deliver than theory. The two go hand in hand but it needs to be practical led" (Clara).

However, SBM engagement with strategies and research varies as for some SBMs, their role has led to their own professional self-reflection. They found that they developed their own knowledge of teaching practice through interaction with ITE, training modules, TS and the NTs themselves. In contrast to SBM3.1.1, Clara (SBM4.1.2) felt that she had,

> *"a good knowledge of current theories and ideas needed to assist an NTs development… I've delivered a lot of sessions and feel adept. A lot of mentors are not/don't feel confident"* (Clara).

As Clara delivered Teaching and Learning sessions on the School Direct programme, engaged in teacher research within her school and had recently completed her own ITE training (4 years ago), she felt that she had a broad range of strategies to aid her NTs:

> *"NTs really need to be given a tool-box of activities; they can't just rely on certain strategies all the time. An SBM helps develop an NTs subject knowledge and professionalism"* (Clara).

As she encouraged a variety of ideas and activities for her NTs to try, her own professionalism was broadened as she was inspired to trial new things (Clara). An NT who shows passion and commitment can have a positive impact on an SBM as "a good trainee helps to develop your own Teaching and Learning" (Clara). If ideas are shared and practiced within the mentor partnership it seems that the pair become "colleagues who are constantly testing and pushing one another" (Clara). SBM2.1.1 shared this approach of collaborative professionalism as she felt that,

"as teachers you pick up on new things and see what works. It's about trial and error for each trainee and mentor. We need to continually improve as much as the NT" (Helen).

Like Clara, Helen often delivered ITE SEN training sessions and acknowledged the need for self-development in order to remain in tune with teaching practice. Additionally, Helen was keen for her NT to "visit other staff… it will be different to just seeing me and my ideas" (Helen). Helen encouraged her NT to try new ideas and openly admitted that her practice was not the perfect model, showing humility and acknowledging the need to develop her knowledge. Despite this, NT2.1.1 felt that she,

"didn't have the time to observe other staff as well as my SBM… I'm already struggling. I also don't want to hassle my colleagues, they're so busy" (NT2.1.1).

This reveals a disconnect between SBM advice, school CPD policy and the NT's ITE timetable as she feels unable to ask if she can observe a colleague's practice.

SBM1.1.1 felt that he had gained a broader spectrum of tools and resources as,

"she (Jenny) is young and has a fresh outlook. I like to try her ideas and share them with the faculty. It's exciting" (Larry).

There is a reciprocity between both parties as Larry's department benefitted from his NT's new ideas, while her vivacity for teaching was also having a positive effect on him and his team:

"I have become enthused to develop myself professionally, and the team are excited to try new things. It's been great" (Larry).

The department explored new ideas, such as creativity when using technology and games because of Jenny's (NT1.1.1) employment within the school. Jenny also attended termly meetings with her fellow NTs, developing creative ideas for her team to share, that both improved practices that were already in place and provided a fresh insight into current teaching trends.

However, Clara also made the point that an NT does not always have this positive impact:

> *"if a trainee comes here with romanticised ideas of teaching and a Dead Poets Society view of English, I find myself having to spend time on time keeping, organisation, behaviour management… those things that come naturally for the people who have realistic expectations. At that stage, I can't say they help me to develop. I'm doing all I can to keep them on the course"* (Clara).

While being an SBM can help provide clarity around teaching, it can also be a role which demystifies the profession and provides emotional support. She admitted that although it is rewarding to see an NT achieve after a struggling year, it can be challenging:

> *"you do question if they are suited to the role and how they will continue without support systems, such as myself in place. They only thing I learn in those partnerships is patience!"* (Clara).

Clara believed that the extent to which an SBM develops professionally within their role is dependent on the NT's tenacity, resilience and enthusiasm. An NT can influence an SBMs own teaching and bring creativity to departments. However, if an NT is struggling to meet targets, plan motivating and differentiated lessons and contribute to faculty schemes of work, there may be little SBM growth as they develop NT's basic practice and lack inspiration for their own self-development. The difference in attitude between School 1's SBMs suggests that their outlook on self-development and professionalism depends on their wider role, how relevant it is to their working life and how valuable it is to their own development.

School 1 lacked a formal schedule for mentor training, and this was not included within their ITE policy documents, something they were looking to change (SLT1.1). SBMs were instructed to attend an initial meeting in September with PM1, although data gathered from my fieldwork suggested this meeting mainly "outlined the course and assessment points for collating evidence" (SBM2.1.1), rather than developing mentor practice. Equally, although encouraged to attend fortnightly

professional development sessions held by School 1, these were largely "opportunities for the professional mentor to review NT evidence folders and critique" (SBM2.1.1, informal conversation recorded in fieldnotes). Generally, as the SBMs at School 1 did not see theory as related to teacher knowledge and did not view pedagogical enhancement as their priority, it was rarely referenced in mentoring conversations. As discussed in my literature review (Jones and Straker 2006), the data shows that where there is no clear reference made to 'teaching theory' in ITE or school policy documentation, SBMs viewed their main responsibility as delivering practical activities such as classroom management. Thus, the form of professionalism that is most prevalent within School 1 is based on practical, craft knowledge that develops NT professional knowledge through SBM experience and their own practice.

Analysis of the data suggests that SBMs occasionally lack the inclination to develop their own strategies and update their professional knowledge. SBM1.1.1 acknowledged the need to attempt different strategies within the classroom to develop the NT as a teacher and assess what tactics work for different groups, "you will have to try so many strategies… I'll try different things with you" (Larry). Although recognising the importance of wide-ranging teacher strategies, Larry offered to provide his own activities and lessons, rather than encouraging Jenny to explore new research as "there's no point in making it harder for her" (Larry). When asked how often he would research and develop his own skills to assist NT1.1.1's progress, Larry commented that, "I am restricted by time. I cannot possibly research every new theory, review literature, and reflect on practice in accordance with this" (Larry). Larry did not aim to develop professionally by reading journals or articles as, "I do not think about teaching… I have been the same every day for 15 years" (Larry). However, as faculty lead, he often attended peer networks and Teaching and Learning conferences within his school's MAT and therefore did engage with research and CPD that further his practice as a teacher and middle leader. Unknowingly, Larry frequently engaged with research and development relating to outstanding teaching and learning practice, curricula, collaborative planning and independent study (SBM1.1.1). Although this may feed into his role as an SBM and

teacher, he did not view this as theoretical or academically based, once more suggesting a tacit theory/practice divide in the SBM's mind.

In comparison, School 2 had a clear focus and ethos on staff professional development through encouraging teachers to engage with research, in order to improve their practice:

> *"We have a focus on professional development for staff and a vice headteacher in charge of CPD and improvement for staff. We also have high profile events that staff can contribute to and INSET days with guest speakers. There's a budget for CPD and we encourage staff to improve their knowledge. Staff do postgraduate units and there's a culture where people feel supported to pursue this. There's a fortnightly meeting on knowledge and reading and they can enrol on online courses and bring ideas to the school. There is a teacher researcher role for all staff to further their own knowledge"* (Nathan-SLT3.2.3).

School policy dictated that all members of staff attend the CPD sessions, which include; specialised G and T training on preparing for the top universities in the country; visits from subject specific consultants who advise on marking for GCSE curriculum and new specifications and distance learning studies affiliated with local universities. These focussed specifically on research in practice covering topics such as group size, teaching style and learning environments with an aim of improving teaching and learning across the school and highlighting outstanding practice. Staff were encouraged to include self/professional development in their appraisal, which was examined through evidence of new practices that they adapted to their teaching or any research-based study they had been involved. This is a different variant of professionalism to School 1 as it encouraged developing professional knowledge through research and interlinking practice with theoretical thought.

There was a general ethos of staff development in School 2 that Gary (SBM5.2.3) felt inspired the students to want to progress, as they were aware that their teachers frequently engaged with research (Gary). Staff were enthused to develop their own

knowledge and engage in current research, largely due to SLT encouragement and policies relating to professional development:

> *"We offer post grad/ research opportunities. We are keen for our teachers to expand their knowledge and be abreast of the latest developments within the field"* (SLT3.2.3).

Rob (SBM7.2.3) felt fully supported by the school to improve his teaching practice and develop his subject knowledge:

> *"We have educational research in terms of CPD and other sessions. It's often subject specific that you seek from other practitioners. That can have a big impact. Lunchtime support sessions are offered too"* (Rob).

The policies on professionalisms are to "constantly improve and be the best you can be" (Nathan-SLT3.2.3). With a variety of support sessions available to staff, there is a consensus that staff well-being is placed at the forefront of the school's priorities (Rob, SBM7.2.3), and an understanding that the teachers of School 2 are of a certain standard, which sets a precedence of professional development for other independent schools in the area (SLT3.2.3). Thus, School 2's policies and actions revealed a strong academic ethos for teaching staff as well as pupils.

Although School 2 appeared to have a stronger ethos and culture around research than School 1, Nathan made it clear that as a privately funded institution, there were financial resources set aside for this purpose: "we choose where to invest our finding and we see staff development as a key area." School 1's headteacher explained that the decision not to invest in staff CPD and research opportunities was financial, as excess resources were being spent on staff and small class sizes which "isn't economical. We aim to increase class size, reduce teaching staff but improve the quality of T and L through CPD and staff development" (Linda). Therefore, developing collaborative professionalism demands a certain level of resource for time and knowledge opportunities which School 1 lacks.

As the lead on staff development, SLT3.2.3 (School 2) had worked with local HEIs to secure his staff places on courses to aid their development and help to create "an

ethos of wanting to improve your practice and push your knowledge further" (Nathan). There was also a weekly research briefing where staff showcased research relating to teaching and learning. This enthusiasm for self-development was illustrated through the work of SBM7.2.3, who aimed to improve his own practice to ensure that it remained relevant and suited to the needs of his students, "I often refer to Bloom's, especially in mentor meetings. I'm keen to develop my knowledge of theory" (Rob- SBM7.2.3). In nurturing a culture of growth and encouraging research, School 2 staff were keen to develop ideas that benefit an NT. Referring to Bloom's taxonomy allowed SBM7.2.3 to explore student thought using questioning and push ideas further between students (Rob), in contrast to closed questioning that he used to employ. In doing so, Rob improved his teaching practice through reading research. Within his role as a mentor, Rob encouraged his NT to adopt this practice of researching techniques and trialling them within the classroom. However, he did make it clear that this should be "later in their training year when they have the basics… they shouldn't experiment before they feel they have control and an established teacher identity" (SBM7.2.3). Working in a culture that encouraged staff development and learning, coupled with the financial capacity to promote research-based study and dedicate time to teacher development allowed School 2's SBMs to develop professionally.

Despite this ethos of teacher-researcher engagement, for some staff at School 2 there were similar issues as seen at School 1:

> *"We speak about practical issues, like classroom layout and using equipment in Science… I think university sessions then make links between practical and theory… I can't say I do a lot of theory. I'm not sure I would know how to make the links? Perhaps I need training?"* (SBM6.2.3, informal conversation collected in fieldnotes).

Mathew lacked confidence in the delivery of theoretical research alongside practice-based knowledge, as was echoed by his NT "my reflections and theory happen at uni. At school it's more practical. And really… just get on with it" (NT6.2.3-Abdul). Abdul distinguished his school experience and university training sessions as separate, which leads to questions regarding the SBM's professional knowledge, but

also the school-HEI partnership, linking to RQ3. The majority of SBMs do not theorise practice or link this to academic language, therefore problematising professional knowledge as this can often be presented in different forms, using varied language.

Overall, there are two variants of professionalism found across the two schools included in this study. At School 2, there was a commitment to developing research-engaged professionalism as SBMs felt supported and had a clear indication of the school's ethos and the teaching priorities that they aim to adopt. For School 1, this is less transparent as it lacks direction on professional policy and school values. Instead, there is a variant of professionalism which is focussed on practice-based professional knowledge and mentor experience. SBMs used their professional judgement to assess and encourage what they consider to be good professional practice. The two schools' different approaches to engagement with staff CPD and research opportunities is largely due to funding available in the independent sector. With this may come further teaching and learning development, with outside agencies, expert practitioners and consultants being funded to enhance teacher knowledge. There is a general sense that SBMs desire training on current theoretical concepts relating to practice and teacher activities, as they rely solely on their own practice to aid NT development.

5.6 The relationships between school-based mentors, novice teachers and university tutors

For SBMs to fulfil their role to the best of their ability, relationships with UTs and programme coordinators are key. However, connections between these actors differ between participants. Communication is crucial as it informs individual knowledge of the programme, expectations of NTs and an understanding of different actors' responsibilities. The validity of the ITE programme, accreditation of QTS and subsequent academic PGCE qualification that accompanies this becomes questionable if an NT's progress is not discussed between tutors. Analysis of the data also reveals that the programmes assessment phases are still led, in many cases, by the university with regular necessary clarification and support by schools.

Finally, this section explores the SBM's isolation due to a lack of communication, leading to SBMs and NTs feeling frustrated and confused.

There are different accounts and interpretations of relationships between all participants involved in the research project. The factors that lead to these varying accounts include the level of seniority that is the participant's role within the school, the length of time that they have been in role and how long partners have worked together. For those who have been involved in the ITE programme for several years and worked with the same staff on a regular basis, there are positive relations and feelings of mutual respect. These are successful partnerships producing between 3-5 qualified teachers each year over a sustained period of time (SBM1.1.1, SBM3.1.1). SBM1.1.1 had worked with the UT1.1.1 for 6 years and felt that they work in collaboration and as a team. However, his relationship with Teach First and School 1's assigned Leadership Development Officer (LDO) lacked this sense of mutual respect and understanding:

> *"The partnership with school and university is good and effective- there is good communication and support from uni. I have worked with them for 6 years- we have a good relationship. We meet to review and discuss standards 3 times a year. I feel involved in the process. My relationship with Teach First is different to the university…I don't always agree with their feedback and will only communicated with them if necessary"* (Larry).

Due to difference of opinion about feedback and mentoring style, there was a breakdown in Larry's relationship with the Teach First LDO. Larry's comment infers a divided approach to mentoring between himself and TF, which could possibly lead to difficulties for the NT in managing these relationships. The lack of communication results in a fractured relationship that does not encourage cooperation in discussions regarding NT progress.

In contrast, Larry's relationship with UT1.1.1 (Lucinda) was much stronger as he was aware of the HEI's processes and feels supported as the partners aim to meet and discuss their NT regularly. He also felt that he benefitted from collaborative working and learnt about mentor practice during joint observation sessions:

> *"I get on well with the UT, I would like more joint observations with her. I learn more about the process of mentoring and the expectations of the university to achieve QTS."* (Larry, fieldnotes following joint observation).

During the joint observation, there was clear evidence of collaboration and a well-established relationship between Larry and Lucinda as they agreed on much of their feedback to NT1.1.1:

> *"I agree with Lucinda, let's move towards more creative activities and group work- I think you are reluctant to try new things because your routine is solid and you feel control. But group work can be great way of engaging all students and encouraging teamwork"* (Larry*).

Furthermore, Lucinda furthered Larry's thinking as she proposed how he could include elements of research to help shape NT1.1.1's practice:

> *"You could suggest developing the Socratic method of dialogue through teasing out information from other students in the class and bouncing ideas off each other"* (Lucinda).

Lucinda also agreed with the strength of their partnership and the value that this holds for NT progression, but noted during a joint observation feedback session that,

> *"I value SBMs opinion and although some relationships aren't as good as this. Some are unwilling to comment in meetings- maybe they are intimidated?"* (Lucinda).

She was aware that the longevity of her relationship with Larry was somewhat unique. In her position as a UT, Lucinda felt that when SBMs are new to role there can be feelings of anxiety or nervousness around UTs, as SBMs may feel that UTs are comparably more academically astute as they hold a position within a HEI. When considering authority, SBMs can feel that UTs hold jurisdiction in this area, having worked with PGCE students and accredited courses regularly as part of their role. UT2.1.1 felt that communication and consistency between partners is key for the ITE programme to be effective:

"Successful relationships depend on rapport with the school. Continuity helps and enable valuable contact i.e. the PM and SBM across a period of time. Sometimes the school is uncertain about the precise nature of the relationship with university as opposed to TF" (Ron-UT2.1.1).

Ron placed importance on the clarity of roles and responsibilities between actors involved in the programme and working closely together to help build relationships, and lessening miscommunication. As seen with Larry and Lucinda, when partnerships are established, actors are familiar with the programme's organisation and feel mutual respect. Although effective communication does not necessarily mean effective ITE, it can enable the programme's success as SBMs/UTs challenge and question each other and NTs. Compliance is not necessary, but a mutual respect for differences in opinions can create a diverse ITE pathway that is unique in its approach. Thus, mentor selection and pairings are key and careful matching of mentors/mentees is crucial for good mentoring relationships. As Lucinda commented, SBMs can sometimes be reluctant to take on the role and SBM2.1.1 explained that some are often asked, rather than volunteer, to do so. If an SBM is the only staff member willing, or available, to take on the role there is little choice for pairing and ensuring an agreeable match of personalities. However, if an SBM is asked to take on the role and does not necessarily volunteer, they may show reluctance towards the NT or UT throughout the training process as they are assigned to a role they did not want.

Despite the positive comments of Larry and Lucinda, there was a disconnect regarding their partnership and regular contact when translated into practice:

"My SBM doesn't speak to my UT or TF. I deliver messages. It's disjointed and there is miscommunication and different standards" (Jenny-NT1.1.1).

The level of communication that SBM1.1.1 and UT1.1.1 shared was not evident, and Jenny felt like the go-between, managing different expectations. This reveals a strained, distant partnership and implies a sense of frustration as she received contradicting information (Jenny). Here miscommunication indicates that a mutually respectful relationship is not sufficient for an effective ITE relationship; the tutors

feel that they are in sync and work well together but need to share their expectations as this seems to have been lost in translation over time.

NT4.1.2 also commented on the lack of communication between tutors but felt that this was unnecessary as all the support she felt she needed came from her SBM. This raises concerns about the validity of QTS, as the lack of communication implies that an NT's progress is not discussed by all tutors. As the UT ultimately makes the decision on the NT passing the course, the SBMs daily supportive interactions could be seen as redundant:

> *"My UT only got in touch for observations and feedback. There was no need to. My university tutor didn't speak to my SBM once"* (Katherine-NT4.1.2).

It is important to recognise that this is the NT's perspective and that there was more communication taking place between SBM4.1.2 and UT4.1.2, as they had previously emailed to discuss observation feedback and an assessment deadline which clashed with the school's inspection from Ofsted (Clara-SBM4.1.2). However, from Katherine's viewpoint, this was a distant relationship. There is a concern that Katherine feels unsupported in the ITE programme, as there is no cross-communication of conversations, possibly resulting in different objectives set by various tutors. This ITE model lacks elements of 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) with no collaboration, reasoning or cross-organisational thought that is visible to the NT.

NT2.1.1 and NT4.1.2 would also have preferred more communication between partners to aid assignment preparation as "you need to ask for more communication" (NT2.1.1). Although both participants acknowledged that the lack of relationship did not deter them from the course, more communication would have aided their professional development during their two-year placement. This disconnect between SBM and NT and their opinions on university relationships is further exemplified from a second pairing in School 1:

> *"(we have) quite a good relationship as the same person oversees for the last few years. We do one paired observation with the UT. We email back and forth. If there was a concern, we would do more. We meet when they come in- we see daily progress whereas they see a snapshot"* (Anne-SBM3.1.1).

Although this lacks the frequency and longevity of SBM1.1.1's partnership, Anne felt that her relationship with the UT was positive, productive and that she could contact them for further support if necessary. During lesson observation feedback meetings, Anne suggested that "we're on the same lines, we both want to see development of behaviour and differentiation" (Anne), however she noted that UTs referenced assessment links in feedback "as they know what would make for strong analysis in academic assignments."(Anne). Despite their focus on NTs academia, Anne felt that her opinion was just as valid as the UTs as they only saw a small segment of NTs development, whereas she had a comprehensive view of their abilities due to her daily interaction. However, NT3.1.1 had a different account of this relationship, and felt that it was not only distant, but negative and lacked respect between partners:

> *"Uni days and UT are for advice for assignments. Your SBM is daily life. That's how it feels. The relationship is non-existent. There's never been correspondence with anyone else at school other than SBM. University and school have minimal contact- there is no relationship. My mentor is negative about my UT and disagrees her with suggestions. She doesn't take her seriously"* (Laura-NT3.1.1).

Laura questioned the authenticity of the relationship as there was mistrust between the mentors, leading to a strained partnership. This implies that partnerships can lack a united approach and joint regular feedback that would enable NT development and self-reflection.

Three SBMs across both schools received little guidance on the NTs timeline of events or deadlines. School 1's SBMs, and to an extent NTs, were keen to develop their role beyond assessment of classroom practice through engagement with HEIs and research. SBM4.1.2 explained that her communication is second to that of the PM, and she relies on her for information:

> *"The PM has more of a role with uni. I don't have any involvement. My only contact is once or twice for observations so it isn't as good as it should be"* (Clara-SBM4.1.2)

Clara was aware that the relationship could be stronger, but this statement also implies that she felt less involved in ITE and potentially undervalued. These feelings were echoed by SBM2.1.1:

> *"I don't know who my current contact is and have never met them. There is no relationship. You should have more contact, even emails."* (Helen-SBM2.1.1)

For SBM6.2.3, the UT and SBM relationship was not fully formed and lacked communication, although he preferred this:

> *"My contact with uni is limited. From the first term the NT is the point of contact, which got me out of that. They come in and observe- we've met but we haven't needed much support. Just when dealing with administrative paperwork. If there were more problems I would have asked for support"* (Mathew).

Mathew believed that the UT role is only needed for advice and/or support on administrative tasks, or when the NT is not meeting the criteria of the programme. Mathew spoke about the NT negotiating communication between the parties, and his comment infers that he was pleased he did not have to communicate with UTs himself, as he lacked the time and felt it was needless. This implies a forced relationship that he felt was unnecessary. The UT gave no insight aside from administrative work and therefore the SBM felt unobligated to engage in this partnership, as he felt it offered nothing to his role. These SBMs view their role as an NT's in-house support, addressing the daily obstacles that only they understand as practicing teachers within the same context.

As there is no synergy between support systems, some NTs may feel pressure to link their learning and sustain relationships between distant tutors:

> *"(Her) university link visits once a term but never meets with me… I wish I knew more about the programme's systems and assessment foci… I feel uninvolved and uninformed"* (Helen-SBM2.1.1).

Helen was keen to expand her knowledge of the programme's processes, but felt excluded from these conversations, as she had never had any contact with the university, revealing a distant model of partnership. As the UT ultimately signs off the NTs PGCE accreditation, it would be expected that they would converse with the SBM at some point as the NT's daily point of contact and the person who monitors progress regularly. The absence of consultation with SBMs lead to questions regarding the validity and strength of the programme. The idea of a shared and productive 'space' whereupon different associates can meet to discuss and negotiate both the programme and NT progress is lacking here as NT3.1.1 felt that she was "in the middle" of her tutors and organising their communications as a go-between. Inactive partnerships are revealed here with NT3.1.1 sustaining internal communications between actors.

There are, however, some relationships within the ITE programmes that utilise regular communication and reveal a mutual respect. In contrast to her colleagues' interpretations of the communication between school and university, PM1.1.2 felt she shared a positive professional relationship with frequent dialogue:

> *"We talk weekly, sometimes more. I'm kept in the loop- communication is useful in terms of knowing what the university is asking us and NTs to do. I have some UT numbers for frequent contact to ask questions"* (Tash-PM1).

Unlike SLT and SBMs in School 1, Tash felt included in programme's logistics, progress of NTs and had regular communication with UTs to address issues or ask questions. Similarly, UT3.1.2 who coordinates the School Direct programme explained that "if there's a problem, the PM will email me and I will try and guide them" (Caroline, UT3.1.2). Therefore, at an organisational and logistical level, there is a strong link and point of contact between school and university, to oversee the practicalities of the programme. The data thus reveals strong partnerships between some actors involved in the ITE programme but a lack of communication between the majority of SBMs and UTs.

Participants in School 2 also show a difference in opinion on the strength of the relationship between partners:

"We have a strong partnership. We've always had constructive dialogue with a shared understanding. The university is heavily invested and supportive. We see commitment and communication and we build the programme together" (Nathan-SLT3.2.3).

School leads and HEI-based programme coordinators felt they share a close relationship, possibly due to the school instigating the collaboration and participating in the programme's design and delivery. When creating the programme, assessing its impact and discussing the contingency plan, Nathan and UT4.2.3 developed a shared understanding and the same end goal of creating bespoke, ITE provision that benefitted both institutions in terms of capacity and recruitment. Rosie felt that "There was a strong mutual respect with all the teachers in the programme" (Rosie, UT4.2.3).

In contrast, this strong partnership was not felt by SBM7.2.3, who noted that HEI staff changed regularly, resulting in difficulties corresponding with the university with questions or advice:

"There has been a rapid change in personnel, so I don't know my contact. It's disorientating. There's uni staffing issues" (Rob).

At a higher level of leadership, there are mutual feelings of support and equal input between partners in this case, as UT4.2.3 also commented on the positive relationships and high levels of communication that took place in the programme's planning and implementation (Rosie-UT4.2.3). However, SBM6.2.3 did not feel that this level of communication was shared with him as an SBM, leading to assumptions that partnerships are formed between those of certain leadership levels within the school, as SBMs were excluded from university contact. Overall, there were mixed feelings in School 2 towards collaboration. Evidence of productive communication between programme leads was revealed, however for SBMs working with the daily programme practicalities, there was little communication regarding ITE programme content and timeline. This led to SBMs feeling isolated in what is deemed to be a collaborative HRI-school partnership.

Ultimately, partnerships appear strong and successful at a senior level within ITE programmes. Key points of contact, programme coordinators and UTs often had strong levels of communication for programmes to run successfully with stable logistics. However, at the SBM level where there is not a previous working relationship with UTs, SBMs often felt uninvolved with systems and strategic planning. This potentially leads to feelings of insignificance and that their impact on NT progress is downgraded and, sometimes, inconsequential. In these cases, the role of SBM feels prescribed and directed rather than a part of collaborative professionalism.

5.6.1 The breakdown of a mentoring relationship

In this small-scale study it is important to highlight outliers within partnerships found during the data collection period. The consensus for every mentor partnership was that, while various elements could be difficult e.g. SBM time, overwhelmingly partnerships were built on "trust and professional respect. We want to see them achieve" (SBM1.1.1). However, for one partnership at School 2 there were difficulties that developed from September, revealing an incompatible pairing. This section explores the negative impact that the SBM role can have on SB ITE and how mentoring practices can differ between schools and ITE pathways. This can risk NT development if there is no external verifier or adjudicator regularly visiting the school or a PM willing to intervene.

Following the breakdown of NT5.2.3's first mentor partnership, Gary (SBM5.2.3) stepped in as his mentor. This intervention was a result of NT5.2.3's explanation of his previous SBM's unsupportive, overly critical stance during a PM meeting with Gary:

> *"What she's doing is unprofessional- she bad mouths me to the kids. I feel undermined when she gets colleagues and kids to ask me stuff. She mentions things I've asked for as if I haven't and I'm not organised. It's a soap opera"* (Will-NT5.2.3).

In his first two months of ITE, Will began to feel increasingly intimidated by his SBM who he felt was persistently speaking negatively about him to staff and students.

This was confirmed by a colleague who acknowledged the SBM's negative feedback, NT relationship and comments to staff. Being more experienced, the SBM held status in front of students and her authority led to NT5.2.3's anxiety in the classroom and with colleagues. This demonstrates unsupportive mentoring, rather than collegiality, as the SBM too readily judged NT5.2.3. Additionally, she openly criticised his practice to their shared students, limiting Will's development as he constantly felt scrutinised. Will eventually discussed the issue with Gary, his PM who then became his SBM. Although rare, Gary explained that "breakdowns in mentor relationships can happen... but she is acting wholly unprofessionally, and this has to end" (Gary). After hearing about Will's difficult first term, Gary assured him of his full support explaining "I will speak to SLT and the situation will be resolved. Don't worry" (Gary). Will was experiencing pressure as an NT but also as a by-product of his mentor relationship:

> *"I wanted her to be normal- she was controlling and manipulative. I'm happy to fight certain battles but with staff? I wasn't expecting that"* (Will).

The decision to change mentors was taken as Will explained to Nathan (SLT3 and leader of professional development) that "I feel that she is unsupportive and doesn't want to be doing the role... and I'm not sure I can carry on with her as my SBM" (Will). Gary felt a sense of responsibility as PM and thus replaced the unsupportive SBM:

> *"with my first SBM, she didn't support me. She judged me. I couldn't ask advice and there was no trust. I would have liked her as a colleague, but she never communicated with me in a positive way. Working with her has been harder than teaching. I am so grateful to Gary for showing me teaching and learning activities, techniques I can adopt and ultimately being there to listen to me and answer my question"* (Will).

Will's previous mentor relationship deeply affected his confidence and Gary aimed to counteract this through his commitment to Will's progress, building his teacher persona and helping him (successfully) secure QTS:

> *"he's been let down by the school and his previous mentor- I need to make sure we help him progress"* (Gary).

This instance of a fractured mentor partnership reveals how small systems with limited support structures can be harmful to NTs and highlights the SBM's importance and the impact that the shared partnership can have on an NT's confidence, development, and progression.

Following Will's difficult start to the year, Gary "felt it was my duty to turn this around… at one point he wanted to give up. If that had happened, we would have failed him as a school and a profession" (Gary). Will's teaching practice and development was monitored regularly as,

"we weren't sure if it was just the mentor relationship that was the problem. I increased observations and diligently checked his books and folders of evidence to ensure he was on track" (Gary).

For Will,

> *"I thought, I've got a year's contract. I'll get through. But I want to stay. Also, who's going to believe a guy in his mid-twenties is being bullied by a pensioner?"* (Will).

Will was aware of the authority that his SBM held within the school and was concerned that if he had left the programme because of this experience, it may have seemed fabricated and so he may suffer professionally. Fortunately, Will successfully completed his first year and continues to teach at School 2. However, this incident, although isolated in terms of this study, highlights how the mentor relationship can have a potentially harmful effect on the NT if the attitude of one actor is negative and unwarranted.

Thus, although the SBM is not solely responsible for the NT's development and success to QTS, it is clear that their role is one of great importance. They are often considered a support system, professional advisor and sounding board for an NT. Without this support, and when outwardly critical towards the NT, the SBM can alter an NT's attitude to the profession whilst damaging the reputation of the school and

other SBMs. This experience gives insight into the risks of school-led ITE, the importance of SBM partnerships and how problems can be addressed. Although Will achieved QTS, the outcome of a negative mentor pairing may not always be positive and can depend on how the situation is dealt with.

5.7 Summary

In summary, learning to teach in these two schools' contexts and across the three different ITE programmes was a different experience for each NT. However, SBMs shared a similar understanding of 'theory' and 'practice', viewing these as separate topics disconnected from their daily teaching practice. The participating SBMs approach to mentorship was similar as they focussed on practice-orientated, craft knowledge and activities that are developed through experience and practice.

It appears that School 2 had a more secure leadership team and clear direction in terms of ethos, SBM professional development, and developing teacher knowledge through research engagement and CPD opportunities. SBM7.2.3's experience with research revealed the benefits of engaging with theoretical-based research and knowledge through improvement of his own teaching practice and his NTs. He encouraged NT7.2.3 to develop his practice, when he felt confident in his level of classroom control and authority, through engaging with research and trialling new techniques. SBM7.2.3 felt he was continually developing and improving as a teacher and mentor and was grateful to School 2 for encouraging professional development through research. However, this attitude was not shared across the SBMs at School 2, revealing mixed messages around professional knowledge and development.

In terms of UT engagement, the NTs in School 1 seemed to have more regular communication although, as with most NTs across both schools, they did not value their advice as much as the practical, daily support of their SBMs. Examples of collaborative partnerships between SBMs and UTs were present in School 1, although limited, and where joint observation feedback and meetings were utilised, the SBM benefitted. In comparison, School 2 saw tutors and mentors working in distinct, separate spheres with little to no communication with regard to NT

progress. The NTs did not see any clear partnership present, despite HEI programme leads and SLT sharing the view of a collaborative approach to SB ITE.

The evidence shows that all participating SBMs had little involvement in the planning, logistics, design, and implementation of the SB programme, other than the support they offered first-hand to their NTs. This reveals a lack of partnership and collaboration at SBM level. Instead, PMs and university-based programme leads developed the school-HEI partnership as they valued their counterpart's advice, direction, and agreement. This resulted in different relationships between the different hierarchies within the schools and HEIs. As SBMs rarely shared communication with programme leads, there was often confusion about programme logistics and a sense of separation between programme partners.

Chapter 6. Data presentation: SBM role and responsibility

6.1 Introduction

This data presentation chapter focuses on the SBM's professional knowledge of school-led ITE, their responsibilities and how practices differ between schools and ITE pathways. It considers who holds authority within these settings and how much influence is afforded to SBMs in these roles with heightened responsibility, compared to other HEI-led programmes. The chapter also investigates the professional training and administration of the SBM role, how they use their professional knowledge and how this can affect NT development.

Finally, it will consider the limitations of SBM time and how this can affect their level of commitment to the role. These findings are significant as they address RQ1 and the role of the SBM, including their responsibilities, training, and the challenges they face undertaking this role. Furthermore, it addresses RQ2 regarding how mentoring practices can differ across ITE programmes due to time, training, and responsibility. It then assesses why this may occur and the impact that this can have on NT development.

6.2 SBM responsibility and accountability

This section analyses and discusses data relating to SBM responsibilities in their roles as both a mentor and teaching practitioner within school-led ITE. There is variation in the SBM tracking and monitoring of NT progress using data and documentation for the ITE course. Largely, the perception of HEIs, SLT and PMs is that SBMs are mainly responsible for the progress of the NT towards QTS. They must also guide them in contributing to teaching teams, department initiatives and school life. This leads to different levels of pressure and accountability felt by the SBMs. There is a Standards-based model of professional learning that emerges from the partnerships as the Teacher Standards' (TS) prove crucial for tracking and monitoring NT. Overall, SBMs feel an increased sense of responsibility, which leads to pressure and raises issues of accountability concerning the NTs progress in terms of teaching, learning, assignments and evidencing Standards.

The importance of meeting TS for the NT's progression cannot be underestimated; without this evidence the university will not provide QTS. However, there is a possibility this has led to a simplification of what it means to become a teacher and the knowledge that underpins it. Analysis of the data indicates the Standards are the focus of NT development, with little acknowledgement given to their style or classroom persona. As SLTs and PMs look to this as a guide for professionalism, progress, and development, SBMs will create targets based on TS and reference these frequently. Consequently, as UT2.1.1 commented,

> *"There is an enhanced focus on the SBM and their monitoring of NTs for Teach First… I think this has increased pressure"* (Ron, UT2.1.1).

For some SBMs, TS are a valuable assessment tool. However, others view these as a formality used to give the impression of measuring and evidencing NT progression with no personal correlation with NTs development.

Analysis of the data suggests the SBM's role has become more administrative than pedagogical as they take responsibility for evidence being recorded and uploaded to a centralised database. Through this observation, there is an inference that assessment is the focus that drives teacher development. Although in practice this would make the system more technologically advanced and easily accessible, UT2.1.1 felt this was an overwhelming system for SBMs, who already struggle with workload issues:

> *"The advent of the electronic journal was problematic for some. Many SBMs commented positively on training arranged in support of the review process"* (Ron).

The SBMs require support to use the administrative systems used to evidence and review NT progress against the HEI requirements and TS. Although training was provided to those struggling with the systems, the initial introduction of a new system was difficult as SBM1.1.1 admitted, "I really need help with BlueSky- I have no idea" (Larry). Larry received technical support in January - five months after he requested it. Although this is a point on the functionality of the online platform employed by TF, the result of this issue is pertinent to the SBM relationship and role. Larry's inability

to use the system led to increased pressure on the NT, who Larry viewed as having a clearer understanding of the system, leaving him feeling inadequate and confused:

> *"Because you use it more than me, you are more switched on. Can you share your entries and comments with me? I get the systems confused… how many objectives do you need? How many Standards? I feel BlueSky is totally out of my control… I don't know the TF modules or essay titles to address them with my NT"* (Larry).

Larry relied on his NT to upload his comments and create objectives, which raises concerns about ITE legitimacy. Ultimately, the NT provides her own comments on her progress reports which are not checked by Larry, thus impacting on the programme's reliability and transparency. Similarly, SBM6.2.3 showed confusion regarding the systems and paperwork that he must complete, asking his NT "I think I need to comment here… is that right? Can it be brief? What does your university tutor do?" (Mathew). Once more, the NT becomes the expert due to their regular communications with their UT and the SBM's lack of training. Before signing off Abdul's (NT6.2.3) second term review and TS, SBM6.2.3 questioned:

> *"Do I double check our comments and sign this? I'm not sure of these systems, or which Standards you've evidenced for… what do you need me to do? Can you ask you university tutor?"* (Mathew).

Mathew was unaware how to evidence NT progress, thereby revealing that this was not his priority. Although he was committed to monitoring his NT's practical development: "I've never missed a mentor meeting- it is so important", the NT was unsupported and must seek advice in evidencing TS:

> *"I highlight my key areas and reflect which Standards I need to evidence, then ask his advice. I'm the one who fills in the forms and links with uni… but I don't mind! It makes me reflective"* (Abdul).

While Abdul showed tenacity and a clear understanding of expectations, he inadvertently fulfilled the SBM role and expectation to "Monitor the progress of the NT towards Teacher Standards'" and "contribute to the Faculty of Education's

evaluation and monitoring processes" (HEI1 2017c). This data signals broader issues relating to TS and their legitimacy as a tool to aid development. It is clear that two of the SBMs within this study relied on their NTs to choose their own areas of development. This raises issues of credibility for the ITE programmes as NTs ultimately sign off and confirm their own progress points, rather than have this validated by the SBM.

A key responsibility of SBMs is to work through the TS with their NT, adding to evidence, highlighting and tackling difficulties and addressing any confusion. However, there is an issue of variability in how explicitly TS are referred to and understood by SBMs. This exposes the wider problem of reliance on TS and concern that perhaps we cannot measure or account for teaching 'quality' by solely using this system. There is also a question over their interpretation. Some SBMs were stringent in their approach, wanting to explore each standard explicitly in order to gain evidence. Equally, some members of SLT used TS to monitor progress and made little reference to the physical practice of an NT. As the PM, school link and leader of School Direct, compliance with external authority i.e. Teaching Standards and HEI expectations, was crucial for PM1.1.2. Across the School Direct and Teach First programmes:

> *"the SBMs check and monitor progress against the Teaching Standards and using their own judgement. It is quality assured, but we trust their judgement"* (Tash).

Furthermore, this was done:

> *"not only at the weekly meetings but also on a daily basis- if they hear from other teachers, or see for themselves, NTs not complying with Standards, they must address this swiftly"* (Tash).

Teacher Standards' are "taken at face value; we need a range of evidence for each and the SBM will assess this throughout the year and I will do a termly review to check they are being met. I quality assure all judgements" (Tash). A Standards-based model of professional learning underpins this approach, with the focus placed on the competence of individual teachers experiencing ITE using a common language,

rather than collaborative learning. This makes it easier for NTs to engage in dialogue about their professional practice and ensures a level of quality assurance across ITE pathways in line with HEI guidelines. The above evidence shows that in some cases, there was limited discussion or interpretation of the fallibility of Standards and little reference to the development of an NT's teacher persona, style and the soft skills developed within the classroom. Therefore, within this study, TS were used in a manner that was reductive and instrumental as they oversaw an NT's interpersonal skills development. Where this was the case, mentor practice was based on performing to the Standards and was replicated by the NT through participation, thus transforming the disposition of both participants.

Equally at School 2, the SLT representative for teaching and learning explained in an informal conversation that:

> *"Each SBM has an NT and they are responsible, in the first instance, for their progress, success, difficulties etc… they will see them all the way through, monitoring progress against Teacher Standards'. And be influential in the final judgement of their training"* (Nathan-SLT3.2.3).

The SBMs accountability is apparent here as their key responsibility is ensuring that each NT meets the necessary requirements for progression. This was also illustrated through the fourth pairing at School 1 when Clara (SBM4.1.2) explained to her NT during a feedback session:

> *"Next week we will focus on behaviour management, that's Standard 7… we need to work on your delivery, and you need to be stronger and gather more evidence. I wonder if we should role play this"* (Clara).

In some ways, SBMs have become the gatekeepers to the teaching profession as they facilitate NT development, even if the HEI is the awarding body of QTS. This was felt by the majority of SBMs, as Clara exemplified when she identified weaknesses in her NTs performance and suggested strategies for improvement. When considering the impact of Clara's advice throughout her training year, Katherine (NT4.1.2) reflected on how mentoring positively impacted her experience:

> *"Clara has helped build my confidence, I've never felt judged. If I had a different mentor I might have dropped out. She's been my constant support system. If there's ever a problem, no matter how small, I can go to her"* (Katherine).

Clara built Katherine's confidence throughout her placement by "addressing each standard and setting targets clearly" (Katherine). Katherine also expressed that she "would like to have stayed at the school for both placements and become part of that community". Clara and Katherine had a shared understanding of what success as an NT looked like, and how to get there. Clara knew that Katherine would pass/fail her training year based on TS so meticulously collected evidence:

> *"I know how important each one is and how necessary it is for me to highlight key areas of focus for the NT… they need to know how and what to improve on in order to pass"* (Clara).

However, this may not align with what Clara feels matters most as she valued "good teaching and positive relationships with students" (Clara). However, she was aware that meeting the TS is key to an NT's progression, so she set aside her views in order to meet assessment criteria. Clara also felt responsible for NT progress as they communicate daily with little university presence:

> *"If a student isn't fulfilling Standards… you have to find ways to help if they are failing. Uni tutors aren't always there. It's the mentor it falls on. Which does make more work and pressure"* (Clara).

Helen (SBM2.1.1) also felt accountable for her NT's progress and tracking against Standards, as her UT's termly reviews used these as a measuring tool. She knew her recommendations would be considered during NT2.1.1's review, and felt they needed to be accurate and well-evidenced for development to be apparent. Therefore, the managerial accountability of the SBM when referencing TS is prominent as there is less university involvement with the NT's development and progress; the SBM's duty was to systematically and regularly refer to these to illustrate progression clearly. TS directly inform QTS accreditation, so a realistic overview of NT's progress is necessary. Equally, reliance on TS also provides a clear

focus for SBMs in meetings, observations, and feedback. Equally, if an SBM is new to the role, TS can become an aid in supporting mentoring conversations within a stable framework. However, for Clara, TS can take priority over professional knowledge. She felt that she had to stringently reference these, rather than relying on her own professional judgement and knowledge, thereby restricting her professional language to that of TS.

In contrast, SBM6.2.3 refused to elevate the significance of TS, revealing differences in SBM priorities. When asked about TS and evidence, Mathew advised his NT to "ask your university tutor, I'm not up to date… I don't really know how to evidence some Standards in many ways". As SBM6.2.3 was unaware of review procedures, a real risk to the legitimacy of the ITE programme is presented. Additionally, SBM6.2.3 explained that the operational documents and systems do not aid his role or the NT's practice:

> *"it's a tick box exercise that doesn't evidence an NT's true progress- for that you need to physically be in the classroom"* (Mathew).

SBM6.2.3 viewed the evidence collation of TS simply as a bureaucratic measure that failed to showcase the reality of an NT's teaching ability or practice. This further highlights the issue of reliability on TS as a tool to measure teaching 'quality', as some SBMs do not refer to these regularly in their mentor practice. In Mathew's case, TS allowed for the appearance of quality assurance. However, when considering Abdul's experience, evidencing TS becomes a perfunctory process that masks and undermines what the process really entails; the practical, daily, relentless training and development of an NT to become a teaching practitioner. Although Mathew did not regularly reference Standards, his ability as an SBM should not be judged on this as he observed Abdul's classroom practice regularly, provided feedback and offered daily support. Therefore, in this particular case, the role of ITE documentation becomes a formality, as SBM6.2.3 provided more support through his presence, consistent support, and advice than through completing administrative tasks.

This analysis reveals variation between the SBMs who viewed TS as a legitimate aid and measure of progress and those who saw it as a 'tick box exercise' with no connection to practical teaching activities. The NT, however, had to reference and set targets based on these regularly to achieve QTS. Therefore, Mathew inadvertently hindered his NT's progress as Abdul conducted his own self-review and progress assessment due to Mathew's unwillingness to engage with the documentation, as was referenced in my fieldnotes. Although TS can encourage reflection, they do not necessarily equate to improvement; they may not map a clear 'reality' of NT practice if viewed as a tick-box exercise. Equally, the TS are a written form of expectations for teachers to meet but do not necessarily outline a 'good' teacher's attributes in terms of self-development and social skills. How TS are used is left to the SBM's discretion, which can lead to significant variance in SBM practice across ITE programmes and schools.

Intense scrutiny and monitoring of SBMs is pressurised as SBM's are considered largely responsible for NT progress; "the role of the SBM is critical. They are an anchor and the main support" (Rosie). Additionally, SBMs felt accountable for an NT's actions and responsible for student progress:

> *"If the NT isn't prepared for a class, or they don't have certain subject knowledge- you must address that as the SBM. It can't hinder pupil learning. If they have yours- or other classes- it's stressful if they don't manage well. And having conversation with other staff makes it difficult as well... sometimes they have different expectations of the NT. They see me as the key link, responsible for their weaknesses and difficulties. Which isn't easy"* (Clara-SBM4.1.2, informal conversation, fieldnotes).

Accountability is paramount as the NT's teaching practice and performance is a reflection on Clara and she felt responsible for any gaps in knowledge, challenges that the NT's encountered or difficult staff interactions. As the lead mentor these responsibilities were pertinent, particularly as her NT was employed full-time and had a full teaching timetable. This connects with the concept of 'responsibilisation', whereby SBM4.1.2 felt individually accountable for her NT's progress which on previous HEI-led ITE programmes would have been a shared duty. This links to

UT2.1.2's view that the "SBM's role has evolved as they have become the NT's primary link and support", thereby increasing pressure.

For SBM3.1.1, following the introduction of school-led ITE and a focus on practice-based training, developing an NT's daily practice became a sole responsibility that was highly pressured. SBM3.1.1 felt her accountability had increased beyond that of subject mentor, and that wider aspects of professional development, such as engaging with extra-curricular activities, should not fall under her jurisdiction:

> "The professional mentor does not see it as her job to help with teaching and learning. It falls on me. There's no accountability for the professional mentor-there's a lot of stuff I do that's not my job" (Anne).

Anne felt there was no support or regular contact between the NT and PM. She felt solely responsible for answering questions, recommending strategies, and covering areas that were not necessarily subject-based. This suggests that SBMs need clarity on their role and the expectations of them as pedagogical leaders. Equally, the lack of input from the PM made Anne's professional life busier with additional tasks assigned to her that were perhaps not appropriate to her role, particularly at a time of higher rates of attrition among teachers. Miscommunication was seen here as the PM reduced their support of NT's Teaching and Learning development without informing the SBM3.1.1. Although Anne felt this extra responsibility did not fall under her remit, she assisted her NT regardless. Following an informal catch-up, Anne explained: "I see her every day to make sure she's ok and I always check in on her with uni work… although I don't exactly know what she should be doing!". Anne engaged with her NT daily and recommended activities alongside professional practice outside the classroom but felt that she lacked the knowledge to support her as well as she would have liked.

Variability in SBM conduct is furthered as the negotiation of SBM/NT responsibility is subject to deliberation between school settings. SBM2.1.1 was concerned about her level of responsibility for NT deadlines:

> *"with school-based ITE there's more commitment from the SBM for the NT to develop. I struggle- if they were to miss a deadline, whose responsibility is that? Theirs or mine?"* (Helen-SBM2.1.1).

During a debrief with the PM, she felt that:

> *"I'm more responsible for the NT development than I have been before. I monitor progress daily and that is across the whole academic year... but no one has told me exactly what to do. However, my responsibility for checking evidence and Standards... I feel some of that should be on the NT themselves"* (Helen).

In a conversation recorded in fieldnotes, Helen's NT showed she was aware of "the effort she puts in and the amount of her time I take up... I go to her for evidence and progression more than my uni mentor" (Amina, NT2.1.1). The attention to TS is evident as Helen planned actions and targets in relation to these both in the short and long term, as she showed during a mentor meeting in March, before Amina's termly review:

> *"We will go through and plan for the next few weeks and any concerns. Let's focus on current actions for Standard 4, then work towards differentiation for Standard 5"* (Helen).

This issue addresses RQ1 as SBMs felt responsible for collecting evidence and ensuring NTs meet targets. This implies a recalibration of ITE partnerships, with more responsibility falling to schools, thereby addressing RQ3 and authority in partnerships. Furthermore, ITE becomes a reductive, administrative process involving the collection and organisation of data, rather than assessing, developing and enhancing NTs professional knowledge and practice. The SBM's role is one of logistics rather than an expert aiding a novice's professional journey.

In School 2 SBM's communication with NTs fluctuated, highlighting the issues around NT development and misinterpretation of expectations between SBMs working in the same setting. Gary (SBM5.2.3) felt an SBM was needed throughout the year for consistency in assessing and developing NTs:

"You have to plan reviews, check progress and lessons, see how he is… We do it together, but I feel I need to go through stages and plan for development at every term and think about the direction he is going to. I'd say I am much more involved than the university" (Gary).

Like SBM4.1.2, Gary felt fully responsible for NT5.2.3's development and used his free time to further this. The SBM's approach seems partly dependent on the NT's progress and ability as SBM6.2.3 mentored quite differently, despite being involved with the same ITE programme:

"I had to help a lot at the start… but he's been great, so I didn't feel under pressure. I didn't really have to hold many meetings as the year went on" (Mathew).

Mathew introduced Abdul (NT6.2.3) to practical necessities such as school systems and timetables, registration processes and faculty schemes of work. However, as gathered in fieldnotes, meetings decreased as Abdul became adept at these everyday tasks, when his planning and teaching "looked good" (Mathew). This reveals miscommunication within School 2's ITE programme regarding the SBM's role and their expectations as Mathew, once assured that Abdul was coping with his classes and teaching, took a more relaxed mentoring approach with less daily support than SBM5.2.3. This shows a lack of consistency and overall understanding of the role, with some NTs becoming heavily reliant and dependent on the SBM to help them progress and some experiencing distanced mentoring. As these SBMs were engaged in the same pathway within the same school, a varying model of SB ITE and mentor practice emerges as NTs have different needs and some require more support. This approach is appropriate for school-led ITE as NTs may progress at different rates and some may require more support than others, thus a mentor's approach to their role will adapt and be flexible.

6.3 SBM power and influence

SBM power and influence over the formation, design and implementation of the programme are key to further informing this study regarding the SBM role and how practice is enacted. This section considers the concept of SBM power and influence

and how this differs between participants, levels of seniority and pathways. I also look to the SBM's knowledge and understanding of ITE and how influential they are in the NT's final judgement on QTS and grading. The power given to SBMs is wide-ranging and not absolute, as decisions regarding NT progress and QTS status are rarely influenced by them. Across both schools the PMs, who were both in promoted posts, together with UTs made the ultimate judgements on NTs progress and achievement of QTS. Thus, the PMs held a level of control and authority that SBMs could never achieve as they were not invited to join these conversations, despite being the NT's daily point of contact.

Although the leading partner varied between the three ITE pathways involved in this study, the SBM was often the first to deal with problems. However, they lacked complete authority over NT progression as they were monitored by school programme leads who held ultimate power when judging and grading NTs. Although this is valuable as a means of assessing mentor practice and providing an overview of mentor relationships and NT development, this may lead to a sense of disempowerment for SBMs. This can be seen through NT termly reviews, updates and when judging against TS as information to SBMs was either withheld or only shared with the 'lead' of a programme:

> *"The PM coordinates every NT, but she should allow us contact with/ point us in the direction of university and give us some control. I have no influence on the final judgement of someone who has been under my watch for an entire year"* (Helen-SBM2.1.1 in a conversation with SBM1.1.1).

Helen felt it would be valuable to discuss NT progress and/or upcoming assignments with UTs. However, within School Direct, this point of contact was limited solely to the PM. As a result, NTs may struggle to bring the focus of their assignments together with their teaching, thus rendering the assessments counterintuitive and unrelated to NT learning and practice enhancement.

NTs and SLT regard the SBM role as minor in comparison to the PM or SLT, as their work focuses on the everyday issues of teaching rather than progression to QTS and

assignments that contribute to this. This includes planning, student assessments, tracking progress and controlling behaviour. NT3.1.1 felt that,

> *"I can contact my SBM whenever but that can't be expected from UTs who have so much more responsibility and trainees and duties. They can't help me whenever I email. They are more important"* (Laura-NT3.1.1).

Laura saw a difference in status between her SBM and UT and felt that the SBM's time was less significant, thereby reducing SBM3.1.1's status. Jenny (NT1.1.1) also commented in an informal conversation with her SBM that she appreciated their time as she knew her UT was busy with academic projects, again implying a difference in perceived status of the SBM.

Similarly, SLT staff at both schools feel that there was a need to oversee SBM practice, implying that SBMs were viewed as 'on loan' to an NT as they were regularly supervised, rather than being seen as pedagogical leaders:

> *"My role is regular meetings with the PM, check on SBMs and if there are any problems with the NTs. Make sure we are all singing from the same hymn sheet"* (Nathan-SLT3.2.3).

In terms of power balance and management, Nathan, as a member of the senior leadership team, communicated with the professional mentor more than the SBM regarding NT progress. The PM conducted joint observations with SBMs to ensure that lesson gradings were based on HEI-set criteria, and that advice was accurate and in line with school policy and professional standards. Although this does imply a level of surveillance over SBMs and mistrust of their practice and decisions, this can also be viewed positively when considering quality assurance of the mentor practice, grading of NT lessons and the school's ITE provision. This practice is also necessary as the school is responsible for ensuring consistency in ITE provision that must be monitored and verified.

However, how this QA is conducted by school providers is dependent on the scale of SB ITE, as the number of trainees and size of the school will affect the frequency that

the PM can meet with each SBM. SLT3.2.3 explored the leadership strategy and the programme's organisation:

> *"I trust the PM's judgement. I also know the SBMs and how they mentor. There will continue to be closer relationships as the programme develops, but I work with the programme lead who manages. We develop action plans together. The PM makes the final decisions for if an NT will pass"* (Nathan).

Effective management of the SBMs is crucial to the programme's success, and Nathan relied on the PM (SBM5.2.3) to monitor ITE provision and ensure it met with HEI standards. The programme lead and PM were largely responsible for the direction and evolution of the programme. As a result, they held overall authority for NT grading despite the SBM's regular contact and the closer relationship that, generally, they shared with the NT. Similarly, SLT1.1 explained that she relied on the PM to manage ITE provision. The PM thus acted as a gatekeeper, revealing the hierarchical ordering of the school and the power shift between the headteacher and PM. In this case, the authority over the programmes and control of NT development was placed on the PM, as SLT1.1 admitted that she was not aware which staff members were SBMs. Consequently, this limited her ability to contribute to the practical organisation and management of the ITE programme. PM1.1.2 explained that she was entrusted with ensuring a high standard of mentoring within the school and admitted that this had implications on her time and workload:

> *"I check the SBMs have the same standard. And I agree with what they say. I need to observe with an SBM to check this. This can be difficult when I'm also teaching, there's a lot of responsibility."* (Tash).

Tash controlled SBM practice in School 1 and could amend their judgements and advice as she saw fit, thereby holding authority over the SBMs at a procedural level. She moderated SBM activity through joint observations, which were perceived as a supportive process but potentially undermined the SBMs as their judgements could have been overruled.

Equally, SBM1.1.1 explained in an informal conversation that there were termly mentor meetings scheduled in which Tash outlined the focus of the term for NTs

(e.g. moving from classroom routines to differentiation and tracking progress). The SBM's power was thus quite limited from a management perspective, or when considered against the different levels of HEI and school leader influence. This is illustrated through SBM5.2.3 who felt he lacked ownership over his role: "I need to go and see SLT. I can't deal with this. He has to take control when dealing with staff" (Gary). When dealing with a personnel issue, the SBM acknowledged his lack of power and authority as he was aware that the issue had to be managed at a higher level. Ultimately, although an SBM's decision and input was valued and necessary in the coordination of the school-based ITE programmes, the PM could overturn any decision that they felt may not be in-keeping with their standards, thus rendering the SBMs role futile when reviewing QTS. This may explain why SBMs felt uninformed and removed from the design and delivery of the programme, as their role was hierarchically below both the PMs and UTs.

School-led ITE programmes are keen to reduce the potential for inconsistency between mentors. For example, Teach First was improving communication between universities and schools so that a success criterion was clearly understood and replicated across all partners:

> "TF keen to prioritise relationships with mentors. PMs more important than SBMs in this way" (Ron-UT2.1.1).

Unfortunately, as UT2.1.1 explained, this link was initially formed with PMs, who then rolled ideas and expectations out across their school ITE programmes. UT1.1.1 worked against this model as she valued SBM input and often asked them to feedback on NT progress or recognise any change in the development:

> "I am keen on SBM input and try and make sure we speak equal amounts. If I felt my input was dominant, I would ask them to speak. They may decline, usually if they are new to post. Then the tutor has more dominance. SBMs can feel threatened, so then I ask them more specific questions for their involvement. A good relationship is so important" (Lucinda-UT1.1.1).

Lucinda established a different work culture to those previously discussed, as she aimed to create a collaborative partnership, where all voices and opinions are heard.

However, it must be noted that espousing this philosophy and achieving it are not indicative of each other. Lucinda described actively encouraging SBM participation, to encourage confidence growing and power sharing, yet there was no evidence of this in the data collected. Lucinda also acknowledged that as a UT, some SBMs could feel intimidated when speaking to them or inadequate and unwilling to voice their opinion. Nevertheless, Lucinda noted that she tried to involve all SBMs in feedback discussions to give them a sense of authority and expertise. This would hopefully lead to a more equally weighted conversation in terms of turn-taking between SBM and UT, whereby the SBM felt their opinion was just as valid as the UTs. Only one relationship like this emerged in this data set, between Lucinda (UT1.1.1) and Larry (SBM1.1.1), and Lucinda gave the impression that ITE partnerships exist wherein the UT takes the lead and position of authority. Where this occurs, SBMs make few comments and give less feedback to NTs in comparison to the UT. Although SBM1.1.1's relationship with UT1.1.1 revealed a positive step towards a partnership of clear communication, shared responsibility and equal weighting between university and school, the main point of contact remained as the PM. Here, a strong partnership of communication and deliberation between SBM and the UT was advocated but not fully enacted, as the PM remained the key person with influence. This then erodes the claim that school-led ITE is influenced by school practitioners and 'expert' mentors as they remained separate to decision-making.

In these cases, collaboration between professionals involved in ITE was often uncomfortable rather than productive. Different partnerships and relationships emerged between actors. Where UTs encouraged SBM participation and valued their input, SBMs gained influence over NT's progress and felt valued. However, where little attempt was made to establish relationships between UTs, PMs and SBMs, the latter appeared to lack input and influence on the formal judgement of NTs at their various progress points through the year. This possibly leads to SBMs seeing their role as inconsequential regarding NT achievement and progress. Overall, there is a lack of formal recognition regarding the importance of the SBM's role for NT progress and professional development, possibly reflecting their position in the school hierarchy of promoted and non-promoted posts.

6.4 SBM training and programme preparation

The SBM training that a school-based ITE programme provides contributes to how mentoring is enacted across SB ITE programmes and can result in different expectations of SBMs and NTs. There is variation in the regularity and detail of provision from both school and university staff in how SBMs are prepared for their roles. The data shows there was little specific training provided for SBMs in terms of physical face-to-face sessions or mentor guides/handbooks. Largely, SBMs employed their own professional knowledge built from experience as a teacher, or from previous mentor experience. Some also felt the school-based programme lacked anything distinctive or unique when compared to other HEI ITE programmes. In contrast, UTs and PMs felt there was thorough, differentiated training provided to contrast SB ITE from other programmes. Therefore, this section shows that there are issues of communication between key actors and inconsistencies in an SBM's approach to their role, thus affecting the NT's progression.

The training for SBMs in this sample was generally considered ineffective or non-existent by participants. An SBMs professional knowledge and understanding of the role was based on personal experience rather than programme representatives' communications or course documentation. Although valid, this is insufficient when considering the expectations of the role and level of SBM responsibility. As a TF mentor, Anne (SBM3.1.1) felt communication she received from the programme was an advertisement exercise, aimed to display the benefits of the programme, almost through propaganda:

> *"The training was non-existent. There wasn't any. For TF I went for a day, a cult seminar, where I was indoctrinated. I met the trainee and that was it. When there was a webinar, I did the PPT and reading myself. It was about portfolio which is like PGCE"* (Anne).

Anne felt overwhelmed with information about the programme's moral impact, which mirrored NT3.1.1's experience and view. In an informal conversation that followed a TF development session, Laura expressed that TF emphasised its national

vision and goals over ITE preparation and that "the TF programme could benefit from less TF propaganda" (Laura, NT3.1.1, fieldnotes). Anne explained:

> *"My professional knowledge is based on my experience and no training whatsoever. I mentor through conversation, observation and trialling ideas. We had no training for SD, just a handbook. We've never been to a meeting, we've never shared ideas with tutors or met up. I've been separate and only got my handbook. That's my training. And we're meant to be a SCITT"* (Anne).

This is concerning as SB ITE programmes are self-proclaimed as distinctive and separate to other routes, with a niche element of school-HEI partnerships offering 'a combination of classroom teaching, practical learning and a salary' (DfE 2019e). However, Anne had not been informed of, nor did she see, any real distinction between routes. As a result, Anne's understanding of the SBM role meant that she functioned and acted in the same way that she always had. For SBMs, SB routes lack the distinctive and different approach to ITE that is suggested by programme leads, as UT3.1.2 referred to a "new and innovative approach to ITE" (Caroline-UT3.1.2). Anne felt that the mentor handbook was her only tool for support, leaving her feeling isolated and separate to other SBMs.

SBM1.1.1 also felt little difference between mentoring on SB ITE and traditional HEI-led routes as both involved weekly meetings, regular observations and provide a sounding board for NT's ideas (SBM1.1.1-Larry). Presumably, there was no insight into how the SBM role had altered and thus Larry was not prepared for potential challenges. Alternatively, perhaps the role of SBM has not changed significantly from before the 'practicum turn'. If this is the case, NTs may lack the consistent SBM daily support that replaces HEI input within these routes, as schools take the mantle yet SBMs fail to realise their significance.

Similarly, SBM4.1.2 based the role on her professional judgement as "there was no training. It was expected I would know what to do" (Clara). SBM2.1.1 also noted that,

"I've never had any training or contact with TF. TF was a one-day seminar where we met the students. The university link came in once a term but did not meet with me" (Helen-SBM2.1.1).

Once again, there was an expectation that SBMs should have an ingrained, inherent knowledge of their role and their school's expectations, with little support. SBM4.1.2 explained to the PM in an observation feedback session that SBMs would benefit from additional information about key aspects of the programme such as; the topics/themes of NT assessments in order to make reference to these in their meetings; how often they should review an NTs folder of evidence; any explicit references they should make to theoretical concepts that underpin teaching practice and activity; and how the role was different to that of a traditional PGCE mentor (Clara-SBM4.1.2).

However, the university programme coordinator for School Direct (UT3.1.2), thought that the support, training and development for SBMs was transparent:

"I've met the mentors, done the training and developed relationships with them. I've done training, paperwork and developed rapport. I always do a joint observation to look at their judgements and develop relationships. Trish oversees their (SBM) development" (Caroline).

Caroline felt that there was a positive relationship between the programme leads and SBMs, and that mentors were encouraged to develop in their role. This view was not shared by SLT1.1:

"Mentors need to know there's more responsibility than PGCE and NQT. I don't think the training outlines that. We need training on being a good mentor" (Linda).

SLT1.1 and UT3.1.2 clearly had different understandings of SBM communications with university tutors and the level of training and support that is afforded to SBMs. Linda felt that there was a disconnect between SBMs' understanding of what it means to be effective and the responsibilities they held, in comparison to other ITE programmes. She believed university training provided by SBMs focussed on the ITE

pathway's processes, rather than professional learning. This not only reveals different understandings between school leaders and mentors, as SBMs reported that they did not receive training from university, but also raises a concern about varied levels of mentor support within ITE as the guidelines and expectations are not clear.

Logistically, there were issues for five SBMs who suggested that they were unaware of the NTs' timeline of events and key assessment deadlines. This implies they were limited in their capacity to successfully enact their role, although it is questionable how accurate these interpretations are. Equally, the participants may have been exaggerating their position due to feeling disempowered and uninvolved as partners on the programme. SBM6.2.3 expressed:

> *"It would be good to meet with the UT and NT in September to lay down expectations, processes and requirements of all parties. As I didn't know that. That would give clarity"* (Mathew).

Mathew claimed to lack a clear understanding of what was expected of him throughout the academic year and how the processes of the programme are delivered. This reveals a lack of communication between parties within a programme that was founded on "partnership and collaboration- it is a shared effort and creating something unique and distinct together, between school and university" (SLT3.2.3). A sense of course direction and logistical information would also have assisted the SBMs, as Rob (SBM7.2.3) added:

> *"Also talking us through assessments and processes, I didn't get any info… and it might be useful to draw on that in our sessions. Maybe an overall chart for where it's all leading?"* (Rob).

The lack of communication between programme leads and SBMs was also felt by NT1.1.1:

> *"There's very little communication and training with TF and mentors. It would be nice to do the practical feedback but my SBM doesn't know how. He also needs to develop"* (Jenny).

Jenny had experienced a practical feedback session with her UT, in which she engaged in roleplay to improve her practice. Jenny felt that it would be beneficial for both mentors to share feedback strategies, thereby creating collaborative training that benefitted from different approaches to feedback. Katherine, (NT4.1.1), also felt that some SBMs needed more preparation:

> *"I think they need more training of SBMs to know their role and understand expectations. Mine doesn't need it but some may need to know what NTs must do. How to help them develop and improve"* (Katherine).

Although Katherine felt that her SBM was fully knowledgeable about her role, she had spoken to other School Direct NTs who felt their mentors lacked direction and relied heavily on advice from UTs. Here, varied and wide-ranging practice in ITE once more becomes an issue due to inconsistency in the mentors' approach and attitude.

6.5 SBM time and commitment to their role

The final data presentation section considers time limitations and other professional responsibilities which can hinder the mentor partnership. SBM priorities can differ depending on their broader roles within the school and teaching commitments, which invariably affect the ITE provision. An SBM's professional life endures varying levels of time constraints and difficulties. This can also differ according to their attitude towards their role, how the NT is progressing and how much emotional/physical support is needed.

The data gathered from participants at School 1 reveals that the SBMs' professional and personal life is difficult to balance. Some SBMs struggled to fulfil their duties and further their own CPD as subject teachers and pastoral leaders, as they used their spare time to conduct meetings with NTs. This resulted in NTs feeling uneasy about asking questions, therefore raising concerns about the support systems available. Equally, there was minimal support from SLT regarding SBM time and remission on their workload. SBMs often juggled their commitments without additional help either financially or physically, as SLT/PMs were rarely available to support them. This can then lead to ITE being adversely affected as the busy and hectic nature of a teacher's daily work life meant that this was not their top priority.

Conversely, School 2 had a more relaxed approach to mentoring and SBMs did not raise issues regarding their time and commitment. Although this is encouraging in terms of reduced pressure, there is a concern about variability involving the different levels of commitment from SBMs.

There is a recurring theme of a lack of common meeting time between mentoring pairs afforded by school leaders and timetable devisers. Many SBMs felt that they wanted to devote more time to their NTs on SB ITE programmes, particularly if they had previously been a mentor. SBM3.1.1 acknowledged the importance of regular meetings and contact, but felt restricted:

> *"We made it work but had no frees together so all meetings were after school. TF requires more guidance and attention. It's a big commitment. Not a chore but I see her twice a day and bob in"* (Anne, fieldnotes-reflection following mentor meeting).

Anne felt it was her moral duty and responsibility to have formal weekly meetings and informal daily catchups, to ensure her NT was progressing with her practice, pedagogical development and to check her emotional wellbeing. Although she explained in an informal reflective conversation that she did not regret this decision, she did feel that certain other aspects of her professional and personal life suffered because of this:

> *"You accept you will miss sports day with your kids… it's a balance act. But being an SBM has meant that I have missed more"* (Anne).

Anne's personal life was affected by her role, with an extra hour of her day dedicated to her NT across the academic year, subject to the NT's progression. She felt the role was more demanding than she had previously known as a PGCE mentor, with an extra hour per week devoted to feedback for the duration of the NT's placement at the school. The time commitment for a school-based mentor is significant, and although Anne accepted this, other SBMs may not be as amenable if given the role.

SBM2.1.1's professional life was also compromised:

"Time management is an issue. Meeting time isn't given. You meet, check in, observe lessons, feedback, daily catch up, alongside your own work… I'm also SENCO so quite often my time is taken up in the evenings ensuring that all deadlines are met. The online forms for NT progression and reviews are time consuming. I spent 2 hours on one at the weekend" (Helen).

Helen found that most of her day both in school and home was spent on her professional work, and that her mental health was affected by this: "I do get anxiety about completing all of my tasks and checking on the NT. But perhaps that's normal." The wellbeing of a mentor is thus at risk as management of SBM time and workload is seemingly overlooked by programme leads.

Similarly, the role led to an increase in SBM4.1.2's workload as:

"it's work finding time for all your jobs… it's a balancing act, we have no free together" (Clara).

However, Clara's SBM role came second to teaching on her list of priorities, as highlighted in a mentor meeting:

"I didn't get chance to give you feedback, and it's too busy this week. Tomorrow morning I'm free, I'll send everything and review it all then. I need to check all your evidence this weekend. We are a few weeks behind" (Clara).

This meeting took place in December, following KS4 GCSE practice mock examinations which were marked and moderated by Clara, amongst her other teaching duties. On reflection of this meeting later in the year Clara regretted the limits on her time:

"I dropped the ball… it happens. Katherine should have had her feedback promptly, and her review complete with evidence checks on time. I regret it, but time is a real issue" (Clara, informal conversation- fieldnotes).

Clara felt pressured as she struggled to balance her work as a classroom teacher and as an SBM. This was illustrated by Katherine (NT4.1.2), who showed a concern about the pressure she was adding to her SBM's workload as a mentor, teacher and School 1's Literacy Coordinator:

> "Sometimes you don't want to ask your SBM too much as they're busy and its difficult. They get no extra time or pay so I feel guilty. But they are always welcoming and ask if I want anything!" (Katherine).

Although Clara did not directly tell Katherine that her time was limited, she was reluctant to ask Clara for support, instead feeling that she should take responsibility for her own development. Although not articulated by every NT, this feeling was mirrored by some who commented on the need to develop quickly (NT1.1.1), adapt to the school setting (NT7.2.3) and establish routine and rules quickly in the classroom (NT2.1.1) to avoid disruption and issues for SBMs who, as the NTs acknowledged, had other school responsibilities.

SBM1.1.1 also felt that the role negatively affected other aspects of his working life:

> "You do the weekly meetings as part of your role, but you don't get time back. You don't have time to read new studies; that takes work. Amongst my role as a mentor and head of department, I don't have the time" (Larry).

Larry's numerous responsibilities meant that his own opportunities for research were limited, as he felt he lacked the time to dedicate to this. At one stage he was keen to look into academic learning, but on reflection felt "that isn't possible… I'm too busy" (Larry). Another time issue for Larry was observing and meeting his NT when scheduled to review her targets:

> "My professional life is affected. It's heavy on timetable. As an SBM you conduct your sessions to be effective and that takes time. I planned to observe Jenny for 4 weeks to see planning for progress… then two of those weeks I was called in for a faculty review and

> *parent liaison meeting. I felt awful as Jenny had planned carefully*
> *for these observation"* (Larry, reflection following mentor meeting).

Larry's absence could not be avoided as SLT directed him to attend these meetings, thus limiting his time as an SBM. This culminated in a meeting where Larry admitted that even though it was one week from February half term "we haven't met yet this term. I can only apologise. How is everything?" (Larry, mentor meeting). Although Jenny (NT1.1.1) explained that she had sought help and advice from colleagues and her UT, Larry realised the role carried more responsibility than he had anticipated. Following this, Larry aimed to dedicate more time to Jenny's development, and they agreed to set meetings after school which were unlikely to be cancelled. This then allowed Larry to commit to all his professional responsibilities whilst monitoring Jenny's progress. Jenny later commented:

> *"My SBM is sometimes restricted but he has 3 NTs as well as being head of*
> *department. So, I don't always ask for help"* (Jenny, informal conversation-
> fieldnotes).

Jenny was aware of the limits on Larry's time, acknowledging that this was often beyond his control. She thus minimised her contact with him, despite him being her main support system. This reveals that the school's priority was on Larry's role as a subject lead, rather than as an SBM. Resource allocation and the wider role of the SBM is questioned here as Larry did not have the capacity to fulfil his role as faculty lead and as an SBM for three NTs. There appeared to be minimal SLT management of SBMs and discussion of suitability, leaving both Larry and Jenny with less support. Overall, School 1's SBMs felt that their time and commitment to their role affected their personal and professional life. At times, this also had an impact on the NT as their other school responsibilities resulted in their dedicated mentoring time being compromised. Equally, the NTs were unwilling to intrude on the SBM's busy schedule, viewing their needs as less significant to other priorities.

In comparison, School 2's SBMs were more relaxed in their approach to SBM time, workload and regularity of meetings. School 2 only expected the SBMs to conduct fortnightly meetings, with the understanding that an NT could go to the SBM at any

time with other concerns. This decision was made by Gary (SBM5.2.3) the PM, under SLT3.2.3's authorisation. This was possibly due to the organic, bespoke nature of the independent ITE programme which was created collaboratively between the HEI and School 2. Internal management of the programme resulted in a more relaxed approach to the SBM role, although this was still externally verified and quality assured by HEIs, as with School 1.

The key difference between the two schools is that School 2's ITE programme was theirs to shape and continued to develop to fit the needs of the school and HEI. School 2 was also afforded more autonomy as it employed the NTs and led the bespoke ITE curriculum based on their priorities and interests, revealing a different culture between the public and private sector. This was highlighted through SBM5.2.3 who, with a TLR (Teaching and Learning Responsibility) for professional development and links to the PE department, found he was often busy and could not always attend SBM meetings: "I'm sorry that we haven't met for 3 weeks, I was away. Any concerns?" (Gary, mentor meeting). Will, (NT5.2.3), was understanding about this as he knew could speak to Gary via email or find him whenever necessary. Although the irregularity of these meetings is concerning, Gary's relaxed approach implied that he felt that he had established a clear balance between tasks, workload, and time, whilst ensuring his NT was not left abandoned. On the occasions he missed meetings, he arranged to visit Will in his planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time or observe his lessons:

> *"We have a formal meeting once a fortnight and many informal in between. That has helped. They are there as and when you need them, even just little things or a quick chat"* (Will).

Will felt that his SBM contact time was sufficient and felt fully supported as "Gary always has time for me and offers help, no matter how busy he is". This reveals a positive relationship which lacks the heavy time commitment previously seen at School 1 and differs vastly in terms of NT perception of the relationship and SBM support. Similarly, Mathew (SBM6.2.3) did not feel that the role affected his personal or professional life:

"Time management has been fine. Not overwhelming. He just comes to see me when he wants something. I wouldn't say we meet regularly, just when a review is coming or if he has questions" (Mathew).

Mathew felt no impact or increased pressure on his professional time and capacity, and was happy within his role.

However, there is a concern about School 2's conduct when complying with HEI policy (HEI1 2017c). During an informal conversation following a mentor meeting, Abdul (NT6.2.3) commented: "I saw him as much as I needed to, there weren't many problems, so I just got on with it". It appears Mathew, and to an extent Gary, did not comply with external requirements of weekly formalised meetings, likely explaining why both SBMs felt less pressure on their time and availability. Thus, although School 2's approach to time dedicated to SBM responsibility was more relaxed than School 1, there is a variability concern in relation to time and commitment they afforded to the NT. Equally, if SBMs are not meeting the requirements set by the HEI and the only external prerequisites of their role, the legitimacy of these HEI documents and policies should be questioned.

With this in mind, it is important to note that there was an informal mentoring culture in both schools at a departmental level. Staff were encouraged to share resources, discuss strategies for teaching and model best practice within subject departments. This process was beneficial for NTs who "could gain ideas to try out and talk about your issues with the team" (NT3.1.1). Although this practice is useful for NTs, and wider staff, there is still a concern about the support provided for NTs at a formal level where the SBMs approach is more relaxed and meetings lack regularity and consistency.

This relaxed approach to ITE may be concurrent with School 2's view of NTs in the professional community. Although novices to the profession, they were colleagues and members of faculty that had to contribute to the curriculum, planning and managing their own classes (SBM6.2.3). Two NTs previously taught in School 2 as unqualified practitioners and had a knowledge of the context, students, and day-to-day logistics of the school. Thus, it was not necessary for SBMs to explain school

systems at the beginning of the year. However, there is a concern that this approach would be taken with any NT enrolling on the Independent Schools' ITE programme, whether familiar with the school or not. If NTs lack confidence in their knowledge of school systems, this relaxed approach to mentoring and lack of induction would not support their development. There is a need for thorough quality assurance of School 2's ITE programme, ensuring SBMs meet all requirements and support their NTs to meet expected standards for achieving QTS, irrespective of previous experience. Beside this, measures put in place must be meaningful- not artificial, quick drop-in sessions that give the pretence of a regularly assessed and monitored ITE provision. Ultimately, programme and school leads should assess the training, preparation and understanding SBMs have of their role. If the drop-in sessions and handbooks merely pay lip-service to the idea of support and training, but have little depth or substance, then some SBMs may unintentionally be providing insufficient support.

Overall, SBM time and commitment was inconsistent and sporadic, implying that for some, wider responsibilities within the school take precedence. There was also a disconnect between the SBMs understanding of time required to dedicate to NTs, with some adopting a distanced approach that lacked daily or weekly support. This raises concerns regarding sufficiency of support and the SBMs understanding of their responsibility to meet with their NTs on at least a weekly basis throughout the duration of the programme. Equally, if pressured to commit an inordinate amount of time to their NTs' development, an SBM's own professional responsibilities and work life balance are at risk.

6.6 Summary

In summary, the data shows that while SBMs included in this study felt a high level of responsibility in their role, the tasks they are given are more administrative than pedagogical. The SBM's main focus and key responsibility was to track and monitor the TS against NT progress and thus a Standards-based model of professional learning was largely adopted.

In line with this finding, the power and authority afforded to SBMs was minimal as they were mainly charged with managing simplistic tasks. This chapter demonstrates

that within this study, SBMs were responsible for the daily progress checks and support of an NT. However, they lacked power in terms of the NT's overall judgement as decisions regarding NT progress and QTS status were rarely influenced by SBMs. Although some UTs attempted to give SBMs an element of authority in input into NT progression through encouraging communication with SBMs, the professional mentor remained the key person of influence over the decision and judgement of an NTs acquisition of QTS.

In terms of SBM status within schools overall, there was a lack of formal recognition from all actors regarding the importance of this role. The level of trust and professional confidence afforded to SBMs differed between the two schools included in this study. Although stringent in their approach to performance outcomes and student achievement, there appears to be stronger professional confidence in SBMs at School 2. Analysis of the data shows there was less anxiety over 'compliance', less regular observations, and less general oversight from senior staff. Also, there was an overall sense that the role does not negatively impact an SBM's time and ability to mentor.

As an independent school, School 2 SBMs were not exposed to Ofsted regimes or the national curriculum, which typically add a notable amount of pressure to a teacher's work life. However, there is the Independent School Inspectorate (ISI) which acts in a similar manner to ensure a high standard of education provision. School 2's SBMs did not have to adhere to set targets and meeting times to the same extent as School 1 and were left to use their professional judgement in relation to their involvement with NT development and communication frequency. This sense of trust in the SBMs professional judgement links to the concept of extended professionalism, as the SBMs in School 2 were afforded increased autonomy and confidence in their ability to manage their role with other professional commitments (Whitty 2004). In comparison, ITE programme managers at School 1 operated with a restricted view of professionalism (Whitty 2004). For these SBMs, there was a lack of trust in their professional knowledge and judgement as it appears that they were not valued as 'experts'. This suggests a level of jurisdiction and power for SBMs in School 2 that was not mirrored by the senior

leaders at School 1. However, there is a concern that this relaxed approach may be taken with all NTs, whatever their ability and adaptability to the profession. If this were the case, the NT in question may feel unsupported and, worryingly, may not develop their professional skills in line with national standards.

Despite this concern, the freedoms afforded to SBMs in School 2 are beneficial, as School 1's SBMs struggled to balance their professional responsibilities with those as mentors. When this occurs, it is often the NT that feels the impact as their meeting time may be shortened or cancelled completely. School 1's NTs often felt unable to approach their SBMs and thus lacked regularity and consistency from their main support system, as well as a sounding board to share new ideas or help to resolve issues they were experiencing.

This chapter also indicated that the level of support and detailed information the SBMs received to prepare them for the role was varied and, often, minimal. Other than the generic handbook of guidance provided by the ITE programme coordinators, the SBMs led their mentor sessions based on their own experience either as a teacher or mentor. This analysis of data infers issues within school-led ITE regarding mentor practice, attitude and approach as this is not explicitly referenced or instructed by the ITE programme or school.

Finally, there were huge contrasts found between SBMs in terms of time constraints and how the role affected their professional and personal life. Analysis showed this was partly subject to the level of support, both emotionally and professionally, that an NT needed. Additionally, an SBM's ability to dedicate time to the role often depended on if they had wider responsibilities within the school. Where this was the case, SBMs may have inadvertently neglected their mentor role. This then negatively impacted on the NT who did not receive their allocated, designated weekly mentor meeting as directed by the ITE programme guidelines. This raises concerns regarding sufficiency of support within school-led ITE programmes and also around SBMs understanding of their responsibility to support their NTs on a weekly basis throughout the academic year.

Chapter 7. Findings and discussion

7.1 Introduction

This aim of this study is to consider the changing role of the mentor in school-led teacher education. The research was designed to explore the impact of the shift to practical-based ITE on the role of the SBM, including their perspectives and experiences of this. It considers SBM authority within this context and their influence over programme design, content, and implementation. School-university ITE partnerships are explored with consideration given to communication, inclusivity, and collaborative work. I look to critically examine how mentoring practices are translated within a newly diversified school-led system and consider the varying forms of local professionalism (Whitty 2014) that emerge from these programmes. I then consider how ITE provision and SBM practice can vary as a result of this, and therefore affect NT development.

Within this chapter, three key themes will be discussed. This chapter's first theme considers partnerships between institutions and the level of collaboration that takes place. This study investigates the nature and diversity of school-HEI partnerships that exist within the school-led ITE context, and considers which partners have power. I deliberate how partnerships are facilitated, under what conditions and whose professional knowledge is most sought when designing and managing the school-led programmes. I then focus on how the formation of school-HEI partnerships can affect SBM practice and morale, as communication can fluctuate depending on the length of an ITE relationship and different stakeholder understandings of the SBM role. I draw on Bhabha's (1994) 'third space' as a model to guide my thinking and explore how partnerships are managed and which ITE actors engage in collaboration. I specifically look at the ITE partnerships between SBMs and other stakeholders and how these contribute to the SBM's influence, authority and understanding of ITE course content.

I contribute to the field of ITE research through utilising 'third space' theory to explore the collaboration that can, but does not always, occur between institutions. Unlike other studies (William et al. 2018, McDougall and Potter 2019, Jang and Kang

2019, Potter and McDougall 2017, Schuck et al. 2017, McIntyre and Hobson 2016), I aimed to ascertain the nature of school-HEI partnerships and determine if 'third space' theory is applicable within this context. I initially expected to find evidence of 'third space' being utilised by partners to develop school-led ITE in collaboration, however cross-institutional work did not occur for all parties involved in the programmes. Although many were hopeful that some form of levelling and hybridity would take place, this generally only applied to programme managers/senior leaders. SBMs were often uninvolved in the design of the ITE programme and rarely included in decision-making processes, particularly when concerning NTs progression to QTS. Instead, they were encouraged to focus on guiding NTs to complete academic assignments and administrative tasks, such as the collation of evidence to meet TS, thereby reducing SBM autonomy. This restrictive form of professionalism leads to a lack of SBM input and authority, signalling distance between the hierarchies of different actors in ITE.

My analysis of the school-HEI partnerships is significant in comparison to other studies which have focussed specifically on partnerships within research-informed ITE practice, national ITE policy and the effect on NT development (Cain 2019; Murray, Swennen and Kosnik 2019). I focus on the lack of communication between certain partners and how underdeveloped relationships result in the absence of certain voices in SB ITE design, curricula and management as data analysis revealed that SBMs are not encouraged to contribute to these discussions. My findings show that a lack of communication can result in SBMs misunderstanding course design, logistics and school-HEI responsibility over content, which further training and cross-institutional working could have prevented.

The second theme explored in this chapter relates to the fragmentation of ITE. I consider school-led ITE provision as a model of professional learning that varies between pathways and school settings. I analyse the participating SBMs models of professional learning and the knowledge that underpins their practice. This practice is largely based on administrative tasks, focuses on Standards and meeting ITE assessment criteria. I explore how this knowledge forms the basis of their 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Kemmis and Smith 2008), as NTs come

to make sense of practice through a social process of participation and observation (Edwards-Groves 2018). The SBMs practice and regular reference to practice-based knowledge, such as classroom management, transforms the NTs disposition as their knowledge and actions become coherent through participation. The NTs come to understand practice through partaking in similar practices, which over time contributes to the development of Standards-based practice and practical knowledge within school-led ITE.

I also reflect on legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) as a model to encourage and welcome NTs into communities of practice, as 5 NTs included within this study were employed within schools and considered colleagues (Lave and Wenger 1991). The chapter suggests that school-led ITE can create a localised form of professionalism (Whitty 2014) which although beneficial to schools as they 'mould' NTs to suit their needs, is disadvantageous in terms of wider NT preparation and development for employment in a range of diverse settings. Additionally, I relate different forms of professionalism to the overall variability in SBM. I consider how SBM responsibility and knowledge varies greatly between each partnership, programme and school, leading to inconsistencies across ITE providers.

My contribution to the field is distinctive through my focus on the role of the SBM and exploration of emerging forms of professionalism in school-led ITE. This study specifically focuses on how this impacts the SBM's role and to what extent practice can vary, thus affecting NT development and potentially the quality of ITE. This contrasts with other studies which focus on the impact and challenges of school-led ITE on HEIs (Mutton et al. 2017, Brown et al. 2015, Brown 2016).

The third theme that I refer to in this chapter relates to SBM authority over NT progress. It considers how the SBM role has been affected by the 'practicum turn', if their influence has increased due to a more responsibilised role and how this affects their status in the ITE partnership. I also analyse how time restrictions can limit interaction with NTs. The views and attitudes of the SBMs are crucial in exploring how they contribute to the ITE programme, alongside other stakeholders' understanding of their role within SB ITE.

This study is distinctive though its contextual setting, research design and semi-ethnographic approach. The longevity of my data collection period contrasts with others in the ITE field, which can range between a period of 8 weeks to 5 months (Cajkler and Wood 2016, Manning and Hobson 2017, Mincu and Davies 2019). My approach was immersive as the fieldwork took place over an academic year and used a range of methods which allowed for depth of insight into participants' perspectives and experiences. I included different stakeholders involved with school-led ITE as participants, which resulted in wide-ranging data. As a full-time, semi-resident researcher, I was able to learn about the intricacies of SBM practice, knowledge and school-HEI partnerships in detail. As I explored participants' opinions and observed their approach to mentoring and partnerships over a year-long period, I became aware of discrepancies in communication and different approaches. I was also able to analyse the SBM's sense of value and authority over a period of time, and how this was at risk of being reduced depending on their collaboration with HEIs and influence over ITE provision.

7.2 Communication and partnerships in school-led ITE

My first key claim is that the school-HEI partnerships in this study generally lacked maturity and collaboration between stakeholders, resulting in varied ITE programme content and teaching. The collaboration between programme leads within schools and HEIs was regular, but at an operational level, SBMs and UTs often shared little communication. This contradicts the idea of 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) and a collaborative, innovative school-led ITE programme that I had expected to see from the policy trajectory towards school-led ITE which sought to enable collaboration, innovation and develop 'better' teachers. These ideas help to clarify my understanding of partnerships between the separate actors involved in the ITE programmes and how, for SBMs, these can lack communication and consistency. The SBM's minimal communication and cross-collaborative work with partners thus reduces teacher agency and the active development of both the NT and SBM as a mentor and guide.

To begin this section, it is important to consider the effect of school-led ITE on the mentoring relationship and how this concurs with or counters the literature

presented earlier. This will help to inform how/if the role of the SBM has been repositioned and further my understanding of how 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) is utilised between actors and why. The literature review focussed on the effect of the policy trajectory towards practice-based ITE and how this can enable NTs to engage with training in new and distinctive ways. Depending on how it is managed, it can be viewed as the move from a training model that emphasises the acquisition of skills and mastering of competencies (Peercy and Troyan 2017, Sandefur and Nicklas 1981), to a practice-based model that emphasises participation, engagement and reflection (Zeichner and Conklin 2017, Zeichner 2010, Grossman and McDonald 2008).

The review also highlighted that NTs should receive further support and direct training from SBMs and PMs as schools are more responsible in the delivery, process and outcomes of ITE school-based pathways (Furlong et al. 2000, Jackson and Burch 2016, DfE 1992, Perryman et al. 2017, Smith and Ulvik 2014, Beardon et al. 1995, DfE 2011b, Hodson et al. 2012, McAllister 2015, Brooks 2000). This latter claim is evident in the data, as school responsibility was referenced frequently by participants. There is little HEI influence in School 1's ITE programmes, although provision must comply with ITE programme regulations, as stipulated by the DfE. UT3.1.1 believed that the programme lead's local knowledge is crucial to its success and therefore,

> *"We would never override the school as they work there. The alliances cover everything but not in the same order and give priority to certain things. That's the beauty of it. The programme leads do it themselves to make sense to them… they have the current experience; they know what needs to be covered"* (UT3.1.2).

HEI-based programme leads at School 2 also valued school input as they "designed the programme in collaboration" (UT4.2.3). The initial ideas for ITE were constructed by the SLT, and were then deliberated with the HEI:

> *"We looked in a theoretical way at how we wanted to design ITE, then went to the university with our ideas and they were very receptive"* (SLT3.2.2).

This reveals that within School 2, the school-HEI partners were receptive to co-constructive, 'third space' working. School leaders chose the foci of the bespoke ITE model, with their school priorities in mind, and collaboratively worked with UT4.2.3 to construct a programme based on these. From this, the model of 'third space' is suggested as there is evidence of the rejection of binaries, such as practitioner and academic knowledge. Competing discourses are integrated in new ways (Zeichner et al. 2015), and there is regular, open dialogue between cultures that were previously seen as separate, creating new ways of working.

However, although my study reveals this level of collaboration, it seems that this was not quite implemented at a practical level. SBM6.2.3 explained that NTs 'need further SEND training' as School 2 'do not often utilise SEND training within our teaching practice'. Despite this, the NTs at School 2 did not reference or note any specific SEND training provided by HEI1. It seems that although the Steering Group for the programme may have been collaborative at a leadership level, the cross-institutional planning and strategy for ITE was not entirely realised within the operational, day-to-day management of the programme. Thus, although the third space model has potential to create new learning spaces in education, through hybrid, networked, bridged, dynamic partnerships (Waterhouse et al. 2009), as the dialogues and hybrid partnerships were not consistent across all stakeholders, and various elements of ITE provision were lost or forgotten due to the lack of synchronicity between SBMs and UTs.

The SBM is crucial to the NTs procedural training process, as "they are responsible, in the first instance, for (NTs) progress, success, difficulties" (SLT3.2.2). The importance of mentoring as a supportive strategy for beginning a new job (Hobson et al. 2009, Howe 2006, Ulvik et al. 2009, Wang, Odell and Schwille 2008) cannot be underestimated as the weekly meetings, regular observations and daily conversations allow the NT to progress professionally, as seen with NT4.1.2 who relied on SBM4.1.2 for professional and emotional support. However, there is not a new, transformative process taking shape here that engages the NT through assimilation into a professional learning community. Rather, NTs are able integrate

into the setting due to recreation of skills and well-worn methods encouraged by the SBM.

School 1 takes NTs from more than one ITE route per year. SBMs work across numerous pathways and gain experience in mentoring, however "(I) act in the same way I always have" (SBM3.1.1). Thus, the shift towards school-led ITE has had little effect on the SBM-NT partnership as SBMs see no difference between their role on school and HEI-led ITE programmes. This type of mentoring is traditionally conventional as it focuses on "situational adjustment to the new school environment, technical advice and emotional support" (Richter et al. 2013:168). SBMs do not change or adapt their practice to involve different styles of mentoring, as they (who previously mentored on HEI-led programmes) have not experienced a change in programme management/design themselves. They lack a relationship with university teacher educators and so their practice is rarely influenced by academic thought or theoretical knowledge.

Following these initial ideas of mentor practice and partnership with NTs, I now consider how the move to practical-based ITE affects wider partnerships within programmes. Specifically, I explore how some partnerships flourish through utilising the concept of 'third space'. However, these partnerships rarely invite input from SBMs. In terms of the design, management and delivery of the programmes, there are contrasting ideas about the level of collaborative activity that takes place. According to the literature, third space theory can be used as a tool to enable productive partnerships in an open place of 'hybridity' whereupon 'the spaces of resistance (can be) opened at the margins of new cultural politics' (Bhabha 1994:33). The problem of enabling productive partnerships occurs when moving away from prescribed social identities and roles according to status, and where there is a strong focus on compliance. Bhabha (1994) acknowledged that liberation between cultural identities can only be achieved after social and individual identities have been partially surrendered or altered. Zeichner et al. (2015) further the concept of altering and adapting identity as they argue for 'transforming' the system and recasting who is considered an expert in the field and whose knowledge is most valued. For this to occur, institutional boundaries should be crossed to encourage communication

between all stakeholders in order to produce reasonable agreements and creative solutions (Zeichner et al. 2015).

Initially when collecting data for this project, I expected to find elements of these concepts and a sense of 'third space' as the policy trajectory implied a move to collaborative ITE across institutions. However, with regards to the school-based ITE programmes in this study, it would seem that this has not occurred. SBMs were restricted to their mentor role and had little interaction with programme leads, UTs or PMs. Further research also informed me of Engestrom and Kerosuo's (2003) concept of horizontal expertise, whereby the knowledge and understanding of each professional is recognised and treated as equally valuable and important. Although this was the case for some participants, this model of learning did not exist for SBMs, as the PM coordinated the activities of the NT and was the only point of contact for university representatives (SBM2.1.1). Thus, although seen in practice between managers and programme lead participants, these partnerships lack the integration of what are often seen as competing discourses in new ways (Zeichner et al. 2015). There is no opportunity for hybrid identifications and reflective thinking (Bhabha 1994) to take place for SBMS, as they are restricted from cross-institution dialogues. The limitations of existing boundaries (Bhabha 1994) are very much in place for SBMs, meaning that their identities and the culture of school-based teacher educators have not been 'altered' (Bhabha 1994); practitioner knowledge remains marginalised in the university sphere, and academic knowledge in schools (Zeichner et al. 2015).

The only pairing which suggests horizontal expertise in practice was SBM1.1.1 and UT1.1.1, who partook in joint observations and encouraged shared development: "you could suggest developing the Socratic method of dialogue" (UT1.1.1). This example of joint assessed observation illustrates utilisation of 'third space' (Bhabha 1994), as professional practice was explored through collaborative dialogue and negotiation. This partnership was well-established and underpinned by mutual respect as the pair offered advice and tested ideas with their counterpart. Within this partnership, there is evidence to suggest 'spaces of resistance' (Bhabha

1994:33) were 'opened' through collegial, cooperative working, thus creating new ways of working and the beginnings of collaborative working.

Despite the evidence of this well-established partnership which 'levelled' UT1.1.1 and SBM1.1.1, this was not seen across the data. Generally, utilisation of 'third space' was only found at a management level, between school senior leaders and university programme leads. Thus, there is a sense of vertical expertise and hierarchies of knowledge as some actors have far more influence and input than SBMs. Broadly, the data collected does not show that cultural hybridity was encouraged for SBMs, nor does horizontal expertise "gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation" (Bhabha 1994:211). If creative concepts and new models of ITE were established, either in the form of a localised profession or school-specific branding, this was due to the influence of the HEI and school programme leads. Analysis of the data shows communication only occurred between certain participants. As the concept of 'third space' was confined to those at a senior management level, I now consider the implications for the SBM when hybridity and horizontal expertise is only available to some in the ITE process and not filtered down to the mentor.

McNamara et al. (2014) argue that if 'third space' can encourage productivity between binary oppositions then new knowledge can be created, thus recreating teaching as a profession. Equally, Zeichner's (2010) work suggests that school-led ITE programmes can integrate practitioner and academic knowledge and redefine the profession. This presents the idea of a new, unique form of ITE being established through the influence of parties that usually have little interaction regarding ITE delivery. A sense of vigour and rejuvenation is voiced in the literature which is reflective of a marketised landscape. Zeichner (2010) proposed that bringing these separate stakeholders together would make programmes more personal for NTs thereby enhancing their ITE experience and, potentially, leading to improved teacher retention rates. Initially, this seemed to be the case with the Independent Schools' ITE programme as SLT3.2.3 felt that "we build the programme together" and UT4.2.3 felt designing a unique programme was a "collaborative effort". Here,

ITE partners are free from binary oppositions and create new models of ITE through bringing together the interests of HEIs and schools. School 2 was keen provide further training on Gifted and Talented students to suit their cohort, which UT4.2.3 was happy to accommodate.

Aspects of Bhaha's (1994) vision of 'third space' are also endorsed by UT3.1.2 who felt that there was a "new, innovative approach to ITE" (UT3.1.2) taking place that is collaborative, although it is important to consider on what basis UT3.1.2 makes this claim. UT3.1.2 is the HEI-based programme lead for School Direct, employed to form relationships with local schools and encourage them to take part in the programme. In line with this position, there is a sense of rhetoric being used within the data to sell the programme more widely. UT3.1.2 felt that she shared a collaborative relationship with PM1 as they designed the programme together, shared regular communication and undertook joint observations where possible. From her perspective, this could be viewed as an innovative approach as previously, she had been employed as a PGCE mentor for the HEI with limited communication with schools and mentors.

However, there were few expressions of collaboration further down the hierarchy of staff within both schools. Overall, SBMs felt excluded from the design process and partnership:

> *"It would be good to meet at the beginning of the year and lay down expectations, processes and requirements of all parties. I didn't know any of that. That would give clarity"* (SBM6.2.3).

> *"I have no input into how the course is run or the topics that are covered in sessions- both in-house and at University. I have not been involved with the design of the course. Some sessions are timetabled at bad times of the year. More development of this needed in line with school priorities"* (SBM4.1.2).

Across the data, SBMs at School 1 for both the Teach First and School Direct programmes felt uninvolved in the coordination of ITE:

"(the) university link visits once a term but never meets with me… I feel uninvolved and uninformed" (SBM2.1.1).

Despite wanting to expand her professional knowledge and develop as a teacher educator, SBM2.1.1 is excluded from interactions with HEIs and programme leads, leading to her feeling isolated. Similarly, at School 2 SBM 7.2.3 felt that he needed more guidance on the programme expectations as "I didn't get any info… maybe an overall chart for where it's leading?" (SBM7.2.3). Bodoczky and Malderez (1997) put forward that SBMs feel a sense of self-worth in their role when they experience recognition and respect from the professional community. The literature highlighted the opportunity for mentors to increase their knowledge, and therefore their professional development and authority, through communication and discussions with UTs (Lopez-Real and Kwan 2005). However, the data shows that this communication was limited as over half of the SBMs felt they had little involvement with NT progress and a limited knowledge of the course content and delivery. The line of communication was shared solely between the UT and the school's programme lead and SBMs felt separated from partners and aspects of the programme.

Data analysis shows that there are issues regarding a lack of consistency in the knowledges of those leading on the ITE programmes and those enacting roles within the programmes. For some there is a disparity between university core content and mentor knowledge; where this is the case, SBMs have little involvement with ITE and "it would be useful for mentors to see what's being delivered and to have an overview of what is being shown" (UT1.1.1). Therefore, a productive, collaborative partnership that integrates practitioner and academic knowledge is only available to some in the relationship.

Broadly, SBMs are not invited into partner dialogue and are not given the opportunity to offer ideas on school-led ITE. For example, SBM6.2.3 articulated clearly that he shared minimal contact with university representatives and felt that this relationship was almost a façade or 'formality' that gave the impression of a partnership between the two parties. This was also suggested and felt by NTs. To their knowledge, "there is no relationship" (NT3.1.1) between their mentors, let

alone an active space where the two come together to deliberate, discuss, and create new forms of knowledge. Additionally, SBM5.2.3 was "hopeful" that the second school placement would cover and explore practices that he had not explored with his NT. There was no clear point of contact between School 2's SBMs and UTs, leading to a lack of coordination with regards to training session content. As such, there are wider implications of creating an underdeveloped ITE programme for an NT which 'hopes' to fulfil the criteria of an ITE programme but lacks the certainty of doing so. ITE programme leads do not invite SBMs to partake in discourse surrounding ITE provision, and their exclusion does not permit critical engagement with content and processes. For the SBMs in this study, the move from a training model of mastering skills and competencies to one of participation, engagement and reflection is not entirely realised (Zeichner and Conklin 2017, Peercy and Troyan 2017, Zeichner 2019, Grossman and McDonald 2008, Sandefur and Nicklas 1981).

Closed partnerships have resulted in a divisive ITE setting wherein SBMs hold a great amount of responsibility but little influence. Their role includes tracking NT progress, conducting observations and weekly meetings and overseeing the performance of the classes they 'lend' to the NT. However, their experience and knowledge are not valued at a higher level. This shows that there is a limiting narrative and dialogue between programme leads as they maintain a partnership that does not reach beyond the key points of contact. This lack of communication and absence of a hybrid, inclusive space for all actors to be involved ultimately reveals that little has changed for SBMs in terms of their role from HEI-led ITE to school-led ITE, other than increased responsibility for the delivery of programmes designed by others.

The SBMs underdeveloped HEI relationships can result in them feeling confused about their role and remote from ITE partners. From this, I draw on the work of Hobson and Malderez (2013a) who argue that SBM training from universities and ITE programmes is vital as there is a lack of understanding for what mentoring ought to entail and what SBMs should seek to achieve. Correspondingly, Furlong et al. (2006) argue that there is a need for development of school explanations and a shared language, in order to avoid miscommunication or feelings of isolation from SBMs. In

order for this to occur, programme coordinators must endorse the concept of liberation from cultural restriction and move towards a status of 'levelling' whereupon individuals surrender their outside status and work on the basis of equality, valuing each individual input and role (Oldenburg 2001). A key concern that emerged from the data was about how 'training' is conceptualised by SBMs and what this should consist of. This was highlighted by three SBMs who felt that they needed support with practical aspects of the course regarding NT targets and assessment deadlines:

> *"I'm more responsible for the NT development than I have been before. I monitor progress daily and that is across the whole academic year… but no one has told me exactly what to do"* (SBM2.1.1).

> *"It would be good to meet with the UT and NT in Sept to lay down expectations, processes and requirements of all parties. As I didn't know that. That would give clarity"* (SBM6.2.3).

> *"Also talking us through assessments and processes, I didn't get any info… and it might be useful to draw on that in our sessions"* (SBM7.2.3).

Broadly, this is seen as a cascade-only process of transmission considering logistics and practicalities of the programmes, rather than a process of educational insight and study into the SBM role and professional knowledge. There was little cross-institutional working which included all stakeholders involved in the ITE programme engaging in a shared language (Furlong et al. 2006). As such, there is a lack of common moral purpose as ITE consultations involve 'some' rather than 'all'. In this sense, there is no ' space of cultural, social and epistemological change in which the competing knowledges and discourses of different spaces are brought into 'conversation' to challenge and reshape' (Moje et al. 2004:44), as only certain knowledges were included in these discussions.

The need for training was advocated and stressed by all SBMs, who agreed with Hobson and Malderez (2013a) but felt that this was entirely lacking. There was minimal mentor preparation including sharing expectations of the role which resulted in varied mentor practice:

My professional knowledge is based on my experience and no training whatsoever. We had none for SD, just a handbook. We've never been to a meeting, we've never shared ideas with tutors or met up (SBM3.1.1).

"there was no training. It was expected I would know what to do" (SBM4.1.1)

"I've never had any training or contact with TF. TF was a one-day seminar where we met the students." (SBM2.1.1).

"I'm not sure I would know how to make the links (between practice and theory)? Perhaps I need training?" (SBM6.2.3).

The SBMs were restricted from gaining insight from school-HEI partners, and there was no reference made to a partnership of equals in which SBM opinion was actively sort. Within school-work cultures, this concept of 'levelling' could be achieved through inviting SBMs into the 'space' where outside agencies and school programme leads meet to discuss aspects of the programme, or even by inviting their opinion once decisions have been made. Instead, all SBMs within this study felt 'uninvolved' in the process of designing ITE and uninformed about the expectations of the mentor role. This then affected what was possible for them to 'do, say and relate' (Kemmis et al. 2014), as their practices and understandings of ITE were restricted to their school contexts and experiences in the classroom. Therefore, the actions and activities that make sense and become comprehensible for NTs are based within these specific settings and interrelated with SBMs practices (Edwards-Groves 2018). Thus, SBMs included in this study experienced cultural restriction as their mentor status, rather than 'programme lead/coordinator', which prevented them from contributing to and adopting a wider, more strategic stance.

SBM practice therefore lacks the scope and wider understanding of ITE that could be achieved through 'levelling' the status of SBMs in line with programme managers and UTs and including their voices in wider conversations. Moreover, there was no sense of 'shared language' or understanding; simply a handbook to outline details of the course. Many did not receive advice for what their role would entail, which forced them to function in a similar mentoring capacity and role to that which they had done previously on HEI-led ITE programme. Analysis of the data shows that

schools recruited experienced SBMs for the role based on their previous involvement with and knowledge of ITE, rather than employing a recruitment process which considered mentor matching and suitability.

At this stage, the authority lies both with the PM, to ensure the SBMs have a full understanding of the role, and within the ITE programme's guidance and policies on mentor standards and expectations. If the role requires specific knowledge to suit the programme's aims/vision, it may be necessary for representatives of that specific pathway to deliver more information than provided in the handbook. SBM1.1.1 was unaware whether there was a separate set of responsibilities attached to his SBM role in school-led ITE. Due to this lack of clarity, SBM1.1.1 based his responsibilities on those of his previous mentor role on a HEI-led PGCE ITE course. These findings not only imply a lack of collaboration between SBMs and universities, but also that there is nothing different in school-led ITE than traditional HEI-led PGCE programme. It seems that the distinctive and novel contribution of SB ITE may be overstated as it draws heavily on traditional HEI programmes. While the funding model and allocation of places has changed, the content and design of programmes has not seen a similar transformation.

Interestingly, the data collected from UT3.1.2 and PM1.1.2 indicates a different understanding of SBM training as PM1.1.2 commented that "we quality assure twice a year" and UT3.1.2 stated that "I've met the mentors, done the training and developed relationships with them". There is a clear lack of 'shared language' and understanding between the programme leads and SBMs, and two different versions of training are evidenced within the data. In contrast, SLT1.1 felt "we need training on being a good mentor and their responsibilities", revealing concerns about the ITE programme from a senior manager of which PM1.1.2 was obviously unaware.

Equally, the data shows that NTs thought there was little communication between SBMs and UTs. They also felt that SBMs needed further training, implying that their experience may have been fractured:

*"I think they need more training of SBMs to know their role and understand
expectations. Mine doesn't need it but some may need to know what NTs
must do. How to help them develop and improve"* (NT4.1.1).

*"There's very little communication and training with TF and mentors. It would
be nice to do the practical feedback but my SBM doesn't know how. He also
needs to develop"* (NT1.1.1).

The SBMs lack of communication with ITE partners has a detrimental effect on their
role. This disconnect affects NT development, as they felt clarification around the
progamme logistics, design and the SBM role was needed. This highlights that
through school autonomy, some SB ITE programmes are creating underdeveloped
training models that can negatively impact on an NT's development. This can then
lead to limitations on NTs professional growth as the ITE programme is relatively
short, spanning one academic year. If the NT has focused on clarifying their SBM's
role and purpose, rather than their own professional development, there is a
concern about the damaging effect this can have on their future teaching capability
and dedication to the profession.

There needs to be a fundamentally different approach to partnership in ITE if the
partnership is not to become a panacea (Kennedy and Doherty 2012). The term
'partnership' within school-led ITE becomes a panacea through its 'cure all' nature,
that has an instant appeal as it gives the impression of joint working and
collaboration. However, these elements are not sustained in terms of its practice or
outcomes (Kennedy and Doherty 2012). Within this space of ITE, partnership is
simply serving as a phrase to describe what should occur and how the institutions
should behave. This is not representative of the practices across ITE, particularly as
schools often work with several universities. As there is a lack of explicit rationale for
how to adopt a partnership approach, only leaders and senior stakeholders hold
jurisdiction and partnership becomes a panacea rather than a specific way of
working. For HEI and schools leads, collaboration and shared knowledge was
evident:

> *"We have a strong partnership. We've always had constructive dialogue with a shared understanding. The university is heavily invested and supportive. We see commitment and communication."* (SLT3.2.3).

> *We tried to make something shared, where all voices were heard. In all collaborations, compromises are important, but the people around had a huge amount of personal interest and wanted it to work"* (UT4.2.3).

However, broadly the SBMs did not share this view:

> *"There has been a rapid change in personnel, so I don't know my contact. It's disorientating. There are uni staffing issues"* (SBM7.2.3)

> *"Processes are not clear… it's wishy washy and not set in stone"* (SBM1.1.1)

> *"my contact with uni is limited… They come in and observe- we've met but we haven't needed much support. Just when dealing with administrative paperwork. If there were more problems I would have asked for support"* (SBM6.2.3).

Where present, partnerships shared with SBMs were based on supportive, organisational matters, rather than an intellectual partnership that considers the practical expression of the theory/ practice relationship (Kennedy and Doherty 2012). Discussions regarding ITE provision and NT assessments only featured in the communications between senior members of staff. Due to their lack of seniority in staff hierarchy, SBMs do not engage in shared responsibility and accountability. Despite their 'expert' knowledge, SBMs are limited to their role as daily support and guide, rather than being encouraged to cross 'boundaries' and sharing in collaborative work. Here, partnership needs to be considered as a form of professional learning alongside these programmes (Kennedy and Doherty 2012:846), providing SBMs with the training, space and opportunity to provide their insight and develop their own professional practice knowledge.

7.3 School-led ITE: professional learning in a fragmented landscape

This section explores the claim that school-led ITE can be viewed as a model of professional learning in England that takes place on new sites with new leading

partners (Whitty 2014). For some including SBM1.1.1 and SBM7.2.3, this is a fully collaborative model that embraces contributions from different fields. However, others see this landscape as underdeveloped and lacking in communication which results in distant and sometimes limited partnerships. I suggest that as a result of this fragmented landscape where different professional knowledges and learning are produced, a broad range of approaches to ITE are inevitable. Varied ITE provision can be seen through SBM practice, their pedagogical and theoretical knowledge and programme content, design and implementation. The range of mentoring styles, attitudes and dispositions results in different experiences and knowledges produced in SB ITE.

Mentoring can endorse LPP as a model of professional learning (Lave and Wenger 1991) as mentors view the NTs as members of the school community and assist their movement from 'legitimate peripheral' to full participation within school. Five NTs within this study were employed as teaching staff in the schools, thus giving them a more realistic teaching experience. The two School Direct NTs within this study were not employed, and therefore could never become established members of the school community as their time within the school was limited to a placement and their contributions were ephemeral. This was illustrated by NT4.1.2 who "would like to have stayed at the school for both placements and become part of that community" (NT4.1.2). In contrast, the five NTs who were employees of their schools felt a sense of 'full participation' as legitimate, permanent members of the school community. Newcomers ultimately "become part of a community of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991:29) and learning occurs through increased participation with the colleagues and 'expert' practice. Through this, NTs become contributing, established members of the school community.

However, for this learning to take place the conditions should be collaborative, open, and explorative. The NT needs to be given the opportunity to expand their skills, develop their professional practice and contribute to their learning environment. This could be through researching activities or attempting new practices learnt from HEI-led ITE training. Initially, SBMs seemed to encourage the practice of collaborative self-development (Kemmis et al. 2014b) as they embrace

the creativity and new ideas that an NT can bring. Most SBMs within the study were open to learning from an NTs practice:

> *"as teachers you pick up on new things and see what works. It's about trial and error for each trainee and mentor. We should try and improve too"* (SBM2.1.1).

> *"a good trainee helps to develop your own Teaching and Learning"* (SBM4.1.2).

> *"I have become enthused to develop myself professionally, and the team are excited to try new things. It's been great"* (SBM1.1.1).

Mentoring is a social practice, and through their own self-development, learning and trialling new activities, SBMs begin to enact the practice of 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Heikkinen et al. 2018, Kemmis et al. 2014a). As they observe NT practice and listen to their suggestions, they are motivated to trial ideas and learn themselves through experience. Through the SBM's process of mentoring, their actions become a specific kind of cooperative human activity in which activities (doings) are comprehensible in terms of relevant ideas in discourses (sayings). Here, both the SBM and NT are involved in the process distributed in characteristic relationships (relatings) (Heikkinen et al. 2018, Kemmis et al. 2014a). SBMs make sense of new practice through participating and engaging with new techniques, thereby transforming their dispositions, and endorsing their NTs to do the same (Edwards-Groves 2018). Thus, where they are keen to acquire new approaches to teaching, SBMs relate the NT's professional work to their own practice and develop themselves.

Through productive use of generative 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) mentoring can be positive (mentor as supporter and learner); in restricted and hierarchical learning environments it can simply be mimicry or compliance (mentor as judge and supervisor). By embracing new strategies and encouraging NTs to contribute to departmental work, SBMs use mentoring as a supportive strategy as they encourage NT participation in a collegial environment (Furlong 2019, Ingersoll and Strong 2012, Callahan 2016, Kidd et al. 2015, Simmie et al. 2017, Spooner-Lane 2017). From their

assertions, it seems that the SBMs embrace their NTs fresh outlook on their career and value their contributions.

However, despite these positive statements of incorporating NT ideas across faculties, the data shows that there was relatively little NT practice shared. This reveals a largely broad model of LPP shared across the ITE programmes. NTs were rarely given responsibility for faculty planning, although they occasionally contributed their ideas to department meetings through suggesting, "creativity when using technology and inventive games" (SBM1.1.1). In practice, although meant with good intentions as "there's no point in making it harder for her" (SBM1.1.1), NTs were given insufficient autonomy and low risk activities (Edwards 1998, Collison and Edwards 1994, Dunne and Bennett 1997). This leads to an unrealistic teaching experience that does not fully prepare them for their role as full-time teaching practitioners.

Furthermore, NTs were mainly advised by SBMs, with little input from the wider school community. SBM2.1.1 encouraged her NT to draw on insights and knowledges outside of their ITE support system and beyond her recommendations:

> *"visit other staff… it will be different to just seeing me and my ideas"* (SBM2.1.1).

SBM2.1.1 was the only mentor, within the data collected, to encourage this practice. This is possibly because for those employed on an almost full timetable while training, there will be little time for observation of other's teaching. This was illustrated by NT2.1.1 who rarely observed other colleagues and gradually assembled a general idea of what constitutes the practice of the community, without engaging directly with the wider staff body as:

> *"I didn't have the time to observe other staff as well as my SBM… I also don't want to hassle my colleagues, they're so busy"* (NT2.1.1).

This perhaps results in NTs engaging in a broadly peripheral experience, which lacked specificity in relation to community roles and members as they were not absorbed in the "culture of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991:95). Overall, the length

of a practicum experience can positively impact on the NT, as an extended period of LPP provides learners with opportunities to make the culture of practice theirs (Lave and Wenger 1991). However, there is limited evidence to show NTs participating in communities of practitioners through full participation in sociocultural practices (Lave and Wenger 1991), as the data reveals little collaboration between NTs and other staff members, aside from SBMs.

The literature review presented the idea that assimilation and working partnerships are affected by the length of time an SBM is in role. If the SBM is an early career teacher and/or new to the school themselves, they may be unable to introduce the NT to a professional community they are barely immersed in themselves (Smith and Hodson 2010, Richter et al. 2013). Although this was not the case for my participants, SBM1.1.1, who was experienced in role and worked with UT1.1.1 previously, benefitted from an established partnership. Over time, the pair had developed a professional working relationship with frequent communication, which led to a collaborative, cross-institutional ITE experience for the NT (Schneider 2008, Achinstein and Athanases 2006). Although this was only present in one case, there was a mutual respect between the tutors alluded to within the data as they felt they were in a partnership and shared responsibility towards the NTs development:

> *"We meet to review and discuss standards 3 times a year. I feel involved in the process"* (SBM1.1.1).

This not only led to a more inclusive approach but also a positive working relationship that was based on their shared experience in roles over 7 years.

Nevertheless, there is a risk that a strong relationship between UTs and SBMs could inadvertently reproduce existing practices and limit opportunities for renewal as they are both comfortable within their spaces and have pre-existing expectations of their roles. SBM1.1.1 and UT1.1.1 had been partners for 7 years, providing NT support on the same programme of ITE for and had a prescribed way of working within this relationship. As a result of their closeness and affability, they both risk making insufficient use of critical reflection or could fail to engage in productive and intentional noticing (Mason 2002, Sundli 2007, Wang and Odell 2002). There is a

danger that as they are comfortable with each other's practice, the SBM and UT become less critically reflective on their longstanding ways of working (Sundli 2007, Wang and Odell 2002). Intentional noticing would therefore not occur as the individuals do not develop their expertise but rather draw upon existing practices and ways of working to which they are accustomed (Mason 2002).

Within the School Direct and Teach First programmes, mentoring becomes a practice-based model which requires more SBM involvement as schools are more responsible for the delivery, process and outcomes of ITE school-based pathways (Perryman et al. 2017, Jackson and Burch 2015, McAllister 2015, Smith and Ulvik 2014, DfE 2011b, Hodson et al. 2012, Brooks 2000, Furlong et al. 2000, Beardon et al. 1995, DfE 1992). SBM1.1.1 practiced his mentoring through a series of observations and 'lending' his NT various activities, PowerPoints and resources that enabled her to reproduce his teaching style and transform her own practice. These actions reveal mentoring as a specific kind of cooperative human activity in which characteristic actions and activities (doings) are comprehensible in terms of relevant ideas in characteristic discourses (sayings), and in which the people and objects involved are distributed in characteristic relationships (relatings) (Heikkinen et al. 2018, Kemmis et al. 2014a). SBM1.1.1. and NT1.1.1 become linked and interrelated through shared practices and similar ways of working (Edwards-Groves 2018). The material–economic arrangements become relevant in terms of practice architectures here (Kemmis and Grootenboer 2008, Kemmis et al. 2014b) as this relates to the contextual conditions and resources that form the activity and work of practice; the 'doings' of practice (Kemmis et al. 2014b). The nature of the workplace, including SBM1.1.1's lack of time and his tendency to encourage NT1.1.1 to 'reproduce' his practice, means that unknowingly, SBM1.1.1 reduces the opportunities for collaborative learning interactions. The NT makes sense of practice through observation, participation, and reproduction of her SBM's style and activities. Over time, this contributes to the emergence and development of particular practices that SBM1.1.1 endorses and NT1.1.1 reproduces, and therefore the practice architectures in place shape the cultural conditions and educational judgements that the NT makes.

Equally, NT3.1.1 engaged in a discourse of specific practice with her SBM:

> *"I mentor through conversation, observation and trialling ideas, based on my experience"* (SBM3.1.1).

Through this, SBM3.1.1 makes her practice comprehensible (Kemmis et al. 2014) to NT3.1.1 as she encourages her to reproduce her own disposition and practices (Edwards-Groves 2018). Accordingly, this 'relates' to NT3.1.1's practice as she replicates her SBMs teaching style and activities. Here, mentor conversations help to makes sense of practice as the process of observing SBM3.1.1's 'doings and saying' allows NT3.1.1 to link these ideas to her own practices. Thus, the practices of mentoring and participation become interrelated and transform NT3.1.1's disposition. These two examples reveal mentoring being practiced as supervision, with the SBM as a supervisor (Kemmis et al. 2014a). However, this was not the detached, impersonal approach that was suggested in the literature. Instead, this approach is coupled with the notion of mentoring as a support, with the mentor acting as a helpful professional colleague and guide (Kemmis et al. 2014b, Kemmis et al. 2014a).

Although there is a sense of mentoring as supervision (Kemmis et al. 2014a) in terms of the specific practice, actions and strategies that are recommended for NT3.1.1 to trial, this is coupled with ongoing encouragement and guidance from SBM3.1.1. Thus, NTs develop professionally through drawing on insights of the SBMs and the practice of mentoring remains interactive and personal and develops the NT's teacher persona and 'self' (Kemmis et al. 2014a). However, it is also through the SBM's reference to Teacher Standards', success criteria and school priorities that 'effective' practice is constructed, as this is the focus of mentoring conversations within the data. This approach is framed by government requirements and priorities, and therefore lacks regular opportunities to develop the NT as an individual. As a result, transformative work and professional development are limited as the SBM's interlink 'effective' practice with standards. Thus, due to the social–political arrangements which mediate the relationships and power between ITE stakeholders (Kemmis et al. 2014b), the SBM's are led by pre-existing rules and organisational practical agreements that lend agency to the state and government powers.

In contrast to this, the data presented in Chapter Five (section 5.1.1) contributes to my discussion surrounding the riskiness of local provision, as a 'dark side' of mentoring within school-led ITE was apparent. For NT5.2.3, there was an element of 'judgementoring' (Hobson and Malderez 2013a) as his previous SBM readily criticised and passed judgement on his planning and teaching. This heavily compromised their working relationship as NT5.2.3 felt victimised and attacked. This may have been a result of the start-up stage of the pilot programme that had yet to consider mentor pairings and compatibility. Equally, the SBM may have been displaying a distinctive pedagogical style and level of expectation that was usual to School 2's high-performing culture and level of attainment. Why this partnership and style of mentoring was endorsed by the SBM is unclear; however, it is key that quality assurance processes identified this problem and that school leaders were quick to address the issues. Despite this, recognition of the issue and acknowledgments of existing damaging SBM relationships is important. Although the situation was resolved and NT5.2.3 completed the programme successfully, there are implications and risks for local ITE providers. If thorough quality assurance is not regularly implemented in a school, there is a danger that negative mentoring partnerships could continue to exist on school-led ITE programmes, potentially leading to NTs leaving the profession.

The approach between a typical supervisory mentor and that which embraces self-development and collegial collaboration is a result of SBM inclination to develop, time afforded to mentoring and the NT's character. As different forms of mentoring are produced, NTs develop different teacher personas and strategies. Although some SBMs occasionally encourage creative practice, the disposition to comply with Standards that many SBMs adopted was somewhat removed from practicing mentoring as collaborative self-development (Kemmis et al. 2014b):

> *"next week we will focus on behaviour management, that's Standard 7... we need to work on your delivery, and you need to be stronger and gather more evidence"* (SBM4.1.2)

> *"SBMs check and monitor progress against the Teaching Standards"*
> (PM1.1.2/SLT3.2.2)

Furthermore, this was done:

> *"not only at the weekly meetings but also on a daily basis- if they hear from other teachers, or see for themselves, NTs not complying with Standards, they must address this swiftly"* (PM1.1.2).

Here, the school and programme leaders are ensuring that teachers comply with standards 'swiftly', with the focus placed on the competence of individual teachers experiencing ITE using a common language, rather than collaborative learning. In this way, mentoring is practiced as supervision (Kemmis et al. 2014a), leading to a less interactive, personal approach which focuses on formal Teacher Standards' and fails to develop the self on a more personal level. In this sense, the majority of NTs are far from developing individual styles as the SBMs generally focus on meeting specific standards and practices in line with ITE expectations and develop the disposition of a supervisor or agent of the state (Kemmis et al. 2014a). Through this standards-based model of professional learning and mentor practice, a space for generative work and collaborative interactions is found. The practice architectures and material-economic arrangements (Kemmis and Grootenboer 2008, Kemmis et al. 2014b) mean that the practice within the workplace, and of the SBM, is predetermined by time and the need to meet standards and complete the HEI-set criteria to achieve QTS, thus inhibiting opportunities for engaging in generative learning experiences. The nature of the workplace has predetermined the affordance of collaborative learning interactions, thus inhibiting opportunities for engaging in generative learning experiences.

This contributes to the understanding of the restrictive nature of Teacher Standards (TS) which reduce autonomy in mentorship as SBMs focus on administrative tasks rather than explaining support mechanisms needed to assist NT professional learning (Whitty 2014, Zwozdiak-Myers et al. 2010, Hobson et al. 2009, Martinez 2004, Furlong et al. 2000, Martinez 2004). These findings lead to me to question whether SBMs experience increased power and authority in the move to school-led

ITE. Their role is largely administrative and centred around meeting TS and assessment criteria, rather than encouraging growth through their own 'practical theorising' (Hagger and McIntyre 2006:58, Schön 1983) and experience. Their model of professional practice is underpinned by objectives and Standards, and thus the social practice of 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a) with NTs encourages this practice and it is reproduced as the practice architectures that are in place create and inform their educational judgements and professionalism (Kemmis and Grootenboer 2008, Kemmis et al. 2014b). As SBMs and NTs dispositions become interrelated within and through practices, the practice that becomes comprehensible and relatable to NTs is practical-led and Standards-based.

In this administrative role, there is minimal opportunity for SBM self-development. Furthermore, the structure of the programme lacks a sense of levelling and hybridity (Oldenburg 2001, Whitty 2006, Evetts 2008) as the mentor is not placed as an 'expert' with current knowledge of professional teaching practice. Overall, within this study there is not a clear model of professional learning which fully utilises the professional knowledge of the mentor, although this is often sought by the NT. More often, the SBM oversees administrative tasks which do not allow for their creative input and professional insight. By reducing the mentor role in this way, there is a question raised over teacher agency and SBM value in the eyes of school leaders that has resulted in a reductive model of professional development and the limited influence on ITE of some SBMs in this study.

7.3.1 Teaching as a branded, localised profession

Whitty (2006, Whitty and Wisby 2006) argues that 'school-led' ITE can be viewed as a unique model of professional learning as it reveals a branded form of local professionalism, individual to each programme and school. However, this localised model contributes towards a fragmented ITE landscape. SBMs are encouraged to endorse certain practices that will aid their school's priorities, rather than considering the need for wholly, rounded experiences for the NT. To an extent, NTs are experiencing a new form of LPP, becoming members of the school community through regular introduction and exposure to the requirements of the school staff

and wider community. This has a different emphasis to HEI-led routes that offer a generic training programme that is not school specific.

There is a certain professional community that is established through school-led ITE that creates an individual NT experience based on their school's needs. These can differ according to Ofsted priorities, and school leaders will often outline their expectations and priorities for the year in staff briefings and INSET days. School-led ITE programmes help to address school-wide areas of concern or highlighted foci, as evidenced in School 2's prospectus, "high standards are enhanced by a strong academic curriculum and an outstanding programme of extra-curricular activities and trips"(School 2, 2019); staff briefings, "you must focus on differentiation and meeting the needs of weaker students"(PM1.1.2); and School 1's INSET days, "our focus of the year is to improve our literacy policy and to reduce the gap between PP boys and high-performing girls" (UT1.1.1, September INSET).

A form of LPP exists for NTs within this study through meeting school priorities and developing a unique insight into specific school needs. As evidenced from the data, NTs were often given specific targets and tasks, such as to focus on SEND in School 1 and high attainers in School 2. As a result, teacher professionalism becomes specific to a certain school, SCITT or Multi-Academy Trust. These findings also reveal that PMs and programme leads used their jurisdiction over ITE design and adapt this to suit their school priorities. The schools included in this study thus create a localised form of professionalism, based on the 'core professionalism' (Whitty 2014) of HEI-led routes. This is moulded to be specific to certain values of the school, and thereby creates a different type of teacher workforce (Whitty 2006). This agreed minimum standard of professionalism, as fostered by university-led provision and shaped by the DfE, consists of topics prescribed by Ofsted in line with expectations of the national ITE guidelines and include "SEND, EAL, G and T, behaviour management, voice control, differentiation, monitoring and assessment" (UT3.1.2). The school could choose how to order and deliver these key topics, using any method or staff member to do so. Consequently, the programme leads and course designers are using their freedom and authority over these programmes to suit their needs, whilst

224

pertaining to national expectations, as the length of time and level of focus on each topic is "not prescribed" (UT3.1.2).

The idea of a branded form of professionalism resonates with many of the staff in School 1, who referenced the unique benefits of school-led ITE programmes. In particular, SBM4.1.2 praised the "specific school framework of sessions" which NTs attended and worked towards. School 1's PM and members of School 2's SLT referenced the benefits of tailoring sessions and NT assessments towards their priorities and needs, which differed vastly between the school contexts. This specific form of professionalism was highlighted by SBM6.2.3 when advising his NT on how to meet certain standards that are required to achieve QTS. I feel it is important to draw attention to this as his attitude seemed to reflect the overall opinion of School 2's staff, and the emerging problem within the school of the NTs exposure to a range of students' abilities and needs:

> *"you don't need to know the techniques, just demonstrate low ability teaching"* (SBM6.2.3).

This evidences the nature of a school-led programme designed to meet the needs of one school. This also raises a concern that SBM6.2.3, and School 2 as a whole, does not recognise differentiated training as a necessity of ITE provision. This highlights School 2's underdeveloped inclusion strategy and approach to teaching that does not upskill or encourage teachers to deliver curricula suited to 'lower ability' students or those who perform less well. School 2 focuses solely on the needs and capabilities of their specific student cohort and therefore professional development opportunities are limited. As a result, NTs lack experience in teaching those that do not fit the school's 'mould' of what is a typical student.

The idea of a localised professionalism being created from these SB ITE routes was further highlighted by UTs, as they commented on the branded approach of these pathways and the freedom and choice that is afforded to schools to prioritise and focus on certain aspects of the course:

> *"Schools want to mould teachers into a certain type. SB route has a branded feel" (*UT1.1.1).

> *"PMs create the programme based on what we say needs to be included, and they can choose the order. So, each programme has a different timeline of events and is flexible*" (UT3.1.2).

This gives the impression of a restricted model of ITE (Whitty 2014) as teaching expertise and learning processes lack the progressive development of flexible, transferable or adaptive expertise, which hinders NTs ability to work within different contexts (Darling-Hammond and Bransford 2007, Crawford 2007, Ball and Bass 2000, Bereiter and Scardamalia 1993). Using LPP as a model of professional learning, NTs are only being readied for certain types of students and contexts through reproducing the SBMs localised, specific behaviours and activities, suited to the school context:

> *"our focus is on more able training and pushing students to achieve... we are streamlined but we do have lower ability, at which stage a lecture teaching style is encouraged so that the students are definitely receiving all the information they need"* (SLT3.2.3).

The ITE programme focuses on developing efficiencies and routines within the specific school setting and does not enable NTs to build greater knowledge and skills as professionals through learning more from their experience (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1993, Feltovich et al. 1997, Gott et al. 1996). This is a less adaptive approach to ITE as it does not entail learning through problem solving, but rather simply applying knowledge and familiar heuristics to problems (Crawford 2007).

Overall, there is an argument that school-led ITE creates a distinct model of professional learning as the data presented a branded form of local professionalism individual to each programme and school. However, this must be mitigated with the

idea that SBMs have little awareness of this localised profession, as they continued to practice mentoring in the same way as they had for HEI-led programmes. Here, the mentor can be seen as a supervisor (Kemmis et al. 2014a), offering a less personal approach to mentoring and not fully engaging with the concept of collaborative self-development, generating new ways of enacting profession. They viewed their role as simply to help NTs to meet Teacher Standards' and progress to QTS, and conducted observations, mentor meetings and discussions in line with these tasks. This can be seen as a non-collaborative approach which, rather than generating new practice, focuses on current "tricks of the trade" (Jackson and Burch 2016) that the SBM endorses.

The ITE programmes included in this study do not show that teaching is undergoing a process of re-professionalisation which meets the needs of a new era (Whitty 2006). Although there remains specific ITE content and standards with school-led ITE that is specified by the DfE, the data shows that there is no modernised teacher workforce with new professional values. Instead, there are more providers of ITE within the landscape who generally design their ITE programme to highlight key foci of the schools. As a result of this, SBMs contributed to a localised form of professionalism as they focused on practice and priorities that were paramount to the school, rather than regularly exploring alternative practices and knowledge that exist within the teaching profession.

Within this study, schools adopt a process of adapting ITE and in doing so diminish the influence of universities over the location and direction of teacher training. This is consistent with the needs of schools in a 21st century marketised landscape. Schools have more independence from LEAs and more responsibility for performance, working in specific contexts and tailoring provision to their own priorities and specialisms (Jones 2016, Abbott, Rathbone and Whitehead 2012, Morris 2002). My study shows that school-led ITE creates a form of local professionalism that focuses on specific school priorities and leads to the underdevelopment of 'core professionalism' (Whitty 2014) and knowledge.

7.3.2 Variance in SBM provision and knowledge

SBMs are looked upon to provide outstanding practice and a plethora of activities and knowledge for NTs to draw upon. They are considered to have a certain level of expertise (Holmes, 2010) which can sometimes lead to mimicry by the NT. Beardon et al. (1995) argue mentors must have first class knowledge of specialist subject, an outstanding record as a teacher and a thorough understanding and ability to talk about successful classroom practice.

However, in this study the SBM's level of 'expert' knowledge, practice, and ability to talk about a wide range of classroom practice varied considerably. Exploration of the data shows that many SBMs felt removed from current subject pedagogy, particularly when they had been teaching for a long time. Although some were willing to explore new practice and pedagogies, others were reluctant to adapt their style as they had a clear, set structure and routine within their classroom that they had developed over time:

> *"I rarely research new strategies although I move with the times as specifications come in. I am old school with a strong teacher presence. I could do with a recap… it's been 20 years since I trained and so I stick with what I know. I don't give strategies for behaviour as I don't need it"* (SBM3.1.1).

In this case, the SBM struggled to help their NT fully develop a repertoire of activities and pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012), as the SBMs were limited to referring only to their own practice knowledge and activities. Although this relates to the idea that PCK is the knowledge that teachers develop over time, and through experience (Loughran et al 2012), there is a sense that SBM3.1.1 does not recognise and value the development of her own PCK. She does not link PCK as having a rich conceptual understanding of particular subject content. Thus, NT3.1.1 will fail to develop this understanding as there is a clear focus on developing and adapting teaching strategies and approaches for use in particular class settings. This is not explicitly or purposefully linked to subject-based knowledge and does not therefore create the combination of knowledge of content and pedagogy that Shulman (1986, 1987) described as PCK.

For some NTs this was viewed as ideal mentor practice as SBMs offered their own teaching strategies and techniques, which they modelled themselves or assisted in incorporating into NT practice:

> *"you will have to try so many strategies… I'll try different things with you"* (SBM1.1.1).

There is an understanding in the literature that mentoring can help to alleviate the reality shock element of teaching (Veenman 1984, Richter et al. 2013, Shaw 2018, Colson et al. 2017, Dicke et al. 2015). This was illustrated in SBM1.1.1's mentoring partnership, as he helped to reduce the element of 'shock' that often accompanies a trainee's first classroom experience. SBM1.1.1 provided NT1.1.1 with a selection of his resources, rather than encouraging NT1.1.1 to create these herself, with his oversight and collaboration. Through providing his tried and tested lessons and activities, SBM1.1.1 allowed his NT to assimilate more easily into the role of a teacher. She began to see SBM1.1.1's repertoire of activities as her own and used his behaviour techniques and strategies to tackle classroom management. Although the NT felt she was developing as a professional, her practice was largely created by her SBM and not through her own professional judgement and learning.

This is somewhat limiting to the development of the NT's PCK, as the topic-specific knowledge that the teacher develops and accumulates, through the process of planning and teaching a certain topic is not built or created by the NT themselves (Hashwah 2005). Although the NT will need to address the topic-specific student conceptions, queries and misunderstanding that are raised in the classroom, as she has not developed her own subject content knowledge or teaching strategies through creating her own resources, this approach to mentoring lacks an element of professional knowledge development. Creating, developing, and building on natural responses to student questions should be combined with the teacher's specific subject knowledge and the pedagogy subcategories that Shulman (1986, 1987) discussed in order to develop PCK. As a result, there seems to be the development of practical teaching here, but less so of subject content knowledge and pedagogy, as she relies on her SBM's resources.

This exemplifies the theory that with mentoring, there is often an element of mimicry or trial and error learning (Roberts 2019, Mason et al. 2018, Lamb et al. 2018, Sucuoğlu 2018, Franke and Dahlgren 1996). Rather than understanding the reasons as to why certain strategies are unsuccessful with a class, NTs are advised to move on quickly and try another activity that may or may not engage their students. This occurred specifically with SBM1.1.1's partnership, where there was a lack of NT creativity, personal accountability, reflection and decision-making. Rather than understanding the deeply rooted theory behind the strategies she was using, NT1.1.1 found SBM1.1.1's activities effective and continued to borrow these. This strategy was deployed by at least three SBMs within the data set as a quick method to aid NT practice and meet the programme requirements. Thus, my study shows that SBMs are inadvertently turning teachers into technicians rather than reflective practitioners (Adams and Tulasiewicz 1995, Sandholtz and Reilly 2004, Townsend and Bates 2007, Webb 2002, Bullough Jr 1994, Douglas 2017, Mattsson et al. 2011, Lamb et al. 2018, Corcoran and O'Flaherty 2018, McNamara et al. 2014a, Magni 2019, Schleicher 2012). However, this activity did not always occur as the NTs developed their own routines and strategies of their training year. Later, NTs used their own initiative and professional judgement, although they often continued to model lessons on their SBM's examples.

To further the claim that varied SBM practice leads to an apprenticeship form of ITE, I now analyse the SBM's view on the relationship between theory and practice. The literature demonstrated that SBMs devote little or insufficient time and attention to pedagogical issues and the promotion of reflective practice (Clarke et al. 2013, Feiman-Nemser 2001, Franke and Dahlgren 1996, Lindgren 2005). Mentor conversations are often based on practical knowledge and are event-structured, practice-orientated, and context-based (Clarke et al. 2014, Lee 2007, Sundli 2007, Jones and Straker 2006, Kessels and Korthagen 1996). Although NTs learn about how to teach well within their school context through developing the "tricks of the trade" (McNamara et al. 2014a), their ideas of what constitutes 'good' teaching can vary. Across the data, the role of theory in school-led ITE seemed insignificant through its

absence and misapplication. Generally, SBMs expected UTs to deliver certain theoretical aspects of ITE, although they were vague about what this might entail:

> *"I usually refer to practical issues, like classroom layout and using equipment in Science... I think university sessions then make links between practical and theory"* (SBM6.2.3).

> *"our NTs focus on what they need here. In their contrasting placement and at university they see other skills to develop so they can mix and match... It's the university's role to train NTs for all school types. It's not realistic for us."* (SBM5.2.3).

> *"The theory behind this is for universities to teach, not me"* (SBM3.1.1).

The SBMs understanding of 'theory' was associated with constructs of how we learn, critical reflections on education policy and research findings in relation to practice. However, the UTs that were included in this study were former teachers and did not necessarily have experience as academics/educational researchers. This furthers my claim that school-led ITE varies in teaching practice, knowledge and ITE content to the extent that teaching becomes an occupation with limited theoretical influence, thereby removing its status and value as a profession.

Some SBMs endorsed the position of teaching as an apprenticeship learned and enacted in accordance with NTs taught practice. Across the data, all SBMs admitted to providing their NTs with resources when they faced challenges but lacked the time to talk through the problem methodically, considering all of the learning strategies that could be employed. There is evidence that where SBMs lacked the capacity to support struggling NTs, they provided lesson plans and activities rather than exploring the issues and possible solutions. Although this was a short-term gain for both participants, there is a concern that in subsequent teaching roles, NTs will not have the full skillset and knowledge required to tackle different contexts, student behaviours or varying levels of ability.

Jones and Straker (2006) argue that within ITE, theory is considered the domain of the HEI and practice that of the school. This view is reinforced in the mentoring

styles of the participating SBMs, as many commented on their affinity for 'practice' and the disconnect that they see between school and university teaching:

> *"I find delivering the practical side easier than the theory. Yes, the two go hand in hand but it needs to be a more practical lead"* (SBM4.1.2).

> *"I am restricted by time- I cannot possibly research every new theory, come back to the trainee, review that and reflect on their practice"* (SBM1.1.1).

> *"Conversations are more about professional development and subject knowledge than theory behind teaching… I wouldn't know where to start"* (SBM3.1.1).

As suggested by the literature, SBMS can make insufficient use of critical reflection or the relation between theoretical concepts and the practical principles within the school (Sundli 2007, Wang and Odell 2002). The data showed that SBMs struggled to link different forms of knowledge and viewed improving the practical elements of NT practice as their responsibility. 'Theory' was seen as a separate, isolated learning construct that informed practice but was rarely referred to in mentor dialogue:

> *"we speak about the practical… I can't say I do a lot of theory"* (SBM6.2.3).

Instead of viewing theoretical concepts as ideas which build upon subject, pedagogical and behaviour knowledge, SBMs valued practical experiences. Little time was spent engaging with research on new techniques/activities, and the majority of SBMs relied on their own practice and experiences to form the basis of their mentoring. This raises concerns regarding the lack of theoretical grounding in mentorship which restricts NT learning (Sundli 2007, Lee 2007, Shulman 2005):

> *"my reflection and theory elements happen at uni… I don't link it to school. I value school for the advice on how I'm doing what I'm doing. The theory might come in handy on reflection at uni and in assignments, but realistically you just get on with it"* (NT6.2.3).

Here, NT6.2.3's development was restricted as he did not associate his HEI-led training sessions with his knowledge from school relating to teaching practice. NT6.2.3 developed an approach of 'getting on with it' and trying multiple activities

until something sticks, rather than reflecting on his practice and considering why strategies may not be successful. This approach may work in the short term; however, teaching practice often requires characteristics of resilience, determination and flexibility that may be difficult to forge and maintain if NTs do not reflect and link their practice with theoretical understanding (Bartell et al. 2019, Mansfield et al. 2016, Ross and Gibson 2007). The majority of SBMs rarely referenced theoretical constructs and academic language and thus, by the process of re-enactment of 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a), NTs also saw pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) and theoretical research as two separate constructs. Through using the DSR model, this data highlights how existing practices come into being, are encouraged but also constrained (Cleland and Durning 2019). In terms of practice architectures, this relates to the cultural–discursive arrangements as NTs draw upon the language and discourse of their SBM's practice, which is heavily focussed on practical experience, rather than academic thought and research. The influence of semantics affects this process as NTs capture the "sayings" characteristic of a given practice, through the language that is used in "describing, interpreting and justifying" behaviour (Kemmis et al., 2014b: 32). School-led ITE mentoring can therefore create different versions of professionalism and a range of teaching practices across the national teaching body. Although it is not possible to say, on the basis of this study, that this will impact teacher retention, these findings add weight to this argument and present a risk.

UT1.1.1 also felt that SBMs largely focus on practical issues, although she admitted this may be a broad claim as she does not see every SBM interaction. She felt that some SBMs were intimidated by the UT's professional status and knowledge base and that they generally focus on classroom-based practices with their NTs. Although it is likely that SBMs will feel more confident when talking about practical classroom issues, such as layouts and seating plans, there is an assumption inferred here that SBMs are unwilling to speak on topics that they feel a UT will have more knowledge. Perhaps it is more the case that SBMs either disagree with a UT or that they are reluctant to overwhelm NTs with information regarding theory and how to develop and link these to their practical classroom activities. These assumptions indicate a

lack of UT communication with SBMs around the joint feedback process. This may differ between school-HEI partners, implying a range of cross-institutional working among ITE providers.

SLT1.1 acknowledged a need for clarity regarding research and theory to avoid varied references to, and understanding of, the theoretical concepts that underpin pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012). SLT1.1 felt that research was crucial for SBMs personal growth, but that there was little reference made to literature to challenge and further teaching practice within School 1:

> *"Mentors need to know there's more responsibility than PGCE and NQT. I don't think the training outlines that. We need to develop a culture of action research. This is key in my strategy for staff CPD"* (SLT1.1.).

In comparison, School 2's SLT members felt that the school cultivated an ethos of engagement with action research. However, SBM practice varied when connecting these two ideas. SLT3.2.3 explained the research and professional development opportunities that are afforded to staff:

> *"we offer postgrad/ research opportunities to help our staff grow and improve professionally… (we keep) our teachers at the forefront of research and understanding latest developments within the field"* (SLT3.2.3).

The literature review highlighted that some SBMs utilise processes of learning whereby they draw on research and practical experiences to shape development. Through a process of 'judgement in practice' (Alter and Coggshall 2009:3), 'clinical reasoning' (Kriewaldt and Turnidge 2013:104) and 'practical theorising' (Hagger and McIntyre 2006:58, Schön 1983), NTs are often able to self-develop and make judgements on what strategies to employ in certain contexts. The foundations of this process are built on reflective conversations with SBMs that develop over time and encourage self-confidence in NT decision-making. The SBMs patience is crucial as NTs can reason through thought processes and can make mistakes without SBM criticism. There was evidence that two SBMs from School 2 were committed to this stance through their engagement with research and discussions with NTs: "I often refer to Blooms" (SBM7.2.3). They held supportive conversations that evaluated the

NTs practice and helped them form a developmental attitude that encouraged the NT to reason and attempt different strategies without fear of being judged. In contrast to this, SBM6.2.3 of School 2 felt unable to refer to the theory that may have aided his NTs decision-making processes and student progress. In Chapter 5.2, SBM6.2.3 referred solely to practical issues regarding classroom layout and equipment, relying on UTs to explore how practice is presented and furthered in relevant research.

In both schools, despite sharing the same context, there are contrasts in SBMs practice and professional knowledge. Generally, my analysis shows that SBMs did not link pedagogical teaching content (the practical elements of teaching such as teaching methods, lesson structure and classroom management) with theoretical concepts. Where this did occur, the practice was not shared by all SBMs within school or ITE programme, thereby creating ITE that lacked theoretical content and was wide-ranging across contexts. This links to Hobson and Malderez's (2013) research which suggested that there is a general lack of understanding for what mentoring ought to entail, or what mentors should seek to achieve. Quite possibly, the SBMs attitude to "theory stuff" (SBM6.2.3) leads to them employ ambiguous, simple methods to scaffold NT learning and development (Hobson and Malderez 2013a). SBMs may be unable to view practice and theory concurrently if they do not have access to literature, or indeed time to research. In the long term, if NTs do not understand which element of an activity was unsuccessful within a certain context and why, they are not developing as practitioners or understanding the theory behind learning and student cognition that would aid their practice.

Analysis of the data suggests that programme leads were unaware of how little SBMs engage with new forms of research that emerge from the theoretical field of teaching practice. Logistically, SBMs cannot access these sources easily if not affiliated with, or a student of, an HEI. SBMs may also lack knowledge of electronic publications, journals and research periodicals that would help to develop this understanding. The UTs viewed their key responsibility as delivering information and guidance on the academic aspect of the programmes, including assignments and reflections. To this end, their focus was based on theoretical concepts for NTs to

engage with in assessments. NTs generally viewed this emphasis as removed from their daily teaching lives. As explored by Struthers (2017), traditionally the NT's subject knowledge base has largely been the responsibility of the university, offering a depth and breadth of research-informed scholarship that can then be pedagogically orientated for teaching in schools. Within school-led ITE, the NT's subject knowledge base is narrowed as there is a lack of cross-institutional working to aid this level of theoretical understanding (Struthers 2017). My findings validate Struthers (2017) argument as NTs did not interlink their learning between institutions. More importantly, SBMs saw 'theory' and 'practice' as separate entities and did not engage with UTs to interweave these concepts or attempt to do so themselves. Consequently, a partnership of separate spheres is created. Stakeholders work in distinct spaces with little communication or collaboration to check duplication of ITE provision or shared understanding of the ITE research field.

From this analysis, there is an emerging requirement for formal mentor development which explicitly outlines the need to adapt their style and understanding of education theory. As SBMs take on more responsibility in ITE, they must view their role as a facilitator of both academic and practical knowledge. However, in line with my first finding, this is difficult to achieve when communication between HEIs and SBMs is limited, and SBM input into ITE provision is not sought by those at a senior management level.

It is important to recognise that SBMs do not see themselves as theorists but as producers of practical-based knowledge. This mindset may begin to shift through strengthening school-HEI partnerships and exploring how theoretical concepts intertwine with their professional practice knowledge. Through collaboration, mentors might view their own 'expert' knowledge as equal to university-based teacher educators, which may then encourage them to interweave theoretical and practical knowledge.

In summary, mentors need support to move beyond their craft knowledge of what works: from transmission-orientated (hierarchical/didactic) to constructivist-orientated mentoring (collegial/exploratory) (Simmie et al. 2017, Spooner-Lane 2017, Richter et al. 2013, O'Brien and Christie 2005). The SBMs see themselves as

236

responsible for practical elements of teaching; the concepts of 'practice' and 'theory' exist in a segregated partnership. As a result of this, their role is closer to that of a cooperating teacher, not a mentor. For SBMs in this study, their own craft knowledge, reference to pedagogical content (Loughran et al. 2012) and use of teacher specific language is not considered to be underpinned by theoretical understanding.

For the SBMs, PCK is the combination of their rich knowledge of pedagogy and content which interact so that their practice is purposefully constructed to ensure that learning takes place and students engage (Loughran et al. 2012, Abell 2008). As learnt through their experience, they use particular procedures and content strategically and for specific cohorts and as a result, lend greater weight to PCK than to research-based theory as this knowledge is enough for them to deliver 'good' professional practice. Thus, although SBMs have a potentially powerful role in ensuring that induction provides the professional learning opportunity for NTs to conceptualise practice and to contextualise theory (Clarke et al. 2017), this is rarely the case. Mentor experience and PCK is perceived as the decisive factor in making classroom judgements. Furthermore, the mentors struggled to articulate their wisdom of practice (Shulman 1986) and 'stick with what they (I) know' (SBM3.1.1). In this sense 'teaching is a personal thing' (Clarke et al. 2013:373) and their PCK refers to particular expertise which has key traits and distinctions that are influenced by the teaching context, content, and experience. Thus, school-based ITE programmes struggle to create new forms of professionalism and new generations of teachers with new forms of knowledge (Furlong et al. 2000). There is scant evidence from this study that school-HEI partnerships such as school-led ITE programmes, and SBM practice, interweave theoretical understanding with practice-based knowledge (Darling-Hammond 2012).

In terms of delivering a broad pedagogical ITE pathway, there are variations in participant practices. SLT3.2.3 used the school's connection with HEIs as a marketing strategy to promote the research-based learning that takes place amongst staff. However, this was not entirely cross-cutting through the various hierarchies of School 2 as SBM6.2.3's responses suggested that this was not common practice.

Largely, through focussing on PCK development (Loughran et al. 2012) and encouraging mimicry of 'tricks of the trade' (McNamara et al. 2014a), there is an apprenticeship model of professional learning emerging from these programmes (Jackson and Burch 2016). Alternatively, this can be viewed as a model of semi-professionalism wherein academic educational knowledge no longer provides the foundation on which ITE is built, as is claimed by HEI-led routes. Research shows that teachers are more likely to engage in research when it directly relates to their subject area, school context, specific cohort of students (for example, SEND students) or to justify their existing practice (Sato and Loewen 2019, Godfrey and Brown 2019, Flynn 2019, Carter 2016). The data highlights this as the relationship between theory and practice is only endorsed by the SBMs when related to practical activities, such as Bloom's taxonomy, to promote varied student questioning.

As discussed, within this study the SBMs pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) is largely based on their experiences. SBM's lack the time, opportunity, or inclination to research new strategies as their practice is well-developed and forms the basis of their classroom activities and judgements. In this way, the three SB ITE pathways included in this study are limiting NT development as they do not expose them to the range of research-based knowledge that could aid their practice. To this end, the SBMs are equally as restricted, although they may not acknowledge this, as often their limited time and capacity means they rely on the practice they have developed through experience and classroom interactions. Although SBM7.2.3 used action research to help develop reflective practice, generally SBM engagement with research to aid self-development was rare. Their reputation and knowledge of the school context forms the basis of their classroom persona, rather through engaging with practice-orientated research.

7.4 SBM authority

My final claim relates to the SBM's contribution to ITE. As explored, SBMs have limited involvement in terms of the planning, delivery, and evaluation of ITE programmes. They rarely communicate with UTs and are often assessed through quality assurance measures, thereby further reducing their sense of authority and creative agency. Although some SBMs engage with current research on teacher

practice, there is an overall lack of SBM authority when considering their knowledge base and how they are situated within the programme, which influences how they make sense of their role. This may link with the HEI's quality assurance requirements:

> *"one key member of staff and programme coordinator who liaises with us and ensures all requirements are met"* (UT3.1.2).

As HEIs continue to award QTS, they hold accountability for Ofsted outcomes and meeting formal regulatory policies. Within the partnership, the HEI has oversight and must ensure all standards and processes are met, however it is for the school to choose how to deliver the various elements of the programme. To this end, it becomes clear why SBMs are not afforded power and authority over the planning and delivery of ITE, as this is a verified process with one lead person taking control. With this in mind, it is important to consider how the SBMs reduced authority affects their role and, potentially, professional agency and development.

In the literature review, I considered the benefits to the SBM role, including renewing professional practice. The SBM role can provide new perspectives, ideas, and self-development (Abell et al. 1995, Simpson et al. 2007), leading a renewal of their own enthusiasm for teaching (Moor et al. 2005). Data analysis revealed that SBMs can often experience a rejuvenation of professional development and reflection through their work with NTs who present new ideas for classroom delivery. SBMs 1.1.1, 4.2.1 and 7.2.3, felt the role allowed them to move beyond self-imposed boundaries and their 'comfort zone'. For these SBMs, the focus on TS, expectations and self-reflection enhanced their professional knowledge:

> *"I have become enthused to develop myself professionally"* (SBM1.1.1).

Broadly, the SBMs felt that regularly referring to government expectations and Standards improved their professional knowledge, thus helping them to reflect on their NT's progression. To an extent, SBMs are revitalising their enthusiasm for teaching as they gain current knowledge of TS and self-reflect on their practice, which may have become tired and prescriptive.

Despite this positive interpretation of SBM practice, I suggest SBM's tendency to rely upon TS to inform their practice reveals that they are complying with external authority and interpreting professional knowledge through regulatory frameworks and Standards. Here, professional knowledge and growth, teaching styles and the teacher persona are excluded as this approach is restricted to regulatory frameworks and not based on practical experiences. The SBM is affected by the practice architectures in place within their schools and school-led ITE structures. The socio-political and material-economic arrangements of the physical space and social relationships between ITE stakeholders (Kemmis et al. 2014b) guides and limits their practice. They are constrained by the "doings" of practice and the shared understandings of power, cohesion, collegiality and practical agreements (Kemmis et al. 2014b:32). This results in a restrictive form of professionalism which lacks SBM input and authority, signalling distance between the hierarchies of different actors in ITE.

Professional knowledge becomes developed through meeting requirements, rather than focussing on the self and developing practice through trialling a range of activities to assess student needs and aid progress. This approach seems to lack a creative, personal response from SBMs, and their role as an 'expert' in the field is reduced (Furlong et al. 2000, Zeichner et al. 2015).

This view offers a different perspective on the critical stance that SBMs have an inherent self-belief that there is a 'right' approach to teaching, thus creating clones of themselves (Hobson and Malderez 2013) with NTs often using mimicry of SBM practice to hide or distort their flaws (Holmes 2010). By following government Standards and self-reflecting, it is possible to see SBMs supporting the NTs development of 'learnacy' (Claxton 2004). This may aid the NTs on-going learning as a broader form of mentorship is employed, exploring beyond the SBMs own teaching.

However, this approach is restricted to regulatory frameworks and not based on practical experiences. In this way, the SBM is affected by the material-economic arrangements of the physical space, in relation to the contextual conditions the form their working activity and practice (Kemmis et al. 2014b). They are constrained by

the "doings" of practice, and "what can be done amid the physical set-ups" of practice locations (Kemmis et al. 2014b:32). Once more, the SBM's practice is predetermined by time, government expectations and the need to meet standards. Consequently, there are also elements of social–political arrangements that interplay here. These practice architectures are mediated by the social relationships between individuals; in this case, the government, teacher educators, school-led ITE programme leads and SBMs. These arrangements have guided the interpretation of roles, rules and organisational function through shared understandings of power and practical agreements (Kemmis et al., 2014b). The practical agreements and power structures at work in this study relate to government expectations that SBMs, and those leading on the programmes, deliver quality, well-managed ITE provision and NT support that aids them to achieving QTS. From the interplay of these two arrangements, the space for generative, personal, reflective work and interactions are not found within this study. The practice architectures that SBMs work within are built around and developed from material-economic and social-political arrangements (Kemmis and Grootenboer 2008, Kemmis et al., 2014b); the practice of the SBM and workplace is bound by government oversight and assurance, thus inhibiting opportunities for engaging in generative learning experiences. By this merit, NT's professional growth is not stunted through mimicry as the mentor pair develop a reliance on frameworks and government compliance to interpret good professional practice. Still, this stance devalues the SBMs expertise, experience and practical knowledge that contributes to an NT's development through the process of re-enactment and 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a), creating a model that is prescriptive rather than developmental.

Through using professional frameworks and guidance as the source for 'good teaching', the SBMs employ a top-down, non-generative approach. NTs train to be 'classroom ready' in line with policy and frameworks, rather than through a flexible, evolutionary journey of learning as they encounter different student cohorts and school contexts. However, some SBMs (SBM1.1.1/SBM6.2.3) felt that developing a teaching style and identity was beyond a tick-box exercise and could not be evidenced "over a couple of terms" (SBM1.1.1). SBM1.1.1 encouraged NT1.1.1 to

develop her own style through soft skills and thinking beyond Standards as she developed her practice and discovered her teacher style and persona.

The data also demonstrated that the SBM role can have a positive impact on mentor practice. A reciprocal learning process can take place between SBMs and NTs, depending on the SBMs willingness to learn, creativity and awareness of the challenges and realities of the profession:

> *"we need to continually improve as much as the NT"* (SBM3.1.1).

However, the SBMs role is more challenging if an NT is struggling to meet programme expectations or TS, thereby affecting the mentor partnership:

> *"If a trainee comes here with a romanticised view of teaching… I can't say that they help me to develop. I'm doing all I can to keep them on the course"* (SBM4.1.2).

SBM4.1.2 found her role was challenging when she had to increase the time and effort that she afforded to the NT to ensure they achieved QTS. She did not feel that she developed personally in these types of partnerships. From this it seems the opportunity for SBM professional development is dependent on the NT's enthusiasm and ability, as the SBMs approach to mentoring may change according to this. Thus, this study illustrates that although it is possible for SBM partnerships to reciprocally develop professional practice, this is seldom the case. It is then conceivable to see a further disconnect between SBMs, UTs and PM as due to a lack of communication, SBMs feel they are single-handedly ensuring an NT continues the programme, "there's a lot of stuff I do that's not my job"(SBM3.1.1).

From a leadership perspective the SBM's status is low in the hierarchy of ITE, as the PM is the designated main point of contact. UT2.1.1 explained that "PMs are more important than SBMs" for NT progression and the formal administrative processes. However, UT2.1.1 also voiced that SBMs have a key role to play and should be encouraged to contribute and given more authority within the programme. The minimal attempts to open dialogue and maintain communication with the majority of SBMs suggests that they are constantly on the periphery of the programme:

"I wish I knew more about the programme's systems and assessment foci" (SBM2.1.1).

Generally, SBMs were not involved with the NT assessment process or included in the review teams which evaluated the programme. In Chapter section 3.2.2, I presented Bullough's (2005) ideas on SBM preparation and practice which suggested that effective mentor preparation should include planned strategies of how to develop mentor identities. When collaboration with university partners and other teacher educators has been active, mentors report learning new and improved teaching styles and strategies (Davies et al. 1999, Lopez-Real and Kwan 2005). According to the data, there was limited professional growth and personal reward for SBMs who maintained daily interaction and weekly meetings with NTs but were kept at a distance from the decision-making process: "I'm not involved in the NTs final grading for QTS"(SBM4.1.2). Although this implies that SB ITE programmes lack the collaborative partnership that they endorse, there is an argument that mentors are supporters, not assessors, and thus should not be involved is awarding QTS (Shaw 2018, Colson et al. 2017, Dicke et al. 2015, Douglas 2017, Douglas 2015, Dicke et al. 2015, Lofthouse 2015, Wilson 2014, Vanassche and Kelchtermans 2014, Hobson and Malderez 2013, Richter et al. 2013, Billett 2011, Malderez and Wedell 2007). As an assessor passes judgement, this contrasts with the SBM's responsibility of supporting NT development. Therefore, it may not be appropriate for SBMs to be involved in this process.

Still, the concept of 'partnership' becomes devalued as although SBMs work is considered crucial to NT development, they are not invited to partake in critical decision regarding their NTs or the programme itself. Two of the SBMs included in this study were also faculty leads, whilst one was acting as an SBM alongside his PM role. Despite their promoted posts and positions of responsibility, like their colleagues these SBMs were uninvolved in the decision-making processes, leading me to suggest that their positions of responsibility were seen as irrelevant when considered alongside their role as an SBM.

Finally, the SBMs authority was reduced as the PM supervises their practice to "check the SBMs have the same standard" (PM1.1.2). As a result, SBMs have limited

creativity or individuality in their approach to the role. Equally, they are discouraged from steering away from TS and moving towards practice that is difficult to monitor, such as student relationships or emotional stability. The SBM's main task was to deliver and evidence assessment foci that are prescribed by the university:

> *"we have certain criteria to be covered, whether at university or in school. My job is to check they've covered everything university requires. I need to see that these are met physically, within portfolios"* (UT3.1.2).

PMs regularly monitored SBM practice, could amend their judgements of NT observation gradings and was the main point of contact with ITE partners:

> *"the SBM will assess (evidence of standards) throughout the year and I will do a termly review to check they are being met…I quality assure all judgements"* (PM1).

> *"My role is regular meetings with the PM, check on SBMs and if there are any problems with the NTs. Make sure we are all singing from the same hymn sheet… The PM makes the final decisions for if an NT will pass"* (SLT3.2.3).

The SBM's authority was therefore reduced as their decisions could be overridden or altered:

> *"The PM coordinates every NT, but she should allow us contact with/ point us in the direction of university and give us some control. I have no influence on the final judgement of someone who has been under my watch for an entire year"* (SBM2.1.1).

As illustrated here, the SBM's self-worth decreased as they felt that the professional community did not trust their judgement and they were not given the opportunity to learn as teacher educators. This links to Hobson's (2009) view that there has been a failure to impress upon schools the importance of thorough mentor selection and training, with appropriate subject specific support to aid professional learning and development needs.

Hobson and Malderez's (2013) feel that schools fail to take mentoring seriously and do not recognise the importance of NT development. This study shows that SBMs

provide support to NTs on a daily basis, but with little appreciation or recognition from their ITE 'partners', despite their commitment to the role. SBM authority is reduced through the PM's quality assurance measures and observations. SBMs are not advancing professionally as they cannot facilitate ITE beyond their mentor role; they are not invited into the cross-institutional dialogue to give opinions on ITE content, structure, or evaluation. This approach denies SBMs the opportunity to develop professionally through HEI collaborations and further understand ITE systems. This reduces their ability to grow as professionals and mentors as they only participate in the practical, day-to-day elements of the programme.

School-based mentoring can be seen to reward and retain capable teachers and help with career progression (Hymans 2019, Beltman and Schaeben 2012, Harris and Crocker 2003, Campbell and Campbell 2000, Little 1990). However, this only occurs when mentoring leads to positive outcomes, such as recognition, incentive, or financial reward (Abell et al. 1995, Evans 1997, Simpson et al. 2007). My findings show that SBM work is constrained by their lack of time, authority, and collaborative working. Equally, there are few positive outcomes for them professionally as their work often goes unrecognised by programme leads, HEIs and PMs.

My study was undertaken during a time of (state) school budget cuts. The Institute of Fiscal Studies reports that the total school spending per pupil in England had fallen by 8% between 2009-2020 (Britton et al. 2019). The bulk of these funding cuts were driven by a 57% reduction in spending on services provided by LEAs and a 20% cut in sixth-form funding. This follows on from average growth in school spending per pupil of around 5% per year during the 2000s (Britton et al. 2019). The impact of these cuts is evident through the issues of time afforded to mentoring and increased pressures on SBMs to manage their roles as mentors, teachers and for some, wider leadership. It may therefore be unrealistic to suppose that all designated SBMs have the skills and capacity and support to perform their role well. They are restricted as they are unable to fully dedicate themselves to their role. Equally, they are not invited into school-HEI ITE partnership dialogue and as such are unable to gain knowledge about the logistics, design, and implementation of ITE, thereby reducing their authority.

7.4.1 SBM time and restrictions

Mentor practice is restricted by the limited time that schools afford to their role, which they must balance alongside other professional responsibilities. There is an agreement in the literature that restrictions to SBM time can negatively impact on their practice. Increase in workload can affect the SBM role as it is sometimes unmanageable, occasionally leading to difficulties in accommodating NT needs (Lee 2007, Robinson 1999, Simpson et al. 2007, Maynard 2000). Mentoring is seen as most effective when given additional non-contact time to help SBMs prepare and then undertake this role (Abell et al. 1995, Lee 2007, Robinson 1999). Bullough (2005) emphasised the importance of coordinating mentors and mentees timetables, as this is often overlooked and insufficient when planning for ITE. The data shows that SBM dedication to NT development fluctuates over the academic year. Some have other professional commitments and responsibilities to attend to, whereas others fail to commit to the programme's policy of at least one formal weekly mentor meeting. This raises issues of SBM compliance and the standard of ITE provision and support.

Broadly, time management and logistics were issues across the mentor pairs in this study. This was particularly evident where pairings did not share planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time. The lack of coordinating timetables can affect the SBMs time and priorities as,

> *"it's a big commitment. It's a balancing act… we have no free lessons together" (SBM3.1.1)*

SBM3.1.1 had to dedicate daily meeting time outside of school hours to her NT in order to support her. Admittedly, daily meetings are not compulsory, as seen from the Teach First mentor guidelines (TeachFirst 2017), but SBM3.1.1 felt this was necessary given her role as first point of contact and support. Broadly, School 1's SBMs felt pressured to meet with their NTs more regularly than was outlined in the mentor handbooks and guides (see Appendix 3 and 4). However, some SBMs were unable or unwilling to commit the time outlined in the programme's guidelines, and so SBM practice and support to NTs varied.

Where SBMs have other work priorities, commitment and time dedicated to NTs is cut short, particularly when SBMs have wider leadership responsibilities within school. This was illustrated by SBM1.1.1 who, as head of department, felt his "professional life was affected" and he occasionally prioritised these responsibilities over his mentor role. Equally, SBM4.1.2 admitted that occasionally she failed to attend weekly mentor meetings and that she "dropped the ball… time is a real issue." Here, the SBM's role as a mentor was temporarily suspended as their other responsibilities and various deadlines took precedence throughout the academic year. Although student educational progress and support should always take priority within these programmes, this leads me to question the status placed on the SBM role within schools and across leadership teams.

As a result of SBM unavailability, NTs lacked consistent support. This was particularly noticeable during pressure points within the academic year, such as GCSE exam season and termly assessments:

> *"Sometimes you don't want to ask your SBM too much as they're busy and its difficult. They get no extra time or pay so I feel guilty" (NT4.1.2).*

This raises a concern about the level of support available to NTs and the SBM's capacity to provide the frequent communication that some NTs may require. This highlights the claim that wide-ranging SBM practice can hinder an NTs development and reduce their access to a model of collaborative self-development and reflection (Kemmis et al. 2014b). This data confirms Hobson and Malderez's (2013a) assertion that an informed consensus on the meaning and purposes of mentoring in ITE is needed, as it can become deprioritised during busy periods of the academic year. Equally, senior leaders who dictate the SBMs time and responsibilities should be cognisant of the importance of their role and place greater emphasis on the process of choosing mentors and pairing with NTs.

Finally, Hobson and Malderez (2013a) argue that mentor selection should consider aptitude for the role based on prior experience, personal characteristics and expertise and a willingness to assume the role. However, within this study the SBM

role and, to an extent, NTs development was not taken seriously as there was limited thought applied to mentor selection: "we ask who we see fit and available for the role"(PM1.1). The data shows that although SBMs were willing to take on the role, SBM1.1.1, SBM3.1.1 and SBM4.1.2 all had reduced capacity to provide consistent support due to their wider professional responsibilities. Once more, this shows the lack of consideration and emphasis that senior school leaders place on mentorship within school-led ITE.

7.5 Summary

In summary, there are different forms of professionalism that emerge from this study. An NT's professional knowledge base and development can often be limited as SBMs focus on their own preferences of practice and school priorities. This results in a localised form of professionalism and ITE teacher content knowledge that is restrictive as their learning is solely based on their school context. I would suggest that no distinct, new form of professionalism emerges in the move towards school-based ITE. Generally, NT development rests on their SBMs previous understanding of mentoring from HEI-led routes, or their knowledge of what makes 'good' practice based on the Teacher Standards' and their own experiences.

Across this study it became clear that SBMs rarely develop their understanding of what constitutes theoretical knowledge. They drew on their experiences to shape NT development through a process of reflectivity, 'practical theorising' (Hagger and McIntyre 2006:58, Schön 1983) and 'clinical reasoning' (Kriewaldt and Turnidge 2013:104) built from everyday practice. This may be due to the SBM's lack of time and inclination to develop their own professional knowledge, and also limited communication with their university counterparts. If these issues were developed, collaborative cross-institutional conversations may enable the SBMs to understand or place theoretical constructs within their teaching practice, thereby allowing them to see these ideas as interlinking counterparts.

There is no set, clear collaborative working model between the NTs, SBMs and UTs included in this study. Generally, although some were employed by schools, NTs were not fully immersed in 'communities of practice'; they mainly interacted with

their mentors and observed their teaching practice as an example to draw upon. However, in some cases NTs were embraced by departments as they provided fresh insight into how curriculum content could be delivered. This occurred most frequently within the Teach First and Independent Schools' programme, as the NTs were employed full-time on these pathways. Here, there is a sense of full participation into the communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991) and it is possible to see the model of LPP as NTs assimilate into their school environments. Importantly, they are often regarded as colleagues, not just trainees, although this can lead to a lack of SBM support as they no longer categorise the NTs as learners, such as with SBM6.2.3:

> *"He just comes to see me when he wants something. I wouldn't say we meet regularly, just when a review is coming or if he has questions."*

An NT's ability to immerse themselves into their departments and contribute to joint work is generally dependent on their disposition and enthusiasm to develop, alongside SBM availability to encourage shared practice. With that being said, evidence from the data has shown that NTs are rarely given the opportunity to develop creatively and practice trial and error learning or through the process of 'judgement in practice' or 'clinical reasoning' (Kriewaldt and Turnidge 2013:104, Alter and Coggshall 2009:3, Franke and Dahlgren 1996). This is largely due to a lack of SBM time, and sometimes their disinclination, to work the NT through this reflective practice that requires introspective thinking and contemplation. As a result, this study shows that NTs are more likely to mimic (Holmes 2010) and adopt the same dispositions and practice of their mentors, as this is readily available and what they are most frequently exposed to.

The findings of this study show that there is evidence of the mentor role benefitting the SBM's practice as the data showed some SBMs endorsing NT practices within their departments. However, although the SBMs seemed interested in new practices, this was more a transaction of convenience that encouraged NT development rather than an example of holistic, transformational model of collaborative self-development (Kemmis et al. 2014b). SBM professional development and learning rarely occurs through weekly mentor meetings as they

249

are often restricted by time and the need to monitor NT progress and evidence against Teacher Standards'. Alongside this, the majority of SBMs within this study were reluctant to explore current action research or recent developments in ITE due to their inexperience and lack of knowledge of this area. More often, the mentor oversaw administrative tasks which did not allow for their creative input and professional insight. By reducing the mentor role in this way, there is a question raised over teacher agency and SBM value in the eyes of school leaders that has resulted in a reductive model of professional development for SBMs in this study.

Within this study, the mentor acts as both a professional colleague and guide to the NT (Kemmis et al. 2014a, Kemmis et al. 2014b). Largely SBMs reserve judgement or criticism, although this is not always the case and the 'dark side' of mentorship involving judgementoring can occur (Hobson and Malderez 2013a, Long 1997). This can have a detrimental effect on the development and self-confidence of an NT, as seen at School 2 with NT5.2.3, and thus the impact of the mentor's disposition and attitude towards the role cannot be underestimated.

This study shows that within school-led ITE, partnership becomes a panacea (Kennedy and Doherty 2012) and simply serves as a phrase to describe what should be enacted and how institutions should behave. There is no explicit rationale for how to adopt a partnership approach in these programmes, and thus leaders and senior stakeholders hold jurisdiction alone. Cultural liberation is not realised for SBMs as their partnerships with UTs and programme leads are underdeveloped and lack communication. Thus, for some teacher educator within school-led ITE, the system is restrictive and lacks the benefits of collaborative working that accompany the concept of 'third space' (Bhabha 1994).

Generally, SBMs felt undervalued within their role and had little to no influence on their NTs assessment, despite being the main source of support throughout the programme. In this way, the structure of the programme lacks a sense of levelling and hybridity (Oldenburg 2001, Whitty 2006, Evetts 2008). The mentor is not placed as an 'expert' within their field, and their knowledge is not sought after within school-HEI collaborative dialogues regarding ITE provision. The communications shared with SBMs are based on supportive, organisational matters, rather than an

intellectual partnership that considers the practical expression of the theory/practice relationship (Kennedy and Doherty 2012). Shared responsibility and accountability are not considered part of the SBM role however, this is perhaps what is needed for the school-HEI partnership to be considered meaningful and collaborative. Partnership as a form of professional learning needs to feature alongside these programmes (Kennedy and Doherty 2012:846), providing SBMs with the training and opportunity to provide their insight and develop their own professional practice knowledge.

Chapter 8. Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the role of the SBM within the context of school-led ITE, what forms of professionalism are evident in different settings and programmes, and how school-HEI partnerships support NT development. I summarise the key assertions about school-led ITE from this study and how this contributes to school mentoring practice, ITE partner collaboration and the development of teacher professionalism. I address and respond to my research question individually and explore themes that relate to each of these. The research questions of this study were as follows:

1) How does the 'practicum turn' affect the role of the school-based mentor?

2) How do the concepts of professionalism and mentoring practices differ between settings?

3) What are the contextual conditions that create and support school-HEI initial teacher education partnerships?

My contribution to the field is distinctive through its focus on the SBM and their perspective on and experiences of school-led ITE. I critically examine emerging forms of local professionalism and consider the formation and delivery of school-led ITE programmes. This study offers an exploration of the nature and diversity of school-HEI partnerships in two schools in North West England. Specifically, I focus on who has power within these partnerships, whose professional knowledge is sought in the collaborative creation of ITE programmes, and the effect on the SBMs, whose voices are often absent. The data revealed that collaborative partnerships exist at both schools within this study, but only at a senior management level. Thus, my study offers an insight into SBM perspectives and how a lack of collaborative work with other ITE partners can lead to SBMs feeling isolated and uninformed about the programme and its processes.

My contribution differs to other studies as I explore the SBM's responsibilities, the model of mentoring they chose to employ and their varied professional practice knowledge. I consider school-HEI partnerships and whose knowledge is most valued in these. Crucially, unlike other research (Cain 2019, Murray et al. 2019, Mutton et al. 2017, Brown et al. 2015), the majority of participating NTs are employed teachers undertaking school-led ITE in one school context. With this in mind, I consider how variation in mentor practice between settings can affect NT development and induction.

In this chapter, I also acknowledge some limitations of the study related to the methodological framework and aspects of my fieldwork that would help to strengthen the study. Finally, I put forward research-based recommendations from this study for policy makers and school-led ITE partners regarding the SB ITE programme model currently promoted in England. These address the restrictions to NT development that can result from learning to teach through a localised model of professional development and inconsistent mentoring practice. My recommendations also suggest how SBMs could be reconsidered in the ITE field through recalibrating partnerships and opening dialogue to include all those involved in ITE. While focussed on England, the findings have wider relevance to the development of school-led ITE on an international scale, as the conclusions I reach may also be applicable to intercontinental models of school-led ITE that I described earlier in my literature review.

8.2 Conclusions

In response to RQ1, the SBMs main role and responsibilities are to support NTs professional development and practice, but primarily centre on completing the administrative tasks needed to achieve QTS. This study shows that the role rarely involves encouraging NTs to develop practice expansively, creatively or with self-reflection. The literature surrounding school-led ITE suggested that mentor preparation and practice rarely explains support mechanisms that can assist NT professional learning and instead, often focuses on administrative aspects of the role (Zwozdiak-Myers et al. 2010, Hobson et al. 2009, Martinez 2004, Furlong et al. 2000). This study's findings illustrate this dichotomy, leading to the conclusion that

teacher preparation pedagogy often lacks breadth and diversity. As seen across the data, restricted forms of mentoring, with little training or collaboration with university partners, can result in the promotion and reproduction of conventional norms and practices (Feiman-Nemser, Parker and Zeichner 1993). The data seldom revealed opportunities for expansive learning to take place as the SBMs rarely referred to different learning processes and teaching styles. Equally, SBMs lacked the time to encourage the NT's originality of thought, reflect on their progress and assess their next steps, despite observation records requiring SBMs to set regular developmental targets. Their feedback sessions were far more practical-based and target-driven, with regular references made to Standards' and meeting deadlines:

> *"next week we will focus on behaviour management, that's Standard 7… we need to work on your delivery, and you need to be stronger and gather more evidence"* (SBM4.1.2).

> *"Let's focus on current actions for Standard 4, then work towards differentiation for Standard 5"* (SBM2.1.1).

SBM practice focused on relational issues, such as student behaviour, interaction and the practicalities of ITE, rather than pedagogical issues. SLT1.1 felt this was due to a disconnect between the SBMs understanding of effective mentor practice and the additional responsibility that school-led ITE mentoring carries, in comparison to HEI-led programmes. She was concerned that the quality of provision and mentor support was compromised as ITE focussed on the programme's processes, rather than professional learning. For her, mentorship has the potential to engage with professional development and provide a space for NTs to trial creative practice and learn from these experiences. As a professional leader, SLT1.1.1 was committed to creating an ethos within School 1 that provides direction for professional development. She planned to engage with programme leads to ensure that she, and SBMs, fully understand what the school's ITE provision entails and where responsibilities lie.

The conclusions of this research show that the model of professional learning that SBMs adopt within this study is predominantly built on TS and practice-based

knowledge. SBMs rarely refer to theoretical constructs and academic language thus, through the process of re-enactment of 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a) NTs see pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) and theoretical understanding as separate entities. The SBMs teaching practice is based on administrative tasks and practice-based knowledge such as classroom management. The NTs disposition is transformed through their observation and participation as SBM knowledge becomes comprehensible and interrelated with their own (Edwards-Groves 2018). This model is largely prescriptive, rather than developmental, as SBMs and NTs rely on frameworks, Standards, practical knowledge and experience to interpret and produce 'good' professional practice. This raises issues regarding SBM practice and NT development as there is little explicit evidence from the data which references theoretical paradigms, research and the principles that inform the ITE curriculum, which is taken as given. Although SBM7.2.3 links teaching strategies and theoretical understanding through encouraging his NT to use Bloom's taxonomy for student questioning, largely the SBM's focus on the practical elements of behaviour management, developing classroom presence and endorsing a range of teaching activities. This leads me to suggest that school-led ITE mentoring can lead to different versions of (largely restricted) professionalism and result in a range of teaching practice, which has implications for the national teaching body.

With regards to RQ2, mentoring practices and concepts of professionalism differ vastly between settings depending on the school's context, priorities and their 'gaps' in educational attainment for particular student cohorts, such as boys or disadvantaged students. As we would expect, within the data SBMs often discussed their own behaviour strategies or provided their lesson plans and PowerPoints as a version of subject enhancement for NTs. This practice takes the form of tailored, localised ITE as SBMs share resources and recommend certain practices to manage the typical student cohort. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that although SBMs are helping the NTs in the short term by reducing their workload and preparation for lessons, they are inadvertently restricting the NTs growth and capacity to adapt to new and unexpected experiences. As recognised in the previous chapter, the model

of SBMs 'lending' NTs teaching activities and resources, can be seen as a form of mimicry (Holmes 2010) and apprenticeship which lacks depth in terms of subject specific pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) and NT self-development. This is to be expected as SBMs are sharing what they regard as effective practice, having had minimal communication with programme leads to discuss their responsibilities and expectations of their role. This encourages the NT to reproduce the SBM teaching style and through a process of interrelating and making sense of activities through practice, transforms their dispositions to be similar to the SBMs (Kemmis et al 2014a, Edwards-Groves 2018), rather than developing adaptive expertise fitted to the future. The NTs come to understand practice through partaking in similar practices which over time contributes to the development of Standards-based practice with a focus on practical knowledge within school-led ITE provision.

The schools participating in this study thus create a form of cultural restriction through regulated practices which do not further the NTs progress and development. Although there is some evidence of NTs contributing to faculty schemes of work, generally the school becomes a limiting environment for NTs to learn teaching skills and develop as practitioners as they are not encouraged to be original and creative with their practice. There is little room for 'judgement in practice' (Alter and Coggshall 2009:3), 'clinical reasoning' (Kriewaldt and Turnidge 2013:104) and 'practical theorising' (Hagger and McIntyre 2006:58, Schön 1983) as they are restricted by the time afforded to mentorship and the need to progress with the 'hurry along' curriculum towards high stakes assessment. This is limiting as NTs do not build their own teaching personas, practice, knowledge or understanding of curriculum planning and assessment. If they were to move to a new school (or are required to move to online learning), or even when their SBM is no longer their mentor, they may be unable to produce differentiated, engaging lessons as they have not had to formulate and deliver original practice previously. The literature showed that the increase in overall teacher numbers since 2010 has not kept pace with increasing pupil numbers (Foster 2019), and my conclusions highlight the risk of losing NQTs and RQTs due to feeling ill-prepared from their training. To attempt to

combat this, SBMs should aim to learn and adopt a mentor language that is explicit in its use of subject content knowledge. This would hopefully also push NTs to develop themselves professionally and not rely on the SBM's resources, which restricts their growth and limits their ability to adapt and nurture their own teaching style. SBMs should aim to create a culturally expansive environment that encourages NTs to contribute to schemes of work, trial new ideas and engage in dynamic practice. Crucially, this would give the NTs space and opportunity to try, and potentially fail, when delivering these in order to learn and grow as practitioners.

The research shows that mentoring is a "developmental activity, with the emphasis on empowering and enabling (mentees) to do things for themselves" (Clutterbuck 2004:11). Invariably this process of modelling and guidance towards an NTs independence and personal professionalism will take unknown periods of time and levels of resources from the SBM (Clutterbuck 2004). As recognised in the previous chapter, SBMs lacked the time to perform their professional work as a teacher and mentor to the best of their ability. SBMs were often overly concerned with the logistics of the course, the relevant forms to be completed and regulations to follow to ensure their NT gained QTS. This resulted in the impression that because they were so busy with their own professional responsibilities, they were keen to make their SBM role as unrestrictive on their time as possible. This is in contrast to the ideas of 'good' induction to the teaching profession which extends beyond ITE and should feature regular reference to classroom pedagogy, a range of teaching strategies, planning, schemes of work and differentiation (see Appendix 5).

The SBMs lacked influence over the ITE programme management as some were not timetabled to shared, designated NT meeting time. Instead, there seemed to be lip-service paid to the mentor role, but the practicalities that would enable meeting time to be worthwhile were often unresolved. This then leaves the SBM subject to criticism in supporting their NT and continuing their work as a professional. Therefore, conclusions from this study raise the concern that the school's approach, outside of the designated programme sessions, is often based on administrative tasks and HEI requirements in order for the NT to achieve QTS. Here, SBM role is more responsibilised as it requires more of their time and practical involvement than

had previously been known on HEI-led routes. However, the type of mentoring that takes place within this provision fails to enable NT professional growth, as there is little time to encourage development and critical reflection with peers.

There are issues regarding communication and mentor preparation as the study's participants had different perspectives on the strength of school-HEI partnerships and the level of support that SBMs receive. In response to RQ3, this study shows that the contextual conditions that create and support school-HEI partnerships are largely dependent on school hierarchy. To be involved in this dialogue, participants must be of a certain level of seniority within school and lead on the delivery of ITE. For communication to take place outside of this hierarchy, SBM-UT relationships have to be well-established, longstanding and based on mutual respect. It is reasonable to conclude that the conditions for a collective, inclusive third space (Bhabha 1994) are not achieved or in place within the two schools or three ITE programmes within this study.

This study suggests that there needs to be additional time, resources, and personal commitment from all ITE stakeholders dedicated to achieving a shared partnership of levelling and hybridity. Within this, there should be opportunities for actors from the different institutions to engage in progressive and transforming conversations to enhance and build new models of SB ITE that this study's participating schools aimed for but did not quite achieve. However, there are clear resource implications to these recommendations within the current context of educations and the time of budget restraints for many schools and an increasing array of demands. Thus, these suggestions may not be easily realised or possible within the current climate. Furthermore, although increased authority and knowledge was desired by some SBMs included in this study, there were mentors who did not appear to want the responsibility of taking on aspects of ITE they deemed university work. For those individuals, increased a levelled, hybrid partnership may bring implication of increased workload and responsibility that is unwelcome.

Engeström and Kerosuo's (2003) concept of horizontal expertise where all input from stakeholders is valued equally is unlikely if partners involved in ITE delivery have never spoken or shared communication regarding NT progress. Consequently,

this study showed that there is no new model of ITE being reimagined or realised within these pathways which "gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation" (Bhabha 1994:211) as the system has not been 'transform(ed)' (Zeichner et al. 2015). What has in fact been 'reimagined' and changed in this sphere is the ITE funding model and allocation of places. The pedagogical content and design of ITE has not been 'transformed'; instead, school-led programmes seem to be repackaged versions of HEI-led ITE courses. This is not surprising given that the school-led model of ITE was never centred on rethinking school-HEI partnerships. In the neo-liberal context of education policy, this model changed who was considered the lead partner in ITE, and was largely based on funding, contracts, markets, and the location of ITE. Thus, the 're-professionalisation' and transformation of the system (Whitty 2014, Zeichner et al. 2015) was never a likely outcome to be expected from this study.

My study suggests that SBMs are rarely 'recast' as experts in the field as they had little autonomy over NT progression. Equally, their status within the hierarchical system and management of the ITE programme was relatively low and constantly scrutinised and quality asssured. In this study, there has been little shift in whose knowledge and expertise counts in the education of new teachers (Zeichner et al. 2015) as programme leads, UTs and PMs continue to monitor SBM practice and award NTs QTS. There was limited collaboration shared with other school-based staff, unless the relationship had longevity and respect, such as with SBM1.1.1 and UT1.1.1.

Overall, this study questions if SBMs have influence and authority within school-led ITE as their role is largely administrative and based on their well-worn practices and methods, and rarely encourages NT growth through their own 'practical theorising' (Hagger and McIntyre 2006:58, Schön 1983). They are rarely involved in cross-institutional dialogue and their 'expert' knowledge is not welcomed or encouraged by senior managers of the ITE programme. As SBMs and NTs dispositions become interrelated within and through practices, the form of ITE that becomes comprehensible to NTs is based on Standards, practical knowledge and is void of theoretical concepts. Teaching often requires characteristics of resilience,

259

determination and flexibility that will be difficult to forge and maintain over the NTs professional lives if they don't develop their own personal teaching skillset that does not rely on 'mimicry', reflect on their practice, or fail to link this with theoretical understanding and reasoning (Bartell et al. 2019, Ross and Gibson 2007, Mansfield et al. 2016). Thus, a conclusion and concern of this study is the effect of varied mentor practice on NTs which could result in an underdeveloped teaching workforce.

8.3 Limitations to this study

The number of participants involved in this study was relatively small, with seven SBMs and NTs, four UTs, three senior leaders and two PMs taking part. This reduced number was largely due to time restrictions, movement between the two school sites and my availability to physically attend every mentor meeting, NT observation feedback session and staff briefing across two sites. Equally, the length of engagement of the data collection period could be seen as restrictive as I could only include SBM partnerships established within one academic year. If I were to amend an aspect of my methodology, I would limit my study to one school and therefore become more assimilated into the culture as I could have spent all of my time in that setting. However, this would have required obtaining access to a school with a high number of trainees from a range of routes which may be difficult to find. Equally, this would have potentially limited the diversity of settings and routes included in the research.

Still, this limited number was appropriate as I sought to spend a large amount of time within the schools and become familiar with the local culture, practices and building relationships with participants. As outlined in Chapter Four, I collected data within both schools for 35 weeks of the academic year, totalling approximately 350 hours of data from lesson observation feedback sessions, mentor meetings, interviews and fieldnotes. Thus, although the number of participants in this study was relatively small, the time afforded to my semi-ethnographic study and strength of the relationships formed were indicative of my commitment to the study. The fact that I collected data for the entirety of the academic NT training year allowed me to get a clear sense of the school-HEI partnerships and different perspectives on this.

This helped me to forge strong links and participant relationships, allowing for more honest and open interactions throughout the data collection period. This gave me and overall insight into the school context, programme coordination and partnerships as I triangulated data from observing various meeting, feedback session and undertaking interviews and also through analysing school/ programme documents.

As explored in Chapter Four, section 4.6, I feel that the study holds a degree of qualitative validity. Although there were only seven mentoring partnerships included, the participants were of varying ages, length of teaching experience, and for the SBMs, different experiences of involvement with ITE. My data has varied scope as one school was an academy and one an independent school and as such, there was diversity in academic attainment and school culture. The two schools worked with different HEIs based in North West England and offered three different forms of school-led ITE. They were also at different stages of engagement with ITE and had different partnerships with HEIs. Five NTs were employed by School 1 and 2 (those which were on the Independent Schools Programme and Teach First), whereas the two participants on the School Direct programme were not. Despite this, it may be difficult to extrapolate and apply my findings to other SBMs and school-led ITE programmes from a sample of seven. Nevertheless, my findings are valuable to the field as I examined how school-led ITE creates forms of localised professionalism and limited SBM partnerships with HEIs. However, further research would be needed to confirm this. Thus, it would be useful for future research to devise a larger-scale study that includes comparable settings to test my claims with a larger sample. This could perhaps take the form of a longitudinal multiple case study design that captures the mentoring partnerships and school-led ITE programmes in different settings, and that documents change over time.

If further research were undertaken beyond the scope of this enquiry, I would recommend a longer data collection period over at least two more academic years, following the NTs into their second or third year of practice. This would take the form of a longitudinal study with repeated observations of the same practice over time, allowing the researcher to reflect on NT development more extensively. The

findings could then ascertain how SBM's actions and ITE and early career programmes and procedures develop over time. Another recommendation from this would be to extend the research to a 'nationwide', larger-scale sample. This research could address the extent it is possible to assert if my findings are issues more broadly within SB ITE.

On reflection, I could have potentially pushed my findings further through increased immersive non-participant observation and attending staff daily meetings, however this may have disrupted school life and the participants ability to go about their professional work. Furthermore, covert activity was not acceptable in this study from an ethical standpoint; it was important to balance what was reasonable to expect from participating school staff and my on-going commitment to an in-depth enquiry and I kept this principle under review and at the forefront of my mind throughout the data collection period. I feel the length of time and my involvement with both schools helped me to avoid becoming disruptive of core work in school and demanding even more of the participants' time; this helped to maintain positive working relationships and resulted in consistent, accurate and non-coercive data being collected (Taylor et l 2015, Ritchie et al. 2013, Kvale 2003, Carson et al. 2001, Kvale 1996).

8.4 Recommendations

In this section, I draw on my research findings to suggest recommendations for schools, HEIs and policy makers regarding the future direction and possible enhancement of locally delivered ITE.

In relation to marketisation, ITE policy in England has repositioned SBMs and all related stakeholders since 2010. With the introduction of school-led ITE programmes, there is an increased level of pressure and accountability (Apple 2005, Mutton et al. 2017, Rayner et al. 2018). My literature review explored how new ITE programmes changed the system through giving schools greater autonomy and control over training and recruiting their own teachers (Douglas 2015). The promotion of 'on the job' learning provided schools with the power to steer NT experience and created a localised form of professionalism that was in-keeping with

their values and priorities. However, this form of ITE can ultimately be regressive for schools and teachers as 'teachers' work is more standardised, rationalised and ''policed'', and teachers' actions 'are now subject to much greater scrutiny in terms of process and outcomes' (Apple 2007:185).

Through tighter control and regulation (Jones 2016), there is little opportunity for SBMs to practice through clinical reasoning using their pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012), which encourages creativity and places emphasis on the SBMs ability. The 'new managerial' policies (Apple and Aasen 2003) which bring rigorous forms of accountability reveal the little control over ITE that schools are actually gifted. They are subject to government intervention through Ofsted inspection, Teacher and Mentor Standards, specified ITE core content, SLEs, NLEs and teaching schools which, although promoted as supportive measures, retain government oversight of ITE practice. Professional accountability and discretion are diminished as government policy and action continues to 'intervene in order to have greater influence, if not control, over the form and content of ITE more directly than in the past' (Furlong et al. 2013:2). Although successive reforms to ITE have shifted control from HEIs to the school classroom, government power can be viewed as filtering through these structures, with schools being compliant in their domination as well as participating in the power structures themselves (Perryman et al. 2017).

With this in mind, a recommendation from this study would be for schools and mentors to hold more jurisdiction and gain influence over school-led ITE. This could involve working in conjunction with HEIs to provide input into the programmes, whilst adhering to government regulations. To an extent, there is opportunity for this within current government legislation; that is, the Early Career Framework (DfE 2019b) which is due to be rolled out nationally in England from September 2021. As explored briefly in Chapter Two, the ECF is currently being planned as a pilot project in association with certain ITE providers, such as Teach First, University College London, Manchester Metropolitan University and Newcastle University. The ECF provides additional support and training for early career teachers, which may then encourage retention in the profession and aid development.

As part of this framework, the government has committed to fund mentor training and additional time for mentors to support early career teachers, although the range of curricula and training is yet to be announced (DfE 2019b). This uncertainty leads to questions around how substantial the training will be, whether it is protected, and if the funding will be sufficient to ensure mentor protected time. Without clarity, this could prove to be a fragile policy that lacks security in resource.

Further school control is alluded to through the ongoing pilot that has been commissioned by the DfE and Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) which plans to evaluate the current online-only model of support that is being offered in conjunction with the ECF (EEF 2019). This model sits alongside other providers who have been quick to move into the space opened up for early career support, such as with the Ambition Institute which now refers to itself as a 'graduate school' (Ambition, 2020: online). The project itself is delivered by The Chartered College of Teaching (CCT) and will provide support for early-career teachers and their mentors, alongside the ECF. However, although the online written activities, multimedia resources and webinars for this pilot offer a low-cost solution to mentor training and knowledge development, school control and freedom is debated.

Overall, although DfE attention may enhance early career provision, there is also a possibility that models such as these could ratchet up central control beyond ITE. These frameworks may offer the government further opportunities to steer at a distance and ensure schools comply with set regulations. They allow for the state to retain oversight and management of NT career progression, through providing government-approved resources, training, and standards for NTs to meet. The approach of both models can be seen as forms of technical rationality (Schön 1983) which do not capture or the full extent of the practice of the professional. As a result, these pilots may fail to fully develop teaching practice as they rely on a form of technical knowledge rather than practical wisdom, thereby reducing the status of the SBM as an 'expert' (Douglas 2017, Clarke et al. 2014). Consequently, these support models appear to extend, but not transform, the nature of early career support.

To explore this further and consider the impact on NT development and SBM authority, future research could seek to ascertain the levels of school and mentor control that exist within these frameworks. This could also consider the level of professional autonomy that SBMs are encouraged to utilise, and how tightly system and programme leaders monitor and scrutinise SBM practice.

The role of the SBM has developed following the 'practicum turn', and involves being an educator, model, acculturator, sponsor and providing psychological support (Lofthouse 2015, Wilson 2014, Vanassche and Kelchtermans 2014, Billett 2011, Malderez and Wedell 2007, Bodoczky et al. 1999). It is a complex activity that requires acknowledgement from SLT as mentors are crucial in empowering NTs to act prudently and develop their confidence in making the best choices in any given situation (Clutterbuck 2004, Langdon 2017, Yates 2017, Maddamsetti 2018). There needs to be a seismic shift in school and HEI leaders approach and attitude to the SBM that acknowledges the mentor's core role and professional practice knowledge (Heikkinnen 2018), rather than SBMs being "buffeted by a system driven by targets, standards and assessment regimes" (Lofthouse and Thomas 2014). As the "foundation of future professional development practices and cultures" (Lofthouse 2018:2), there is a need to place a higher level of trust in SBMs, giving them responsibility in assessing NTs grading and achievement of QTS in order to show their value and significance. This would also provide SBMs with status and recognition as leaders of professional learning, rather than facilitators and administrators. However, before this can occur, the SBMs need the conditions to fulfil this role.

The findings and conclusions of this study show that mentoring should be reimagined as a 'dynamic hub' (Lofthouse 2018:253), or at least be acknowledged by senior leaders as impactful, insightful and pertinent to the development of the NT. This study showed that mentors are relied upon heavily. Senior leaders and NTs expect SBMs to provide daily emotional support and guide NTs through administrative tasks to ensure they achieve QTs, without the acknowledgement of being an 'expert' within their field. Instead of this attitude and approach, mentoring should be supported as the foundation of future professional development

(Lofthouse 2018). This includes releasing financial resource to afford time and CPD learning to mentors, alongside giving SBMs a voice within school-HEI partner dialogue and the opportunity to develop as practitioners and leaders. While mentoring is unsupported and outside of an imagined "dynamic hub" (Lofthouse 2018:253), there is little opportunity for them to develop professionally as ITE specialists within the field. As a result of this, disillusioned SBMs who receive little acknowledgement may fail to aid NT development. More directly, they may fail to realise their own potential as expert practitioners and will not want to retain the role for long. This does not aid the development of early career support as high SBM turnover does not build capacity or knowledge in this area.

My study shows that school-led ITE mentoring is seen as a cascade-only process of transmission which largely involves educational insight and SBM professional knowledge and development. Generally, this form of mentoring focuses on the logistics and practicalities of the programmes, with little cross-institutional working between all partners involved in the programme. Due to the lack of shared language (Furlong et al. 2006) and communication, the school-led ITE programmes included in my study lack a common moral purpose. ITE consultations involve 'some' rather than 'all', thus there is no ' space of cultural, social and epistemological change in which the competing knowledges and discourses of different spaces are brought into 'conversation' to challenge and reshape' (Moje et al. 2004:44). Therefore, my research suggests that there is a need to further examine what is meant by partnership in school-HEI collaborations. Further study into this area could consider if partners have a shared understanding about the provision, if they are motivated by common goals and if the resource allocation is sufficient and equitable, ensuring sufficient support for NTs progressing to QTS.

At an operational level, a further recommendation for schools and universities providing SB ITE programmes would be to improve and adapt the conditions in which they work and communicate in order to make a 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) model possible. There should be increased collaborative working within school-led ITE at every staff level, in order to address the concerns of hierarchical partnerships and vertical, downward communication between stakeholders. School-HEI partners

should aim to clearly communicate the preferred approaches to professional learning, where modules sit within the ITE training schedule and who has responsibility for different areas of provision. However, this goes beyond simply creating training sessions for mentors; SBMs should be given the opportunity to engage in the co-construction of the ITE sessions the school delivers. This has resource implications. To get closer to a 'third space' model, there should be the opportunity afforded to SBMs to engage with HEI representatives, PMs and other stakeholders to develop their understanding of mentorship within school-led ITE and to develop this as a genuinely collaborative approach to ITE. As mentoring is "a developmental activity, with the emphasis on empowering and enabling (mentees) to do things for themselves" (Clutterbuck 2004:11), SBMs would feel enabled to contribute to discussion and become more knowledgeable about the programme. Mentors have a powerful role in ensuring that induction provides the professional learning opportunity for beginning teachers to conceptualise practice and to contextualise theory (Clarke et al. 2017), thus as SBMs develop a more comprehensive understanding of ITE, so too would NT's professional knowledge.

Alongside school leaders, HEIs should look to engage with all partners and make space for different voices in the co-creation of ITE. This is prescient as recent ITE policy creates a competitive market, promotes diversification of ITE and emphasises practical-led provision. HEIs must also work to secure well-formed, functioning, and equitable partnerships in the context of New Public Management (Lane 2002), austerity and teacher retention concerns in state schools. All partners associated with school-led ITE within the marketised landscape should aim to increase levels of NT enrolment through offering a high standard of ITE provision with solid support structures for early career development.

With this in mind, future research could aim to consider why certain knowledges are drawn upon in school-HEI partnerships, and if this is prevalent on a broader scale through exploring 'nationwide' school-led ITE programmes. Studies could review school-HEI partnerships from the perspective of programme leads and those at a managerial level, who mainly hold the relationships with university counterparts. This research has merit in exploring exactly what the barriers are to achieve a hybrid

model of 'third space' (Bhabha 1994), which has a horizontal approach and involves inclusivity and cross-institutional partner engagement, and how 'third space' working could be made possible in the school-led ITE context.

The need for capacity building in teacher education in England has been raised as a serious issue. Many commentators have noted that teacher educators should be provided with the support and opportunities to develop their expertise by acquiring new skills, knowledge and understanding of research (Murray, Lunenberg and Smith 2017, Murray and Mutton 2015, Murray et al. 2009, Munn 2008, Fowler and Procter 2008, Furlong 2007, Pollard 2007, Menter, Brisard and Smith 2006, Jones and Straker 2006, Bassey 2003, Dyson and Desforges 2002). Mentor preparation needs to go beyond training, as mentors are more than effective practitioners who are able to model good professional practice (Roehrig et al. 2008, Bullough 2005, Foster 1999). A key finding of my study showed that many SBMs felt they lacked, theoretical knowledge and needed more thorough preparation to broaden their understanding, as they had no time or resource to revisit professional career training themselves. This professional support should be "...research informed, long-term, [in order to] develop mentors' (self-) understanding of teaching and mentoring" (Aspfors and Fransson 2015:85). My research thus identifies a need to enhance and broaden SBM professional learning in preparation for their expanded role. This would allow for mentor growth and also benefit NTs in respect of the breadth of knowledge they are exposed to and advised on. Equally, it would be beneficial for further research to consider what SBM preparation should involve that would enhance the skills and knowledge of mentors, how this can be achieved and what structures or resources should be in place to accommodate this.

A frequently overlooked area of expertise includes the pedagogical skills and knowledge of how adult learners are best supported in becoming professionals (McNamara, Murray and Jones 2016). The 'second order knowledge' (Murray 2002) which good teacher educators possess is not synonymous with that required for teaching in schools (McNamara et al. 2016). Second order knowledge of ITE teaching is seen as mainly experiential in origin (Murray 2002), with a focus on the learnt processes and practices that have been developed over time through experience.

This in part explains why good teachers are not necessarily good mentors, and reveals the need for increased CPD and workplace learning for SBMs to further their skillset. As the SBMs role and responsibilities within school-led ITE are complex and multifaceted, mentors need to enhance their skills through conversation, practice, pedagogy and a shared discourse for mentoring (Bullough 2005).

Further exploration of this theme in research could consider the professional learning opportunities afforded to mentors throughout their time in role, as both a supportive tool and CPD incentive. This could also consider which knowledge bases are recommended for SBMs to draw upon and further examine school-based programme leads attitudes to teacher professional knowledge and the debate between 'theory' and 'practice'. This may then inform if, on a larger scale, school-led ITE's professional learning model is largely practice-based, and how this affects the status of the teaching profession.

At an operational level, mentorship and mentor preparation should be considered a priority for school-led ITE providers, including planned strategies for how to develop mentor identities and ITE delivery. There is a strong case for colleagues within ITE partnerships to work more collaboratively on mentor development and the ITE curriculum. I argue against a concept of partnership that is restricted to administrative focus, which was cautioned by Mutton et al. (2017) as a possible outcome of the school-led policy context. Collaborative working may facilitate conversations about a more coherent curriculum experience that integrates the university and workplace domains. Therefore, it could be beneficial for HEIs and ITE programme leads to offer mentor development or training sessions to SBMs. These could provide sessions on recent education research and organised around the practice of mentoring. This would allow hopefully allow for mentor's professional knowledge to grow, whilst enhancing their skillset through practice and a shared mentoring discourse (Bullough 2005).

Knowledge enhancement sessions for SBMs, and other ITE programme stakeholders, may also incentivise staff to take on the role as it offers a level of CPD and would hopefully increase their confidence in their ability to advise, demonstrate and refer to recent education research. Through constructing and extending their knowledge

base as mentors through self-evaluation and collaborative thinking, SBM practice could bear the hallmarks of professionalism that it currently lacks (Jones and Straker 2006). It would be interesting for future research to consider the SBM's motivation and rationale for becoming a mentor, and if they feel that taking up this role will bring an element of CPD and subject enhancement.

Although there are many recent studies that focus on mentoring, these focus on the impact on students in the classroom, improving student behaviour, assessing learning environments and the correlation to student educational outcomes, rather than the role and knowledge base of the mentor (Núñez et al. 2013, McQuillin et al. 2015, Tolan et al. 2014, Eby et al. 2008, Karcher 2008). Given the relatively new policy direction towards school-led ITE and departure from HEI-led programmes, more research into forms of mentoring led by schoolteachers would be beneficial to the field. Within this study, schools adopt a process of adapting ITE to meet their needs in line with a 21st century marketised landscape. As schools have gained responsibilities and scrutiny from the policy trajectory towards practice-based ITE, they have been enabled to engage with ITE training and develop this in specific contexts, tailored to their own priorities and specialisms (Jones 2016, Abbott, Rathbone and Whitehead 2012, Morris 2002). My study shows that although there remains an expected standard of HEI prescribed content within school-led ITE, there is no new form of professionalism that emerges from school-led ITE to meets the needs of a new era (Whitty 2006). Within my study, the act of mentoring did not produce a new, modernised teacher workforce with different professional values. Instead, my findings revealed that there is an increased number of ITE providers within the markestised landscape, who individually design their course content to focus on the priorities of their school. SBMs equally contribute to this form of local, branded professionalism through reproducing the expected practices of the school and focusing on their priorities.

School-led ITE mentoring can therefore create different versions of professionalism and a range of teaching practices across the national teaching body. Through its focus on specific school priorities, school-led ITE can lead to the underdevelopment of professional knowledge. These findings add weight to the argument surrounding

the impact and risk that this presents to teacher retention. However, I cannot make this assertion on the basis of this study alone, although the evidence from this study did show that many NQTs stay on as teachers for more than 1-2 years within both school settings (SLT1.1 and SLT3.2). Thus, it would be useful for future studies to evaluate if this has an impact on teacher retention rates as early-career teachers may struggle within the profession when faced with different cohorts of students, behaviors or school foci that they have never before experienced. Furthermore, future research could aim to investigate how NTs continue to develop throughout their teaching career, either within the same school setting where they formed their 'local' professional practice or when they moved to a new teaching post. This research could consider the impact of localised practice on teaching practice and the effect that this has on an NT's ability to adapt, and if this practice becomes standardised as they develop throughout their careers and experience a range of school contexts.

Within this study, the SBM's pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) was largely based on their experience and practice that they had developed over time. This formed the basis of their classroom activities and judgements as the majority of SBMs rarely referred to theoretical constructs and academic language. This affects an NT's practice and actions as, in the process of learning through experience and the re-enactment of 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a), they develop a similar disposition to their mentors (Edwards-Groves 2018). This practice-based model can have positive or negative effects, as it is dependent and connected with the social context of the learning and mentoring environment. In this case, through the process of re-enactment and mimicry, NTs do not intertwine pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) and theoretical research, knowledge and paradigms. This study therefore suggests that some school-led ITE programmes limit NT development though focussing purely on practice-based learning, with little theoretical insight as they view these concepts as discrete. Generally, the SBM's engagement with research to aid self-development was rare and their knowledge of the school context formed the basis of their classroom persona, rather than through engaging with practice-orientated research.

Thus, the SBMs unknowingly restrict their own practice. Their lack of understanding of theoretical concepts in relation to classroom activities means that they rely on their experience to form the basis of their practice. I suggest that future studies could engage with dichotomy of SBM professional knowledge and the 'theory-practice' divide specifically within school-led ITE. Although this topic has long been debated, school-led ITE moves the field towards a space where these two concepts should be seen and referred to in integration. Without interweaving these concepts and applying theoretical constructs to their own practice, SBMs and school-led ITE programmes risk reducing the status of teaching as a profession, based on academic thought and research-based activities.

8.5 Closing

This qualitative study was designed to determine and explore the role of the mentor within school-led ITE. Throughout the course of this investigation, it became clear that the partnerships and communication shared at cross-institutional and individual levels are key to the formation and effective operation of ITE programmes. Within these partnerships, authority and power is exercised by some individuals more than others.

Participants in this study included SBMs, NTs, school senior leaders, programme leads and UTs from two schools and two universities in North West England. I utilised theoretical concepts as tools to engage with mentor practice and partnership, including 'third space', learning through praxis and the model of 'doings, sayings and relatings' (Bhabha 1991, Kemmis et al. 2014a, Heikkinnen 2018). I drew upon participant experiences and their different realities in order to generate findings and reach conclusions. As a semi-ethnographic researcher, I assimilated into both school communities to the extent where participants trusted me enough to share specific information and their personal opinions on the SBM role, the ITE programme and the partnerships that existed within this.

Variance in mentor practice is evident as SBMs employ different professional practice models to nurture and guide their NTs. The model of professional learning that SBMs generally adopted within this study is predominantly based on

administrative tasks and practice-based knowledge, such as classroom or behaviour management. In mentor meetings, SBMs largely concentrated on the NT evidencing Teacher Standards' and meeting targets, and seldom drew upon theoretical and empirical research related to quality in teaching. Generally, the mentors included in this study did not consider themselves 'experts' or academically involved with ITE.

As SBMs rarely refer to theoretical constructs and teacher education research, through the process of re-enactment of 'sayings, doings and relatings' (Kemmis et al. 2014a) NTs see pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2012) and theoretical research as two separate constructs. The NT's disposition is transformed through their observation and participation, as SBM knowledge becomes comprehensible and interrelated with their own (Edwards-Groves 2018). This model is largely prescriptive, rather than developmental. SBMs and NTs rely on frameworks, Teacher Standards', practical knowledge, and experience to interpret and produce 'good' professional practice. This leads me to suggest that school-led ITE mentoring can lead to different versions of (largely restricted) professionalism and result in a range of teaching practice across the national teaching body.

With this in mind, a key focus of my research was to consider how the development of school-led ITE has created uncertainty surrounding the re-making of teacher professionalism(s) (Whitty 2006). This study analysed what forms of professionalism are produced within school-led ITE settings and how this affects mentoring practice and NT development. My research demonstrates that there is an increased number of ITE providers within the markestised landscape, who individually design their course content to focus on the priorities of their school. SBMs contribute to the production of local, branded forms of teacher professionalism as they focus on practice related specifically to school priorities and typical student cohorts. School-led ITE mentoring can therefore create different versions of professionalism and a range of teaching practices across the national teaching body, thus leading to the underdevelopment of 'core professionalism' and knowledge (Whitty 2006, Whitty 2014). Thus, this study found that further research into mentor preparation is needed which considers what knowledge bases mentors draw upon, how ITE

content and knowledge is communicated to SBMs and how programme leads coordinate mentor support.

My research shows that mentor practice and school-led ITE stakeholder relationships can vary as opportunities for collaboration within school-university partnerships are subject to the participant's role and status. The data gathered established a noteworthy partnership and relationship at a management level that was not filtered down to SBMs, often leading to them feeling separate from the programme and its partners. Overall, the conditions for a collective, inclusive third space (Bhabha 1994) were not found within the two schools or three ITE programmes within this study. There needs to be time dedicated to achieving a shared partnership of levelling and hybridity (Oldenburg 2001, Whitty 2006, Evetts 2008), and opportunities for actors from the different institutions to engage in progressive and transforming conversations to enhance and build a new model of SB ITE.

To this end, this study showed that there is no new model of ITE being reimagined or realised within these pathways which "gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation" (Bhabha 1994:211) as the system has not been 'transform(ed)' (Zeichner et al. 2015). Despite the ITE policy trajectory towards schools-led ITE in England, this study found that not all school-based teacher educators experience the contextual conditions that would equip them well to contribute and lead on ITE at school level. However, given the neo-liberal context of education policy, school-led ITE was never likely to be transformative and evoke a radical new form of democratic professionalism. Within this study, I could never have expected a great degree of change or transformation of ITE, as the programmes involved were not focused on rethinking partnerships or exploring knowledge and ITE content. School Direct changed formal contractual relations for brokering ITE between schools and universities but was arguably not intended to be educative. School-led ITE changes the location and ostensibly who is the lead partner in ITE provision but does not address the core focus of the relationship. From this, the re-professionalisation of

274

teaching (Whitty 2014) can be seen as an optimistic outcome in this space, but not necessarily a likelihood.

The content and design of school-led ITE has not seen transformation from HEI-led programmes (Zeichner et al. 2015). Instead, the school-led pathways included within this study reveal the continuation of the university-led model of ITE, although their structures have changed in terms of budgets, contracts, funding, markets, allocation of places and the location of ITE. SBMs continue to lack autonomy over NT progression, achievement towards QTS, and hold a relatively low status in the hierarchical management of ITE. Thus, ITE programme leads and senior leaders should aim to show increased acknowledgement and appreciation for the role the mentor plays in the formation and development of the NT. Future research could consider how 'third space' (Bhabha 1994) working is achievable within school-led ITE from the perspective of programme leads and managers. This may also determine what barriers exist that limit collaborative working for all teacher educators involved in school-led ITE, and how these can be overcome.

To close, the SBM role in school-led ITE is multi-faceted and crucial to NT development and progression. However, this responsibilised role lacks status and authority. Senior leaders and managers fail to show appreciation for the demands and skills of mentorship. Furthermore, they do not fully recognise the impact, both positive and negative, that mentors can have on an NT's progression to QTS, and beyond into their teaching career. As a result, mentors diminish their own authority and significance within the ITE programme as their role lacks the status of an expert, focuses on administrative tasks and is mainly practice-orientated.

Appendices.

Appendix 1: Teacher Standards (TS)

PART ONE: TEACHING

A teacher must:

1. Set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils:

- establish a safe and stimulating environment for pupils, rooted in mutual respect
- set goals that stretch and challenge pupils of all backgrounds, abilities and dispositions
- demonstrate consistently the positive attitudes, values and behaviour which are expected of pupils.

2. Promote good progress and outcomes by pupils:

- be accountable for pupils' attainment, progress and outcomes
- be aware of pupils' capabilities and their prior knowledge, and plan teaching to build on these
- guide pupils to reflect on the progress they have made and their emerging needs
- demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how pupils learn and how this impacts on teaching
- encourage pupils to take a responsible and conscientious attitude to their own work and study.

3. Demonstrate good subject and curriculum knowledge:

- have a secure knowledge of the relevant subject(s) and curriculum areas, foster and maintain pupils' interest in the subject, and address misunderstandings
- demonstrate a critical understanding of developments in the subject and curriculum areas, and promote the value of scholarship
- demonstrate an understanding of and take responsibility for promoting high standards of literacy, articulacy and the correct use of standard English, whatever the teacher's specialist subject
- if teaching early reading, demonstrate a clear understanding of systematic synthetic phonics
- if teaching early mathematics, demonstrate a clear understanding of appropriate teaching strategies.

4. Plan and teach well-structured lessons:

- impart knowledge and develop understanding through effective use of lesson time
- promote a love of learning and children's intellectual curiosity
- set homework and plan other out-of-class activities to consolidate and extend the knowledge and understanding pupils have acquired
- reflect systematically on the effectiveness of lessons and approaches to teaching
- contribute to the design and provision of an engaging curriculum within the relevant subject area(s).

5. Adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils:

- know when and how to differentiate appropriately, using approaches which enable pupils to be taught effectively
- have a secure understanding of how a range of factors can inhibit pupils' ability to learn, and how best to overcome these
- demonstrate an awareness of the physical, social and intellectual development of children, and know how to adapt teaching to support pupils' education at different stages of development
- have a clear understanding of the needs of all pupils, including those with special educational needs; those of high ability; those with English as an additional language; those with disabilities; and be able to use and evaluate distinctive teaching approaches to engage and support them.

6. Make accurate and productive use of assessment:

- know and understand how to assess the relevant subject and curriculum areas, including statutory assessment requirements
- make use of formative and summative assessment to secure pupils' progress
- use relevant data to monitor progress, set targets, and plan subsequent lessons
- give pupils regular feedback, both orally and through accurate marking, and encourage pupils to respond to the feedback.

7. Manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment:

- have clear rules and routines for behaviour in classrooms, and take responsibility for promoting good and courteous behaviour both in classrooms and around the school, in accordance with the school's behaviour policy

- have high expectations of behaviour, and establish a framework for discipline with a range of strategies, using praise, sanctions and rewards consistently and fairly

- manage classes effectively, using approaches which are appropriate to pupils' needs in order to involve and motivate them

- maintain good relationships with pupils, exercise appropriate authority, and act decisively when necessary.

8. Fulfil wider professional responsibilities:

- make a positive contribution to the wider life and ethos of the school

- develop effective professional relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support

- deploy support staff effectively

- take responsibility for improving teaching through appropriate professional development, responding to advice and feedback from colleagues

- communicate effectively with parents with regard to pupils' achievements and well-being.

PART TWO: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct. The following statements define the behaviour and attitudes which set the required standard for conduct throughout a teacher's career.

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
    - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
    - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
    - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
    - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
    - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

Department for Education. (2011a) *Teachers' Standards*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-standards

Appendix 2: Ofsted's four areas of focus

Ofsted focus	Areas of expertise
Leadership and management	Academies and academy transition; assessment; leadership of continuing professional development; school business management and financial management; leadership of curriculum
Pupil achievement	Art; closing the gap; drama; design and technology; early years; English; geography; history; information and communication technology; maths; modern foreign languages; music; phonics; physical education; personal, social and health education; religious education; science; special educational needs; support for the most able pupils
Quality of teaching	Initial teacher training and newly qualified teacher development
Behaviour and safety	Behaviour and discipline; attendance

Department for Education. (2014c) *Guidance: Teaching schools and system leaders: get support for you and your school*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/system-leaders-who-they-are-and-what-they-do

Appendix 3: HEI1's Subject Mentor School Direct Handbook 2017-2018

School-based mentor guidelines and summary of roles and responsibilities for School-based Training

- Must attend one Subject Mentor evening training session and attend one Subject Mentor Conference to meet with University staff and other SBMs in the area, in order to familiarise themselves with the role and share good practice
- Inducts the NT into the department
- Devises the NTs timetable
- Plans lessons with the NT collaboratively
- Carry out a formal weekly observation
- Carry out a formal weekly mentor meeting
- Monitor the progress of the NT towards teacher standards
- Supports the NT with their assignments
- Must contribute to the Faculty of Education's evaluation and monitoring processes
- Adopt a coaching role when required

Appendix 4: HEI2- The Teach First Mentor Handbook 2017-2018

School-based mentor guidelines and summary of responsibilities

- Lead an hour-long, weekly, one-to-one development interaction with the participant
- Model exemplary pedagogical content knowledge
- Help participants translate taught content into classroom practice
- Monitor participants' ongoing progress, utilising Bluesky and the Participant Development Framework
- Conduct 9 lesson observations in year 1 (6 formal, 3 informal)
- Lead preparations for participants' termly reviews and final assessment
- Engage with the Mentor Development Framework
- Attend mentor induction and locally-help CPD sessions
- Engage in termly development interactions with a Teach First Development Lead
- Engage in half-termly development interactions with the university tutor
- Provide feedback through the Teach First Annual Mentor Survey

Appendix 5: HEI1's Subject Mentor guide for PGCE students 2017-2018

Summary of roles and responsibilities for the subject mentor.

- Offer professional support to NTs
- Carry out a weekly formal observation of classroom teaching and provide constructive oral and written feedback
- Hold weekly meetings with individual Trainee Teachers to review their professional development as subject teachers and agree targets
- Monitor the progress of NTs and act in an evaluative role
- Construct a timetable of classroom teaching for the NT
- Act in a training role
- Monitor trainee's school experience files and provide written comments
- Record development in a summative report to be given to the Professional Mentor
- Attend one Subject Mentor training session if new to the role

Appendix 6: HEI2 and School 1's school-led ITE programme outline and sessions

School 1's School Direct programme

- Safeguarding

- Short and long-term planning

- Behaviour management (x3)

- SEND and EAL (x2)

- Numeracy and literacy across the curriculum

- G and T/ Differentiation

- Making use of prior attainment data

- Becoming an Entrepreneurial teacher

- Collaborative learning

- Schemes of Work- planning for progress

- Using data to aid pupil progress

- Modelling work

- Questioning

- British Values

- Digital technology

- Communicating with parents- reports and parents evening

- Homework- making best use of this

- HEI-led training session (x4), focus on assessment

HEI2's programme outline and sessions for school-led ITE

- Assessment preparation, responses and focus (x5)

- Collecting evidence towards standards (x2)

- Reviewing portfolio (x2)

- Academic writing

- Subject specific knowledge training (x2)

Appendix 7: Topic guides for interviews

Topic guide for school-based mentors

1) Has your role as a mentor changed following the move to school-led initial teacher training? How so?

2) If you are new to the role, how has your professional life changed since taking on this responsibility?

3) How would you describe the partnership between the school and the university offering accreditation for the novice teacher?

4) How often do these separate stakeholders meet? How useful is this partnership?

5) Do you feel your professional knowledge is adequate for the role?

6) How important do you feel a broad knowledge of practice-based pedagogy is to a novice teacher?

7) How confident are you in delivering a range of practice-based pedagogy to a novice teacher?

8) How could the partnership between university and school be strengthened further?

9) Do you consider teaching to be a profession or an occupation? Why?

10) Does being a professional mean you are more valued by society?

11) Do you think an element of theoretical knowledge is required to be a professional?

Topic guide for novice teachers

1) Are you confident in your own professional knowledge following your training? Are there any areas that you feel need development?

2) How have you been supported to develop your professional knowledge during your training?

3) How much communication have you had with university tutors?

4) Do you feel this was adequate? Was there anything you would change?

5) How much involvement do you feel university tutors had in your training?

6) How has your school-based mentor provided the support and guidance you feel you needed to complete the training programme?

7) Do you feel that your mentor and university tutor communicate regularly?

8) How would you describe the partnership between the school and university?

9) Has you mentor ever been restricted with the time they can dedicate to your training?

10) Is there any aspect of the professional relationship with your school-based mentor that you would change?

11) What have you found particularly useful about completing a school-based programme in relation to mentoring and partnerships with the university?

12) Would you change any aspect of the school-based programme relating to mentoring and partnerships with the university?

Topic guide for SLT/ professional tutors

1) Do you consider teaching to be a profession or an occupation? Why?

2) Does being a professional mean you are more valued by society?

3) Do you think an element of theoretical knowledge is required to be a professional?

4) What is you school's policy and ethos relating to teacher professionalism?

5) Does your school's policy relating to school-based ITE include theoretical and practical elements?

6) How does your school monitor novice teachers on a school-based ITE pathway?

7) How often do you communicate with university partners regarding school-based mentors and novice teacher development?

8) How often do you communicate with university partners regarding the school-based ITE programme outline and content?

9) Do you feel in a partnership with the University? Why/ why not?

10) How could the partnership between University and school be strengthened further?

Topic guide for university tutors/ partners

1) How involved do you feel in the school-based ITE course?

2) How do you view your relationship with the school-based mentor?

3) Has the university been involved in the planning, outline and content of the school-based ITE programme? If so, which aspects?

4) Do you think an element of theoretical knowledge is required to be a professional?

5) How do you view the partnership between university and the school/Academy?

6) How could the partnership between university and school be strengthened further?

7) Do you feel that there is an element of collaboration between school-based mentor and the university? Why/ why not?

Protocols for interviews/ recording meetings.

- Ensure all participants are aware that they are being recorded

- Researcher to be present at all recordings and interviews scheduled

- Semi-structured interviews to take place, allowing for open questions and opportunities for participants to explore and further their responses

- The researcher will make all recordings on a Dictaphone and personally transcribe them to ensure anonymity and accuracy

Appendix 8: Participant profiles

Participant profiles.

SBM 1- Larry- School 1

Larry is a male MFL teacher who has been in the profession for 20 years. He is the head of the MFL department and, due to funding cuts, no longer has assistant head of department and so is running this single-handedly. Coupled with this, between September 2017- July 2018 Larry was a subject mentor for one PGCE novice teacher, two School Direct novice teachers and one Teach First novice teacher. This means he has to balance his time and ensure each NT receives 1 weekly mentor meeting, regular observation and feedbacks and any informal meetings/ discussion that they require. Larry trained on the GDP course which he feels has meant he can connect with his students as he also trained on the job in schools, however he recognises that schools are very different entities to 20 years ago and the expectations of teachers, students and progress is vastly different. Larry received no training for School Direct and hadn't seen the handbook until his NT showed it to him. For TF, Larry attended one training session which comprised of a welcome event, TF principles and vision and a quick meeting with NTs. Larry feels he has received no formal training at any time on SD or TF mentoring and expectations. Equally, Larry has been a TF mentor previously but this year all systems become electronic. He received no formal training for Bluesky (online performance management and CPD tool) and struggled for over half the year to access information on his NTs progress, Teacher Standards', and journal entries. He felt he struggled because of his lack of time/ other responsibilities and needed a simple explanation of new systems that was not provided to him.

SBM 2- Helen- School 1

Helen is a female English teacher that has been in the profession for 8 years. She trained on the PGCE programme but has been a Teach First mentor for the last four years, and so is aware of the expectations of this programme. She is the SENCO of the school and lead of the SEN department, alongside mentoring one PGCE student and one TF NT during the academic year. Although she feels she has a good

knowledge of TF and she recognises how she is relied upon more heavily compared to the PGCE NT, who will converse with their university tutor frequently, she feels she has had no formal training for TF other than the first session she attended 4 years ago when she first became and SBM for TF. She could not attend the welcome session this year due to other commitments she had as SENCO and received no powerpoint/ explanation of this session an what she missed. She initially struggled with the electronic system bluesky that has replaced the paper journals and trackers but soon became accustomed to it and feels that it is less time consuming.

SBM 3- Clara- School 1

Clara is a female English teacher who trained on the PGCE course 6 years ago. She is KS3 coordinator for English, Literacy Coordinator for the school and also assists with SD training sessions that take place in the school on a Friday afternoon. Although her experience of training was different to that of a school-based route, she feels fully informed of the expectations of the course and her role as she works alongside the professional tutor in her role as an English teacher and feels she can ask her questions on a daily basis if necessary. She also noted she had no formal training for her role as an SBM, but her relationship with the professional mentor on a daily basis has aided this. Clara recently completed an MA in Education Studies.

SBM 4- Anne- School 1

Anne is a female Geography teacher who has taught at the school for 24 years and has been a qualified teacher for 25. She trained within a local school from working as a Teaching Assistant and the school recommended her for a PGCE based on this experience and her ability to work well with children. This past academic year she has been a mentor on both the PGCE and TF programmes. It is her first year of being a TF SBM and she noted that she had not received any training, other than an initial welcome event which she described as "indoctrination into a cult". She felt that her mentoring on TF was more intense than on the PGCE route and she feels that she needs more knowledge of the electronic systems TF work from.

SBM 5- Gary- School 2

Gary is a male teacher who works across both the PE and Maths department and completed his PGCE 16 years ago. He is both the professional mentor for the school and an SBM; his role includes managing NQTs, staff CPD, managing the independent school's programme and coordinating trainee teachers within the school. Gary took over as an SBM for a Russian NT who had a negative relationship with their SBM that eventually broke down entirely. Gary has assisted in coordinating the independent schools ITE programme within the school and has close links with the university to ensure all NTs are meeting targets. He views his knowledge of the SB ITE programme as good as he oversees the problem and has regular communication with all NTs, SLT and university tutors/ programme leads.

SBM 6- Matthew- School 2

Matthew is a male science teacher who has been teaching for 4 years. He has never previously been a mentor for an NT on any ITE programme and was asked to be the SBM for an NT of the independent schools' programme as no one else was available. He received no formal training about his role/ expectations and the responsibilities he would have and admits that he relies on the NT to c maintain communication with the university as he has never spoken to a university tutor or programme lead.

SBM 7- Rob- School 2

Rob is a male RE teacher who has only worked in independent schools in his 30 years career, following his GDP teacher training programme. He has been a mentor for PGCE students and has been the SBM for an NT on the independent schools' programme for the last two years. He had not received any formal training for his role as an SBM and commented that he used the same skillset for this mentoring as he always has for other PGCE students. He liked that he could tailor the mentoring and discussions to his school specifically as the NT experienced 2 years employment at the school, with only 1 secondary school experience of 1 week.

NT 1- Jenny- School 1

Jenny is a 22-year-old female MFL teacher at an Academy that is part of a MAT. She is an NT on the TF ITE programme and came to her training straight from university.

In her sandwich year at university she worked in a school in Spain, and her interest in teaching was piqued.

NT 2- Amina- School 1

Amina is a 23-year-old female English teacher at an Academy that is part of a MAT. She is an NT on the TF programme. She worked for two years as a TA following her undergraduate degree and applied for TF both of these years. She was successful with her second application. Her work as a TA was in a local grammar school and she felt she was not aware of the reality of comprehensive schools based on her previous experience.

NT 3- Laura- School 1

Laura is a 21-year-old female Geography teacher at an Academy that is part of a MAT. She is an NT on the TF programme and came to her training 4 weeks after finishing her undergraduate degree, as the TF summer institute started in early July 2017. She has no previous experience in schools and went to a grammar school in South East England.

NT 4- Katherine- School 1

Katherine is a 24-year-old female English teacher at an Academy that is part of a MAT. She is an NT on the SD ITE programme. She had previously worked as a TA in a primary school and acknowledged this had not prepared her for her role as a teacher and the pressures she would face.

NT 5- Will- School 2

Will is a 23-year-old male MFL teacher at an Independent school. Previously, he also attended an Independent school for his secondary education and had some experience teaching in a similar school in Russia in his undergraduate degree course. He is an independent school ITE programme NT and he hope that the school will make his an offer of a permanent job following his training. He liked the idea if this course as it gave him the specific skills that he felt he needed to work in the private sector of education, unlike the usual PGCE course.

NT 6- Abdul- School 2

Abdul is a 22-year-old male science teacher at an Independent school. He previously went to a comprehensive school for his education, and had accepted a place on a PGCE course at a local university before he heard about the independent school programme and decided he would prefer to take part in that and focus his efforts on the private sector.

NT 7- Simon- School 2

Simon is a 30-year-old RE teacher at an independent school. He previously worked in the private sector for a finance company and last year decided he wanted to train as a teacher after hearing about the independent schools programme at a university careers fair that he was also working at, promoting students to start a career in finance. He feels the university element of the course is unnecessary as he learns what is necessary to teach practically in the classroom.

Professional mentor 1- Tash- School 1

Tash has been a teacher for 35 years and has worked as an English teacher, head of department and lead on teaching and learning before taking up the role of professional mentor and SD programme lead at an Academy that is part of a MAT. She is responsible for planning the SD course across the local area as she is employed by the main teaching school. She must quality assure the mentoring that takes place across her academy and other schools in the area and is the lead contact for the university.

SLT 1- Linda- School 1

Linda is the newly appointed principal of an Academy that is part of a MAT. She had previously worked as a deputy headteacher with responsibility for teaching and learning within her old school. She helped establish Teach First as an ITE programme within her school so feels she has a good understanding of this but has never previously worked with School Direct and therefore has weekly meetings with Tash to aid her understanding of the programme and see how NTs and NQTs are progressing.

SLT 2- Rachel- School 1

Rachel is the vice principal of KS4 at an Academy that is part of a MAT and has been a teacher for 8 years. She has previously worked as SENCO, and in this capacity was asked to deliver training on the SD programme on both SEN and progress trackers for NTs. She has only been involved in SD training and has had no previous involvement with TF within the academy.

SLT 3- Nathan- School 2

Nathan is the deputy headteacher of an independent school and oversees teaching and learning within the school. He is the line manager of Gary, the professional mentor, and has regular weekly meetings with his to discuss the progress of all trainee and new staff in the school. Nathan felt heavily involved in the conception, development and implementation of the independent schools' programme and felt that he worked in collaboration with the university to develop a course that was original and specific to the private education sector.

University tutor 1- Lucinda- School 1

Lucinda is a university tutor for MFL and has worked as a Teach First tutor for 8 years. She is affiliated with over 20 schools in the North West and is NT Jenny's lead university link. She previously worked as an MFL teacher in Yorkshire. She has seen the changes that have occurred to the TF programme over that last few years and notes that her role has become more distance in the last year than it used to be.

University tutor 2- Ron- School 1

Ron is a university tutor for English and has worked as a Teach First tutor for 10 years. He is affiliated with 25 schools in the North West and is Amina's university tutor. He previously worked as an English teacher in Liverpool. He has also seen the changes that have occurred in TF over the last few years and has decided to retire from July 2018 due to these changes and his limited role in trainee development.

University tutor 3- Caroline- School 1

Caroline is the School Direct programme lead and coordinator at a local university and views her role as overseeing the SD programme in the associated teaching schools, quality assuring the training sessions that each school provides and ensuring the NTs pass their ITE programme and at what level they are graded. She works directly with Tash to oversee the SD programme at Greenfield academy.

University tutor 4- Rosie- School 2

Rosie is the university lead and programme link for the Independent Schools' programme. She is instrumental in the design of the programme and worked closely with the professional mentor and senior leader in charge of professional development within School 2 to implement the programme within the school.

Appendix 9: Coding frame

Theme: Third space/ partnership

Codes:

Communication school and uni
School uni relationship
TF and uni relationship
Power between mentors

Theme: Role/ expectations of mentor

Codes:

Mentor knowledge
Mentor responsibility
Mentor time
Mentor training

Theme: Professionalism/ teacher values

Codes:

Expectations of teacher
Local or general professionalism
Professional values
School policy on professionalism
Theory in training
Practice in training

Theme: Training NT

Codes:

Positives school-based
Trainee reflection
Trainee responsibility
Trainee training
Trainee development school

Trainee development uni

Theme: School-based programmes info

Codes:

MGS course outline
School Direct prog general
SD course outline
Teach First programme general
TF course design

Theme: Role of university

Codes:

University tutor role
Uni responsibility

Theme: School-based staff knowledge/ relationships

Codes:

SBM NT relationship
SLT knowledge
Professional mentor responsibility

References

Abbott, I., Rathbone, M. and Whitehead, P. (2012) *Education policy*. London: Sage
   Publications Ltd.

Abbott, P., Tyler, M. and Wallace, C. (2006) *An introduction to sociology: Feminist
   perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Abdalla, M.M., Oliveira, L.G.L., Azevedo, C.E.F. and Gonzalez, R.K. (2018) 'Quality in
   qualitative organizational research: Types of triangulation as a methodological
   alternative*.' Administração: ensino e pesquisa,* 19(1) pp. 66-98.

Abell, S.K. (2008) 'Twenty Years Later: Does pedagogical content knowledge remain a useful
   idea?', *International Journal of Science Education*, 30(10) pp. 1405-1416.

Abell, S., Dillon, D., Hopkins, C., McInerney, W. and O'Brien, D.G. (1995) '"Somebody to
   count on": Mentor/intern relationships in a beginning teacher internship program.'
   Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(2) pp. 173-188.

Achinstein, B. and S.Z. Athanases. (2006) *Mentors in the making: Developing new leaders for
   new teachers*. Teachers College Press.

Adams, A. and Tulasiewicz, W. (1995) *The Crisis in Teacher Education: A European Concern?*
   London: The Falmer Press.

Agee, J., Breuer, F., Mruck, K., Roth, W., Ellis, C. and Watt, D. (2011). Reflexivity. In Lichtman,
   M. (eds). *Understanding and evaluating qualitative educational research*. Thousand
   Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd, pp. 287-298.

Ahmad, A.K., Gjøtterud, S. and Krogh, E. (2016) 'Dialogue conferences and empowerment:
   transforming primary education in Tanzania through cooperation.' *Educational
   Action Research,* 24(2) pp. 300-316.

Alase, A. (2017) 'The interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA): A guide to a good
   qualitative research approach.' *International Journal of Education and Literacy
   Studies,* 5(2) pp. 9-19.

Allen, R., Belfield, C., Greaves, E., Sharp, C. and Walker, M. (2016) *High costs result from four
   in ten trainee teachers not teaching five years later,* Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS).
   [Online] [Press release] [Accessed on 12th June 2020]
   https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/8369

Alter, J. and Coggshall, J.G. (2009) *Teaching as a Clinical Practice Profession: Implications for
   Teacher Preparation and State Policy.* Issue Brief. National Comprehensive Center
   for Teacher Quality.

Alvesson, M. and Sköldberg, K. (2009) *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

Ambition Institute. (2020) *Ambition Institute: About us*. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.ambition.org.uk/about-us/

Andreasen, J., Bjørndal, C. and Kovač, V. (2019) 'Being a teacher and teacher educator: The antecedents of teacher educator identity among mentor teachers.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 85, October, pp. 281-291.

Apple, M. (1996) *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. (2005) 'Education, markets, and an audit culture.' *Critical Quarterly,* 47(1-2) pp. 11-29.

Apple, M. (2006) *Educating the "right" way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2016) 'Introduction to "The Politics of Educational Reforms".' *The Educational forum (West Lafayette, Ind.),* 80(2) pp. 127-136.

Apple, M. and Aasen, P. (2003) *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2007) Whose markets, whose knowledge. In Sadovnik, A.R. (ed.) *Sociology of education: A critical reader***,** pp. 177-193.

Aspfors, J. and Fransson, G. (2015) 'Research on mentor education for mentors of newly qualified teachers: A qualitative meta-synthesis.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 48(1) pp. 75-86.

Atkinson, P. and Hammersley, M. (1994) Ethnography and participant observation. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd, pp. 248-261.

Attia, M. and Edge, J. (2017) Be (com) ing a reflexive researcher: a developmental approach to research methodology. *Open Review of Educational Research,* 4(1) pp. 33-45.

Auerbach, C. and Silverstein, L.B. (2003) *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York: New York Uuniversity press.

Avril, E. (2016) 'The (Unintended) Consequences of New Labour: Party Leadership vs Party Management in the British Labour Party.' *Politics and Governance*, 4(2) pp. 5-14.

Bailey, P.L. and Ball, S.J. (2016) The coalition government, the general election and the policy ratchet in education: a reflection on the 'ghosts' of policy past, present and

yet to come. In Bochel, H. and Powell, M. (eds.) *The coalition government and social policy: Restructuring the welfare state*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 127-151.

Ball, D.L. and Bass, H. (2000) Interweaving content and pedagogy in teaching and learning to teach: Knowing and using mathematics. In Boaler, J. (ed.) *Multiple perspectives on the teaching and learning of mathematics*. Westport, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing, pp. 83-104.

Ball, S.J. (1990) Introducing Monsieur Foucault. In Ball, S.J. (ed.) *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge.* London: Routledge, pp. 1-8.

Ball, S.J. (1993) 'Education policy, power relations and teachers' work.' *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 41(2) pp. 106-121.

Ball, S.J. (2007) *Education plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S.J. (2009) 'Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: Network governance and the 'competition state'.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 24(1) pp. 83-99.

Ball, S.J., Maguire, M. and Braun, A. (2012) *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactment in the Secondary School*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Banerjee-Batist, R., Reio Jr, T.G. and Rocco, T.S. (2019) 'Mentoring functions and outcomes: an integrative literature review of sociocultural factors and individual differences.' *Human Resource Development Review,* 18(1) pp. 114-162.

Bartell, T., Cho, C., Drake, C., Petchauer, E. and Richmond, G. (2019) *Teacher Agency and Resilience in the Age of Neoliberalism.* Los Angeles (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Baškarada, S. (2014) 'Qualitative case study guidelines.' *The Qualitative Report,* 19(40) pp. 1-25.

Bassey, M. (2003) 'Editorial: Out of this nettle, danger, we pluck this flower.' *Research Intelligence,* 84(1).

Beardon, T., Booth, M., Hargreaves, D. and Reiss, M. (1995) School-led initial teacher training. In: Kerry, T. and Shelton Mayes, A. (eds.) *Issues in Mentoring.* London: Routledge, pp. 81-88.

Beauchamp, G., Clarke, L., Hulme, M. and Murray, J. (2015) 'Teacher education in the United Kingdom post devolution: convergences and divergences.' *Oxford Review of Education*. 41 (2) pp. 154-170.

Beck, C. and Kosnik, C. (2000) 'Associate teachers in pre-service education: Clarifying and enhancing their role.' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy,* 26(3) pp. 207-224.

Beltman, S. and Schaeben, M. (2012) 'Institution-wide peer mentoring: Benefits for mentors.' *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education,* 3(2) pp. 33-44.

Benzies, K.M. and Allen, M. (2001) 'Symbolic interactionism as a theoretical perspective for multiple method research.' *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* 33(4) pp. 541-547.

BERA. (2018) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*, 4th ed. London.

Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. (1993) *Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise.* Chicago: Open Court.

Berg, B.L. and Lune, H. (2012) *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Scenes*. 8th ed. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge Doubleday.* Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Berry, J. (2012) 'Teachers' Professional Autonomy in England: are neo-liberal approaches incontestable?' *Forum*. 54(3) pp. 397-409.

Beutel, D., Crosswell, L., Willis, J., Spooner-Lane, R., Curtis, E. and Churchward, P. (2017) 'Preparing teachers to mentor beginning teachers: an Australian case study.' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 6(3) pp. 164-177.

Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Billett, S. (2011) *Workplace curriculum: practice and propositions*. London: Routledge.

Black, I. (2006) 'The presentation of interpretivist research.' *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal,* 9(4) pp. 319-324.

Bobbitt, P. (2002) *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace and the Course of History*. New York: Alfred Knobf.

Bodoczky, C. and Malderez, A. (1997) The INSET impact on a mentoring course. In Hayes, D. (ed.) *In-service teacher development: international perspectives.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall, pp. 50-59.

Bodoczky, C., Malderez, A., Gairns, R. and Williams, M. (1999) *Mentor Training: A Resource Book for Trainer-trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. (2007) *Research for education: An introduction to theories and methods.* New York: Pearson.

Borko, H. and Mayfield, V. (1995) 'The roles of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 11(5) pp. 501-518.

Bressman, S., Winter, J.S. and Efron, S.E. (2018) 'Next generation mentoring: Supporting teachers beyond induction.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 73(1) pp. 162-170.

Brewer, J. (2000) *Ethnography*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Britton, J., Farquharson, C. and Sibieta, L. (2019) *2019 annual report on education spending in England*, Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS). [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/14344

Brooks, V. (2000) 'School-based initial teacher training: squeezing a quart into a pint pot or a square peg into a round hole?' *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* 8(2) pp. 99-112.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A. and Duguid, P. (1989) 'Situated cognition and the culture of learning.' *Educational Researcher,* 18(1) pp. 32-42.

Brown, J.S. and Duguid, P. (1991) Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. Organization Science, 2(1) pp. 40-57.

Brown, T. (2017) *Teacher Education in England: A Critical Interrogation of School-led Training*. Oxon: Routledge.

Brown, T. (2016) The beginnings of school-led teacher training: New challenges for university teacher education. 30 March. *BERA*. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.bera.ac.uk/blog/the-beginnings-of-school-led-teacher-training-new-challenges-for-university-teacher-education

Brown, T., Rowley, H. and Smith, K. (2014) 'Rethinking research in teacher education.' *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 62(3) pp. 281-296.

Brown, T., Rowley, H. and Smith, K. (2015) *The beginnings of school led teacher training: New challenges for university teacher education.* MMU: ESRI. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://www.esri.mmu.ac.uk/resgroups/schooldirect.pdf

Brown, T. and McNamara, O. (2011) *Becoming a mathematics teacher: Identity and identifications* (Vol. 53). London: Springer Science & Business Media.

Brown, T. and McNamara, O. (2005) *New teacher identity and regulative government.* London: Springer Science & Business Media.

Brunstad, P. O. (2007) 'Faglig klokskap–mer enn kunnskap og ferdigheter.' *Pacem,* 10(2) pp. 59-70.

Bubb, S. and Earley, P. (2006) 'Induction rites and wrongs: the 'educational vandalism'of new teachers' professional development.' *Journal of In-Service Education,* 32(1) pp. 5-12.

Bullough Jr, R.V. (1994) 'Digging at the roots: Discipline, management, and metaphor.' *Action in Teacher Education,* 16(1) pp. 1-10.

Bullough, R., Draper, R., Smith, L. and Birrell, J. (2004) 'Moving beyond collusion: Clinical faculty and university/public school partnership.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(5) pp. 505-521.

Bullough, R.V. (2005) 'Being and becoming a mentor: School-based teacher educators and teacher educator identity.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 21(2) pp. 143-155.

Burch, J. and Jackson, A. (2013) 'Developing partnership through third space activity.' *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal (TEAN),* 5(2) pp. 57-68.

Burn, K. and Mutton, T. (2015) 'A review of 'research-informed clinical practice' in Initial Teacher Education.' *Oxford Review of Education,* 41(2) pp. 217-233.

Bush, T., Coleman, M., Wall, D. and West-Burnham, J. (2018) Mentoring and continuing professional development. In McIntyre, D. and Hagger, H. (eds.) *Mentors in Schools: Developing the Profession of Teaching*. London: Routledge, pp. 121-143.

Byrne, D. and Ragin, C.C. (2009) *The SAGE Handbook of Case-Based Methods*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Cain, T. (2019) Research-informed Initial Teacher Education. In Godfrey, D. (ed.) *An Ecosystem for Research-Engaged Schools*. London: Routledge, pp. 123-137.

Cajkler, W. and Wood, P. (2016) 'Lesson Study and Pedagogic Literacy in Initial Teacher Education: Challenging Reductive Models.' *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 64(4) pp. 503-521.

Cajkler, W. and Wood, P. (2016) 'Adapting 'lesson study' to investigate classroom pedagogy in initial teacher education: what student-teachers think.' *Cambridge Journal for Education,* 46(1) pp. 1-18.

Callahan, J. (2016) 'Encouraging retention of new teachers through mentoring strategies.' *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin,* 83(6), pp. 6-12.

Campbell, D.E. and Campbell, T.A. (2000) 'The mentoring relationship: Differing perceptions of benefits.' *College Student Journal,* 34(4) pp. 516-524.

Campbell, R., Goodman-Williams, R., Feeney, H. and Fehler-Cabral, G. (2018) 'Assessing Triangulation Across Methodologies, Methods, and Stakeholder Groups: The Joys,

Woes, and Politics of Interpreting Convergent and Divergent Data.' *American Journal of Evaluation,* 41(1) pp. 125-144.

Carson, D., Gilmore, A., Perry, C. and Gronhaug, K. (2001) *Qualitative marketing research*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Carter, A. (2015) *Carter review of initial teacher training (ITT).* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/carter-review-of-initial-teacher-training

Carter, A. (2016) 'Teachers as researchers: Using action research to inform practice.' *Australian Educational Leader,* 38(4) pp. 51-53.

Carver, C. and Feiman-Nemser, S. (2009) 'Using policy to improve teacher induction: Critical elements and missing pieces.' *Educational Policy,* 23(2) pp. 295-328.

Chowdry, H. and Sibieta, L. (2011) *Trends in Education and School Spending.* London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Clandinin, D.J. and Connelly, F.M. (1996) 'Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Teacher stories. Stories of teachers. School stories. Stories of schools*.' Educational Researcher*, 25(3) pp. 24-30.

Clarke, A., Triggs, V. and Nielsen, W. (2014) 'Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education: A review of the literature.' *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2) pp. 163-202.

Clarke, A. and Jarvis-Selinger, S. (2005) 'What the teaching perspectives of cooperating teachers tell us about their advisory practices.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 21(1) pp. 65-78.

Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S. and McLaughlin, E. (2000) *New managerialism, new welfare?*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Clarke, M., Killeavy, M. and Moloney, A. (2013) 'The genesis of mentors' professional and personal knowledge about teaching: perspectives from the Republic of Ireland.' *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3) pp. 364-375.

Claxton, G. (2004) Learning is learnable (and we ought to teach it). In Cassel, J. (ed.) *Ten Years On.* Bristol: The National Commission for Education Report. pp. 237-250.

Cleland, J. and Durning, S.J. (2019) Education and service: how theories can help in understanding tensions. *Medical education*, 53(1) pp. 42-55.

Clutterbuck, D. (2004) *Everyone needs a mentor: Fostering talent in your organisation*. London: CIPD Publishing.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005) 'The new teacher education: For better or for worse?' *Educational Researcher,* 34(7) pp. 3-17.

Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S.L. (2004) Practitioner inquiry, knowledge, and university culture. In Loughran, J.J., Hamilton, M.L., LaBoskey, V.K. and Russell, T. (eds.) *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (Vol. 1). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press, pp. 601-649.

Collins, C. (2004). Envisaging a new education studies major: What are the core educational knowledges to be addressed in pre-service teacher education? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,* (32)3 pp. 227-240.

Collison, J. and Edwards, A. (1994) How teachers support student learning. In Reid, I., Constable, H. and Griffiths, R. (eds.) *Teacher Education Reform: Current Research.* London: Paul Chapman Pub, pp. 131-136.

Colson, T., Sparks, K., Berridge, G,. Frimming. R. and Willis, C. (2017) 'Pre-service teachers and self-efficacy: A study in contrast.' *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education,* 8(2) pp. 66-76.

Connell, R. (2009) 'Good teachers on dangerous ground: Towards a new view of teacher quality and professionalism.' *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(3) pp. 213-229.

Connolly, M. (2018) 'The Benefits of Mentoring Teacher Candidates: Professional Reflection and Growth.' *New Jersey English Journal,* 7(1) pp. 77-88.

Corcoran, R.P. and O'Flaherty, J. (2018) 'Factors that predict pre-service teachers' teaching performance.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 44(2) pp. 175-193.

Correa, J.M., Martínez-Arbelaiz, A. and Aberasturi-Apraiz, E. (2015) 'Post-modern reality shock: Beginning teachers as sojourners in communities of practice.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 48(1) pp. 66-74.

Cova, B. and Elliott, R. (2008) 'Everything you always wanted to know about interpretive consumer research but were afraid to ask.' *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal,* 11(2) pp. 121-129.

Craft, M. (1984) Change and continuity in teacher education. In Alexander, R,. Craft, M. and Lynch, J. (eds.) *Change in Teacher Education. Context and Provision since Robins.* London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 332-341.

Crawford, V. M. (2007) Adaptive expertise as knowledge building in science teachers' problem solving. In *Proceedings of the European cognitive science conference*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 250-255.

Creswell, J. W. (2013) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage publications Ltd.

Creswell, J.W. and Poth, C.N. (2017) *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. London: Sage publications Ltd.

Daloz, L.A. (1983) 'Mentors: Teachers who make a difference.' *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning,* 15(6) pp. 24-27.

Dang, T.K.A. (2013) 'Identity in activity: Examining teacher professional identity formation in the paired-placement of student teachers.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 30(1) pp. 47-59.

Danilewicz, W., Korzeniecka-Bondar, A., Kowalczuk-Walędziak. M. and Lauwers, G.M.L.V. (2019) *Rethinking Teacher Education for the 21st Century: Trends, Challenges and New Directions*. Poland: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006) 'Constructing 21st-Century Teacher Education.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 57(3) pp. 300-314.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012) *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Bransford, J. (2007) *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Davies, M. A., Brady, M., Rodger, E. and Wall, P. (1999) 'Mentors and school-based partnership: Ingredients for professional growth.' *Action in teacher Education,* 21(1) pp. 85-96.

Demirbulak, D. 2012. 'Fostering Propensities for Reflective Practice at Undergraduate Methodology and Practicum Courses.' *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), pp. 39-58.

Department for Education. (1992) *Circular 9/92. Initial teacher training (secondary phase).* London: DfE.

Department for Education. (1993) *Circular 14/93. The initial training of primary school teachers: New criteria for course approval*. London: DfE.

Department for Education. (2010) *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper 2010, Cm 7980.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175429/CM-7980.pdf

Department for Education. (2011a) *Teachers' Standards*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-standards

Department for Education. (2011b) *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: implementation plan*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/training-our-next-generation-of-outstanding-teachers-implementation-plan.

Department for Education. (2012) *Press release:New school-led teacher training programme announced*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-school-led-teacher-training-programme-announced

Department for Education. (2014a) *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Census for the academic year 2014 to 2015, England.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/initial-teacher-training-trainee-number-census-2014-to-2015

Department for Education. (2014b) *School Direct: get involved with teacher training* London: National College for Teaching and Leadership.

Department for Education. (2014c) *Guidance: Teaching schools and system leaders: get support for you and your school*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/system-leaders-who-they-are-and-what-they-do

Department for Education. (2016a) *Initial teacher training: government response to Carter review*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-government-response-to-carter-review

Department for Education. 2016b. *National Standards for school-based initial teacher training (ITT) mentors.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/536891/Mentor_standa rds_report_Final.pdf

Department for Education. (2016c) *Registration of independent schools: Departmental guidance for proprietors and prospective proprietors of independent schools in England*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/865049/BRANDED_independent_school_registration_guidance_21_August_2019Ms.pdf

Department for Education. (2017) *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Census for the academic year 2017 to 2018.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/initial-teacher-training-trainee-number-census-2017-to-2018

Department for Education. (2018a) *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Census for the academic year 2018 to 2019.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/initial-teacher-training-trainee-number-census-2018-to-2019

Department for Education. (2018b) *Strengthening Qualified Teacher Status and Improving Career Progression for Teachers: Government Consultation.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://consult.education.gov.uk/teaching-profession-unit/strengthening-qts-and-improving-career-progression/

Department for Education. (2018c) *System leaders handbook.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://tscouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/SL-Handbook-Autumn-2018-Final-1.0.pdf

Department for Education. (2019a) *2018/2019 DfE School Improvement Pilot*. London: Teaching Schools Council. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://tscouncil.org.uk/2018-19-dfe-school-improvement-pilot/

Department for Education. (2019b) *Early Career Framework.* London: Teaching Schools Council. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/773705/Early-Career_Framework.pdf

Department for Education. (2019c) *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Census for the academic year 2019 to 2020, England.* London: Teaching Schools Council. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/initial-teacher-training-trainee-number-census-2019-to-2020

Department for Education. (2019d) *ITT Core Content Framework* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/843676/Initial_teacher_training_core_content_framework.pdf

Department for Education. (2019e) *Salaried Teacher Training: School Direct*. London: Get Into Teaching. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://getintoteaching.education.gov.uk/explore-my-options/teacher-training-routes/school-led-training/school-direct-salaried

Department for Education. (2019f) *School workforce in England: November 2018*. London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/school-workforce-in-england-november-2018

Department for Education. (2020) *Statutory guidance: Initial teacher training (ITT): criteria and supporting advice.* London: DfE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-criteria

Department for Education and Employment. (1998) *Teachers: meeting the challenge of change*. London: DfEE.

Dicke, T., Elling, J., Schmeck, A., and Leutner, D. (2015) 'Reducing reality shock: The effects of classroom management skills training on beginning teachers.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 48(1) pp. 1-12.

Douglas, A.S. (2015) 'A new research agenda for teacher education: the value of a partnership approach to classroom-based research.' *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal (TEAN),* 7(1) pp. 3-13.

Douglas, A.S. (2017) 'Extending the teacher educator role: developing tools for working with school mentors.' *Professional Development in Education,* 43(5) pp. 841-859.

Dovemark, M., Kosunen, S., Kauko, J., Magnúsdóttir, B., Hansen, P. and Rasmussen, P. (2018) 'Deregulation, privatisation and marketisation of Nordic comprehensive education: social changes reflected in schooling.' *Education Inquiry,* 9(1) pp. 122-141.

Dunk, R., and Haniak-Cockerham, F. (2018) *Learning to teach in the University Schools Model*. Part of the Parliamentary Education Symposium hosted by Mike Kane MP, Shadow Minister for Schools, at the House of Commons. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://www2.mmu.ac.uk/education/symposium/

Dunne, E. and Bennett, N. (1997) 'Mentoring processes in school-based training.' *British Educational Research Journal,* 23(2) pp. 225-237.

Dyson, A. and Desforges, C. (2002) *Building research capacity: some possible lines of action.* London: NERF.

Dysthe, O. and Engelsen, K. (2004) 'Portfolios and assessment in teacher education in Norway: a theory-based discussion of different models in two sites.' *Assessment & evaluation in higher education,* 29(2) pp. 239-258.

Eby, L.T., Allen, T.D., Evans, S.C., Ng, T. and DuBois, D.L. (2008) 'Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals.' *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 72(2) pp. 254-267.

Eden, D. (2001) 'Who controls the teachers? Overt and covert control in schools.' *Educational Management & Administration,* 29(1) pp. 97-111.

Edge, J. (2011) *The reflexive teacher educator in TESOL: Roots and wings*. London: Routledge.

Edirisingha, P. (2012) Interpretivism and positivism (Ontological and epistemological perspectives). *Research Paradigms and Approaches*. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://prabash78.wordpress.com/2012/03/14/interpretivism-and-postivism-ontological-and-epistemological-perspectives/

Edwards, A. (1997). 'Guests bearing Gifts: The position of student teachers in primary school classrooms.' *British Educational Research Journal,* 23(1) pp. 27-37.

Edwards, A. (1998) 'Mentoring student teachers in primary schools: assisting student teachers to become learners.' *European Journal of Teacher Education,* 21(1) pp. 47-62.

Edwards, A. and Collison, J. (1995) 'What do teacher mentors tell student teachers about pupil learning in infant schools?' *Teachers and Teaching,* 1(2) pp. 265-279.

Edwards, A. and Protheroe, L. (2003) 'Learning to see in classrooms: what are student teachers learning about teaching and learning while learning to teach in schools?' *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(2) pp.227-242.

Edwards, A. and Protheroe, L. (2004) 'Teaching by proxy: Understanding how mentors are positioned in partnerships.' *Oxford Review of Education,* 30(2) pp. 183-197.

Edwards-Groves, C. (2018) The practice architectures of pedagogy: conceptualising the convergences between sociality, dialogue, ontology and temporality in teaching practices. In Bernad-Cavero, O., and Llevot-Calvet, N. (eds.) *New Pedagogical Challenges in the 21st Century: Contributions of Research in Education*. London: IntechOpen, pp.119-139.

Education Endowment Foundation. (2019) *Early-career support: online teacher development*. *.* London: EEF. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/early-career-support-online-teacher-development/

Eilertsen, T.V. and Strøm, B. (2008) Towards a Symbiosis of Learning and Examinations. In Mattsson, M., Hohansoon, I. and Sandström, B. (eds.) *Examining Praxis: Assessment and knowledge construction in teacher education.* Sense Publishers. Rotterdam:

Ellis, V. (2019) 'Teacher education in England: a critical interrogation of school-led training.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 45(3) pp. 365-367.

Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Eraut, M. (2007) 'Learning from other people in the workplace.' *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4) pp. 403-422.

Eraut M (2009) How Professionals Learn through Work. In Jackson, N. (ed.) *Learning to be Professional through a Higher Education ebook.* [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://learningtobeprofessional.pbworks.com/Howprofessionals-learn-through-work

Ertas, N. and McKnight, A.N. (2019) 'Clarifying and reframing the neoliberal critique of educational policy using policy process theories.' *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 40(2) pp. 234-247.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2013) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. USA: Princeton University Press.

Evans, B. K. and Fischer, D.G. (1992) 'A hierarchical model of participatory decision-making, job autonomy, and perceived control.' *Human Relations,* 45(11) pp. 1169-1189.

Evans, L. (1997) 'Developing as mentors in school-based teacher training.' *Teacher Development,* 1(1) pp. 135-148.

Evetts, J. (2008) 'Introduction: Professional Work in Europe *Concepts, theories, and methodologies*.' *European Societies,* 10(4) pp. 525-544.

Farrell, T. S. (2016) *From trainee to teacher: Reflective practice for novice teachers*. London: Equinox.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990) Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In Houston, W.R., Huberman, M. and Sikula, J. (eds.) *Handbook of research in teacher education*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 212-233.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001) 'Helping Novices Learn to Teach: Lessons from an Exemplary Support Teacher.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 52(1) pp. 17-30.

Feiman-Nemser, S. and Carver, C.L. (2012) 'Creating conditions for serious mentoring: Implications for induction policy.' *National Society for the Study of Education,* 111(2), pp. 342-364.

Feiman-Nemser, S., Parker, M.B. and Zeichner, K. (1993) Are Mentor Teachers Teacher Educators?. In McIntyre, D,. Hagger, H,. and Wilkin, M. (eds.) *Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Feltovich, P. J., Spiro, R.J. and Coulson, R.L. (1997) Issues of expert flexibility in contexts characterized by complexity and change. In Feltovich, P.J., Ford, K.M. and Hoffman, R.R. (eds.*) Expertise in context: Human and machine*. American Association for Artificial Intelligence: The MIT Press, pp. 125-146.

Fenstermacher, G. (1996) 'Les arguments pratiques dans la transformation morale de l'enseignement d'une discipline.' *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, 22(3), pp. 617-634.

Fergusson, R. (1994) Managerialism in education. In Clarke, J., Cochrane, A. and McLaughlin, E. (eds.) *Managing Social Policy*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 93-114.

Fletcher, S. and Mullen,C.A. (2012) *Sage handbook of mentoring and coaching in education*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Flick, U. (2018) Triangulation in data collection. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Flynn, N. (2019) 'Facilitating evidence-informed practice.' *Teacher Development,* 23(1) pp. 64-82.

Fontdevila, C. and Verger A. (2019) The Political Turn of Corporate Influence in Education: A Synthesis of Main Policy Reform Strategies. In Parreira do Amaral, M., Steiner-Khamsi, G. and Thompson, C. (eds.) *Researching the Global Education Industry*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 47-68.

Foong, L.Y.Y., Nor, M.B.M. and Nolan, A. (2018) 'The influence of practicum supervisors' facilitation styles on student teachers' reflective thinking during collective reflection.' *Reflective Practice,* 19(2) pp. 225-242.

Form, S., Schlichting, K. and Kaernbach, C. (2017)' Mentoring functions: Interpersonal tensions are associated with mentees' creative achievement.' *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts,* 11(4) pp. 440-450.

Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F. and Davidson, L. (2002) 'Understanding and evaluating qualitative research.' *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry,* 36(6) pp. 717-732.

Foster, D. (2019) *Teacher recruitment and retention in England.* London: House of Commons Library. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-7222/

Foster, R. (1999) 'School-based initial teacher training in England and France: trainee teachers' perspectives compared.' *Mentoring & tutoring for Partnership in Learning,* 7(2) pp. 131-143.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Fowler, Z. and Procter, R. (2008) *Mapping the ripples: an evaluation of TLRP's research capacity building.* London: TLRP. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://www.tlrp.org/mappingtheripples

Franke, A. and Dahlgren, L.O. (1996) 'Conceptions of mentoring: An empirical study of conceptions of mentoring during the school-based teacher education.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 12(6) pp. 627-641.

Fung, D. and Gordon, C. (2017) *Rewarding educators and education leaders in research-intensive universities.* London: London School of Economics.

Furlong, J. (2007) *The universities and education*. 9 November. Keynote speech at the University Council for the Education of Teachers conference, Daventry, England*.*

Furlong, J. (2013) *Education–An anatomy of the discipline: Rescuing the university project?*. London: Routledge.

Furlong, J. (2019) 'The Universities and initial teacher education; challenging the discourse of derision. The case of Wales.' *Teachers and Teaching,* 25(5) pp. 1-15.

Furlong, J., Campbell, A., Howson, J., Lewis, S. and McNamara, O. (2006) 'Partnership in English initial teacher education: changing times, changing definitions–Evidence from the Teacher training agency national partnership project.' *Scottish Educational Review,* 37(1) pp. 32-45.

Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M. and Brennan, M. (2013) *Policy and politics in teacher education: International perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Whiting, C., Miles, S. and Barton, L. (2000) *Teacher education in transition: Re-forming professionalism?.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Fusch, P., Fusch, G.E. and Ness, L.R. (2018) Denzin's paradigm shift: Revisiting triangulation in qualitative research. *Journal of Social Change,* 10(1) pp. 19-32.

Gagen, L. and Bowie, S. (2005) 'Effective Mentoring: A Case for Training Mentors for Novice Teachers.' *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 76(7) pp. 40-45.

Gale, T. and Parker, S. (2017) The prevailing logic of teacher education: Privileging the practical in Australia, England and Scotland. In Peters, M., Cowie, B. and Menter, I. (eds.) *A Companion to Research in Teacher Education*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 521-535.

Garvey, R., Garvey, B., Stokes, P. and Megginson, D. (2017) *Coaching and mentoring: Theory and practice*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

George, R. and Maguire, M. (2019) 'Choice and diversity in English initial teacher education (ITE): trainees' perspectives.' *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1) pp. 19-35.

Gewirtz, S. 2003. *The managerial school: Post-welfarism and social justice in education*. London: Routledge.

Gewirtz, S., Maguire, M., Neumann, E. and Towers, E. (2019) 'What's wrong with 'deliverology'? Performance measurement, accountability and quality improvement in English secondary education.' *Journal of Education Policy*, December, pp. 1-26.

Gewirtz, S., Mahony, P., Hextall, I. and Cribb, A. (2009) *Changing teacher professionalism: International trends, challenges and ways forward*. London: Routledge.

Gillard, D. 2011. *Education in England: a brief history*. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] www.educationengland.org.uk/history

Ginsburg, M.B. (1997) 'Professionalism or politics as a model for educators' engagement with/in communities.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 12(1-2) pp. 5-12.

Ginsburg, M.B. and Lindsay, B. (2004) *The political dimension in teacher education: Comparative perspectives on policy formation, socialization, and society*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Godfrey, D. and Brown, C. (2019) *An Ecosystem for Research-Engaged Schools: Reforming Education Through Research*. London: Routledge.

Goodfellow, J. (2000) 'Knowing from the inside: Reflective conversations with and through the narratives of one cooperating teacher.' *Reflective Practice,* 1(1) pp. 25-42.

Gott, S. P., Glaser, R., Hall, E.P., Dibble, E. and Pokorny, R.A. (1996) A naturalistic study of transfer: Adaptive expertise in technical domains. In Detterman, D.K. and Sternberg, R.J. (eds.) *Transfer on trial: intelligence, cognition and instruction.* Norwood (NJ): Ablex, pp. 258-288.

Gove, M. (2013) 'I refuse to surrender to the Marxist teachers hell-bent on destroying our schools: Education Secretary berates 'the new enemies of promise' for opposing his plans'. *Daily Mail*. [Online] 23 March. [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2298146/I-refuse-surrender-Marxist-teachers-hell-bent-destroying-schools-Education-Secretary-berates-new-enemies-promise-opposing-plans.html

Green, F. (2017) 'Private schooling and labour market outcomes.' *British Educational Research Journal,* 43(1) pp. 7-28.

Green, F., Allen, R. and Jenkins, A. (2015) 'Are English free schools socially selective? A quantitative analysis.' *British Educational Research Journal,* 41(6) pp. 907-924.

Griffiths, V., Thompson, S. and Hryniewicz, L. (2010) 'Developing a research profile: mentoring and support for teacher educators.' *Professional Development in Education,* 36(1-2) pp. 245-262.

Grima-Farrell, C. (2015) 'Mentoring pathways to enhancing the personal and professional development of pre-service teachers.' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education,* 4(4) pp. 255-268.

Grossman, P. and McDonald, M. (2008) 'Back to the future: Directions for Research in Teaching and Teacher Education.' *American Educational Research Journal,* 45(1) pp. 184-205.

Gu, Q., Rea, S., Hill, R., Smethem, L. and Dunford, J. (2014) *The Evaluation of Teaching Schools: Emerging Findings from the First Phase Investigation.* London: National College for Teaching and Leadership. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/505517/RR332_-_Teaching_schools_Evaluation.pdf

Gu, Q., Rea, S., Hill, R., Smethem, L. and Dunford, J. (2016) *Teaching Schools evaluation: Final report.* London: National College for Teaching and Leadership. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/503333/Evaluation_of_Teaching_schools_FINAL_FOR_PUB_25_feb_final_.pdf

Gummesson, E. (2000) *Qualitative methods in management research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hagger, H. and McIntyre, D. (2006) *Learning teaching from teachers: Realising the potential of school-based teacher education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. (2016) *Reading Ethnographic Research*. Abingson-on-Thames: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.

Hanley, C. and Brown, T. (2017) 'Developing a university contribution to teacher education: creating an analytical space for learning narratives.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(3) pp. 352-368.

Hansen, P., Wallenius, T., Juvonen, S. and Varjo, J. (2019) 'Moving landscapes of Nordic basic
education: approaching shifting international influences through the narratives of
educational experts.' *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International
Education*, January, pp. 1-19.

Hardy, C. A. (1999) 'Perceptions of physical education beginning teachers' first year of
teaching: Are we doing enough to prevent early attrition?' *Teacher Development,*
3(1) pp. 109-127.

Hargreaves, A. and Lo, L.N. (2000) 'Professionalism in Teaching.' *Prospects: Quarterly Review
of Comparative Education,* 30(2) pp. 167-181.

Hargreaves, D. (1994) *The mosaic of learning: Schools and teachers for the next century*.
London: Demos.

Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (2012) *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every
School.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Harris, A. and Jones, M. (2017) 'Leading professional learning: putting teachers at the
centre.' *School Leadership & Management,* 37(4) pp. 331-333.

Harris, S. and Crocker, C. (2003) 'Benefits to Mentors: "It's Like I Have a Legacy".' *Planning
and Changing,* 34(1-2) pp. 70-83.

Hascher, T., Cocard, Y. and Moser, P. (2004) 'Forget about theory- practice is all? Student
teachers' learning in practicum.' *Teachers and Teaching, Theory and Practice,* 10(6)
pp. 623-637.

Hashweh, M.Z. (2005) 'Teacher pedagogical constructions: a reconfiguration of pedagogical
content knowledge.', *Teachers and Teaching*, 11(3) pp. 273-292.

Haugaløkken, O. and Ramberg, P (2005) 'NTNUs partners kapmodell: Et samarbeid mellom
skole og lærerutdanningsinstitusjonen.' *Evaluering og analyse. Publikasjoner i
skriftserien NTNU Program for lærerutdanning (PLU).* Trondheim: NTNU.

HEI1. (2017a) PGCE Secondary Student Course Guide. In *Secondary Programme of School-
based Initial Teacher Training.* Faculty of Education in Partnership with Schools and
Colleges, HEI1.

HEI1. (2017b) Subject Mentor Handbook (Core) Concise Guide 2017-2018. In *Secondary
Programme of School-based Initial Teacher Training*. Faculty of Education in
Partnership with Schools and Colleges, HEI1.

HEI1. (2017c) Subject Mentor SD Handbook 2017-2018. In *Secondary Programme of School-
based Initial Teacher Training.* Faculty of Education in Partnership with Schools and
Colleges, HEI1.

HEI1. (2020) *School-led routes guidance*. Faculty of Education in Partnership with Schools and Colleges, HEI1.

Heikkinen, H., Wilkinson, J., Aspfors, J. and Bristol, L. (2018) 'Understanding mentoring of new teachers: Communicative and strategic practices in Australia and Finland.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 71(1) pp. 1-11.

Heikkinen, H.L., Tynjälä, P. and Kiviniemi, U. (2011) Integrative pedagogy in practicum. In Mattsson, M., Eilertsen, T.V. and Rorrison, D. (eds.) *A Practicum Turn in Teacher Education,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 91-112.

Heikonen, L., Pietarinen, J., Toom, A., Soini, T. and Pyhältö, K. (2020) 'The development of student teachers' sense of professional agency in the classroom during teacher education.' *Learning: Research and Practice*, February, pp. 1-23.

Hemmings, B., Kemmis, S. and Reupert, A. (2013). Practice architectures of university inclusive education teaching in Australia. Professional Development in Education, 39(4) pp. 470-487.

Henig, J. R. (2008) *Spin Cycle: How Research Gets Used in Policy Debates-The Case of Charter Schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Henning, J. E., Gut, D.M. and Beam, P.C. (2018) *Building mentoring capacity in teacher education: A guide to clinically-based practice*. Ney York and London: Routledge.

Herbert S., Redman C. and Speldewinde C. (2018) Sustaining School–University Partnerships: Threats, Challenges and Critical Success Factors. In Hobbs L., Campbell C. and Jones M. (eds.) *School-based Partnerships in Teacher Education*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 169-189.

Higgins, S., Katsipataki, M., Villanueva-Aguilera, A., Coleman, R., Henderson, P., Major, L., Coe, R. and Mason, D. (2016) *The Sutton Trust-Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit.* London: Education Endowment Foundation. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/

Hill, D. 2010. *The rich world and the impoverishment of education: Diminishing democracy, equity and workers' rights*. New York and London: Routledge.

Hirschman, E. C. (1985) 'Primitive aspects of consumption in modern American society.' *Journal of Consumer Research,* 12(2) pp. 142-154.

HMSO. (1972) *The James Report: Teacher Education and Training.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

HMSO. (1988) *Education Reform Act.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Hobson, A. (2003) 'Student teachers' conceptions and evaluations of 'theory' in initial teacher training (ITT).' *Mentoring & Tutoring,* 11(3) pp. 245-261.

Hobson, A. (2009) 'On being bottom of the pecking order: Beginner teachers' perceptions and experiences of support.' *Teacher Development,* 13(4) pp. 299-320.

Hobson, A., Ashby, P., Malderez, A. and Tomlinson, P. (2009) 'Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't.' *Teaching and teacher education,* 25(1) pp. 207-216.

Hobson, A.J. and Malderez, A. (2013) 'Judgementoring and other threats to realizing the potential of school-based mentoring in teacher education.' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education,* 2(2) pp. 89-108.

Hobson, A. J., Malderez, A., Tracey, L., Homer, M., Mitchell, N., Biddulph, M., Giannakaki, M.S., Rose, A., Pell, R.G., Roper, T., Chambers, G.N. and Tomlinson, P.D. (2007) *Newly qualified teachers' experiences of their first year of teaching: Findings from phase III of the becoming a teacher project*. Nottingham: Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF).

Hodson, E., Smith, K. and Brown, T. (2012) 'Reasserting theory in professionally based initial teacher education.' *Teachers and Teaching,* 18(2) pp. 181-195.

Holland, E. (2018) 'Mentoring communities of practice: what's in it for the mentor?' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 7(2) pp. 110-126.

Holliday, A. (2016) *Doing and writing qualitative research*. Los Angeles (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Holloway, I. and Galvin, K. (2016) *Qualitative Research in Nursing and Healthcare*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Holloway, I. and Wheeler, S. (2013) *Qualitative Research in Nursing and Healthcare*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Holm, G. (2018) 'Justice through education in the Nordic countries: critical issues and perspectives.' *Education Inquiry*, 9(1) pp. 1-3.

Holmes, R. (2010) 'Cinemaethnographic specta (c) torship: Discursive readings of what we choose to (dis) possess.' *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies,* 10(3) pp. 221-237.

Hort, S. (2014) *Social policy, welfare state, and civil society in Sweden. Vol. 2. The lost world of social democracy 1988-2015*. Lund: Arkiv.

House of Commons Education Committee. (2012) *Great Teachers: Attracting, Training and Retaining the Best. Government's Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of*

Session 2010-12 Volume 1. London: House of Commons. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmeduc/1515/1515.pdf

Howe, E. R. (2006) 'Exemplary teacher induction: An international review.' *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 38(3) pp. 287-297.

Hudson, A. (2017) 'Academis identity of AccessHE tutors: a focussed reiew of the literature.' *Research in Teacher Education*, 7(1) pp. 6-12.

Hudson, P. (2016) 'Forming the mentor-mentee relationship.' *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* 24(1) pp. 30-43.

Hudson, L. A. and Ozanne, J.L. (1988) 'Alternative ways of seeking knowledge in consumer research.' *Journal of Consumer Research,* 14(4) pp. 508-521.

Hymans, M. (2019) *Coaching and Mentoring Staff in Schools: A Practical Guide*. New York and London: Routledge.

Ingersoll, R. and Kralik, J.M. (2004) *The Impact of Mentoring on Teacher Retention: What the Research Says.* Denver, CO: The Education Commission of the States.

Ingersoll, R. and Strong, M. (2012) 'What the Research Tells Us about the Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers.' *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* 81(2) pp. 466-490.

Ingleby, E. (2014) 'Developing reflective practice or judging teaching performance? The implications for mentor training.' *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 19(1) pp. 18-32.

Izadinia, M. (2016) 'Student teachers' and mentor teachers' perceptions and expectations of a mentoring relationship: do they match or clash?.' *Professional Development in Education*, 42(3) pp. 387-402.

Jackson, A. and Burch, J. (2016) 'School Direct, a policy for Initial Teacher Training in England: plotting a principled pedagogical path through a changing landscape.' *Professional Development in Education,* 42(4) pp. 511-526.

Jackson, A. and Burch, J. (2019) 'New directions for teacher education: investigating school/university partnership in an increasingly school-based context.' *Professional Development in Education,* 45(1) pp. 138-150.

Jacobi, M. (1991) 'Mentoring and academic success: A literature review.' *Review of Educational Research,* 61(4) pp. 505-532.

Jacques, K. (1992) Mentoring in initial teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 22(3) pp. 337-350.

Janesick, V. (2000) The Choreography of Qualitative Research: Minuets, Improvisations, and Crystallization. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S (eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 379-399.

Jang, E.Y. and Kang, S.J. (2019) 'Becoming Me in third space: Media education for North Korean refugee youths in South Korea.' *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 63(1) pp. 83-91.

Jardine, N. (2009) Philosophy of history of science. In Tucker, A. (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, New York: Wiley, pp. 285-296.

Jaspers, W.M., Meijer, P.C., Prins, F. and Wubbels, T. (2014) 'Mentor teachers: Their perceived possibilities and challenges as mentor and teacher.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 44(1) pp. 106-116.

Johnson, S.M., Berg, J.H. and Donaldson, M.L. (2005) *Who stays in teaching and why?: A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Harvard: NRTA's Educator Support Network. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://projectngt.gse.harvard.edu/publications/who-stays-teaching-and-why-review-literature-teacher-retention

Johnston, D.H. (2010) 'Losing the joy': Student teachers' experiences of problematic relations with host teachers on school placement.' *Teacher Development,* 14(3) pp. 307-320.

Johnston, D.H. (2016) 'Sitting alone in the staffroom contemplating my future': communities of practice, legitimate peripheral participation and student teachers' experiences of problematic school placements as guests.' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4) pp. 533-551.

Jones, K. (2016) *Education in Britain: 1944 to the present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jones, L., Reid, D. and Bevins, S. (1997) 'Teachers' perceptions of mentoring in a collaborative model of initial teacher training.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 23(3) pp. 253-262.

Jones, M. and Straker, K. (2006) 'What informs mentors' practice when working with trainees and newly qualified teachers? An investigation into mentors' professional knowledge base.' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(2) pp. 165-184.

Jonson, K. F. (2008) *Being an effective mentor: How to help beginning teachers succeed*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Corwin Press.

Jørgensen, C. H. (2018) Vocational education and training in the Nordic countries:: Different systems and common challenges. In Jørgensen, C.H., Olsen, O.J., and Persson

Thunqvist, D. (eds.) *Vocational Education in the Nordic Countries: Learning from Diversity*. 2nd ed., New York: Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education, pp. 1-28.

Karcher, M. J. (2008) 'The study of mentoring in the learning environment (SMILE): A randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of school-based mentoring.' *Prevention Science,* 9(2) pp. 99-113.

Katz, M. B. and Rose, M. (2013) *Public education under siege*. Philadelphia (PA): University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kazim, R., Mahomed, A., Moloney, M. and Morrison, L. (2014) 'Developing a 'dynamic'and collaborative pedagogy for postgraduate certificate (PGCE) secondary mathematics students.' *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal (TEAN),* 6(3) pp. 28-36.

Kemmis, S., Edwards-Groves, C., Wilkinson, J. and Hardy, I. (2012). Ecologies of practices. In Hager, P., Lee, A. and Reich, A. (eds.) Practice, Learning and Change. London: Springer, pp. 33-49.

Kemmis, S., and Grootenboer, P. (2008). Situating praxis in practice: Practice architectures and the cultural, social and material conditions for practice. In Kemmis, S. and Smith, T.J. (eds.) Enabling praxis: Challenges for education. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 37-62.

Kemmis, S., Heikkinen, H., Fransson, G., Aspfors, J. and Edwards-Groves, C. (2014a) 'Mentoring of new teachers as a contested practice: Supervision, support and collaborative self-development.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 43(1) pp. 154-164.

Kemmis, S., Mattsson, M., Ponte, P. and Rönnerman, K. (2008) Series introduction. In Kemmis, S. and Smith, T.J. (eds.) *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. vii-viii.

Kemmis, S. and Smith, T. (2008) Praxis and praxis development. In Kemmis, S. and Smith, T.J. (eds.) *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 3-13.

Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P. and Bristol, L. (2014b) Praxis, practice and practice architectures. In Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P. and Bristol, L. *Changing Practices, Changing Education*. London: Springer, pp. 25-41.

Kennedy, A. and Doherty, R. (2012) 'Professionalism and partnership: panaceas for teacher education in Scotland?' *Journal of Education Policy,* 27(6) pp. 835-848.

Kerosuo, H. and Engeström, Y. (2003) 'Boundary crossing and learning in creation of new work practice.' *Journal of Workplace Learning,* 15(7-8) pp. 345-351.

Kerry, T. and Mayes, A.S. (2013) *Issues in mentoring*. New York: Routledge.

Kessels, J. and Korthagen, F. (1996) 'The relationship between theory and practice: Back to the classics.' *Educational Researcher*, 25(3) pp. 17-22.

Kidd, L., Brown N. and Fitzallen, N. (2015) 'Beginning Teachers' Perception of Their Induction into the Teaching Profession.' *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,* 40(3) pp. 140-159.

Kivunja, C. and Kuyini, A.B. (2017) 'Understanding and applying research paradigms in educational contexts.' *International Journal of Higher Education,* 6(5) pp. 26-41.

Knight, B. (2017) 'The evolving codification of teachers' work: Policy, politics and the consequences of pursuing quality control in Initial Teacher Education.' *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal (TEAN)*, 9(1) pp. 4-13.

Korthagen, F., Baker, E., McGaw, B and Peterson, P. (2010) The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education. In Peterson, P., Baker, E. and McGaw, B. (eds.) *International Encyclopedia of Education,* Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 669-675.

Kretchmar, K. and Zeichner, K. (2016) 'Teacher prep 3.0: A vision for teacher education to impact social transformation.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 42(4) pp. 417-433.

Kriewaldt, J. and Turnidge, D. (2013) 'Conceptualising an approach to clinical reasoning in the education profession.' *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,* 38(6) pp. 103-115.

Kronholz, J. (2012) 'A New Type of Ed School: Linking candidate success to student success.' *Education Next,* 12(4) pp. 42-49.

Kubiak, C., Fenton-O'Creevy, M., Mylrea, P., Rees, E. and A. Shreeve, A. (2015) Brokering boundary encounters. In Wenger-Trayner, E., Fenton-O'Creevy, M., Hutchinson, S., Kubiak, C. and Wenger-Trayner, B. (eds.) *Learning in landscapes of practice: boundaries, identity, and knowledgeability in practice-based learning.* New York: Routledge.

Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Kvale, S. (2003) The psychoanalytic interview as inspiration for qualitative research. In Camic, P.M. and Rhodes, J.E. (eds.) *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design*. Washington DC: American Pscychological Association, pp. 275-297.

Kvale, S., B. Nilsson and J. Retzlaff. (2000) *Mästarlära: Lärande som social praxis*. (Nilsson, B. and Retzlaff,J. Trans). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Lamb, C., Uong, J., Haynes, C., Coley, E., Valdes, L. and Wendel, D. (2018) 'Trial and error: How student affairs staff in community colleges learn to supervise.' *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 42(10) pp. 740-743.

Lane, J.E. (2000) *New public management*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Lane, J.E. (2002) *New public management: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Langdon, F.J. (2017) 'Learning to mentor: Unravelling routine practice to develop adaptive mentoring expertise.' *Teacher Development,* 21(4) pp. 528-546.

Lasswell, H.D. (1970) 'The emerging conception of the policy sciences.' *Policy sciences,* 1(1) pp. 3-14.

Lave, J. (1996) 'Teaching, as learning, in practice.' *Mind, culture, and activity,* 3(3) pp. 149-164.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawlor, S. (1990) *Teachers Mistaught: training in theories or education in subjects?*. London: Centre for Policy Studies.

Lee, J.C. (2007) 'Mentoring support and the professional development of beginning teachers: a Chinese perspective.' *Mentoring & tutoring for partnership in learning,* 15(3) pp. 243-263.

Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H. and Mckee, B. (1978) *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Leys, C. (2003) *Market-driven politics: Neoliberal democracy and the public interest*. London and New York: Verso.

Lim K.M. and Huan V.S.L. (2017) In Focus: The Role of Education Studies in Teacher Education. In Tan OS., Liu WC. and Low EL. (eds.) *Teacher Education in the 21st Century*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 77-106.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Lindgren, U. (2005) 'Experiences of beginning teachers in a school-based mentoring program in Sweden.' *Educational studies,* 31(3) pp. 251-263.

Lindstrom, L. (2008) The Teacher as Servant of Nature. In Mattsson, M., Sandström. J.I. and Sandström, B. (eds.) *Examining Praxis: Assessment and Knowledge Construction in Teacher Education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Little, J.W. (1990) Chapter 6: The Mentor Phenomenon and the Social Organization of Teaching. *Review of research in education,* 16, pp. 297-351.

Liu, Y. and Xu, Y. (2013) 'The trajectory of learning in a teacher community of practice: A narrative inquiry of a language teacher's identity in the workplace.' *Research Papers in Education*, 28(2) pp. 176-195.

Lloyd, C. (2009) Historiographic schools. In Tucker, A (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography***,** Chichester: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 371-380.

Lockyer, S. (2004) Coding qualitative data. In Lewis-Beck, M.S., Bryman, A. and Futing Liao, T. (eds.) *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 137-138.

Lofthouse, R. (2015) *Metamorphosis, model-making and meaning: developing exemplary knowledge for teacher education.* PhD thesis, Newcastle University.

Lofthouse, R. (2018) 'Re-imagining mentoring as a dynamic hub in the transformation of initial teacher education.' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education,* 7(3) pp. 248-260.

Lofthouse, R. and Thomas, U. (2014) 'Mentoring student teachers; a vulnerable workplace learning practice.' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education,* 3(3) pp. 201-218.

Long, J. (1997) 'The dark side of mentoring.' *Australian Educational Researcher,* 24(2) pp. 115-133.

Lopez-Real, F. and Kwan, T. (2005) 'Mentors' perceptions of their own professional development during mentoring.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 31(1) pp. 15-24.

Lortie, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loughran, J., Berry, A. and Mulhall, P. (2012) Pedagogical Content Knowledge. In Loughran, J., Berry A. and Mulhall P. (Eds). *Understanding and Developing Science Teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge. Professional Learning.* (Vol 12) Rotterdam: SensePublishers, pp 7-14.

Lundström, U. (2015) 'Teacher autonomy in the era of New Public Management.' *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy,* 2015(2) pp. 73-85.

Macbeth, D. (2001) 'On "reflexivity" in qualitative research: Two readings, and a third.' *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(1) pp. 35-68.

MacLure, S. (1993) Fight this tooth and nail. *Times Educational Supplement,* 18 June.

Maddamsetti, J. (2018) 'Perceptions of pre-service teachers on mentor teachers' roles in promoting inclusive practicum: case studies in US elementary school contexts.' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 44(2) pp. 1-5.

Magni, F. (2019) Initial Teacher Education Policies: A Comparison between Italy and the UK. Recent Trends and Future Prospects. In Kowalczuk-Walędziak, M., Korzeniecka-Bondar, A., Danilewicz, W. and Lauwers, G. (eds.) *Rethinking Teacher Education for the 21st Century. Trends, Challenges and New Directions*. Berlin: Blackwells, pp. 127-139.

Maguire, M. (2001) 'Bullying and the postgraduate secondary school trainee teacher: An English case study.' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy,* 27(6) pp. 95-109.

Maguire, M. (2014) 'Reforming teacher education in England: 'an economy of discourses of truth.' *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(6) pp. 774-784.

Mak, B. and Pun, S.H. (2015) 'Cultivating a teacher community of practice for sustainable professional development: Beyond planned efforts.' *Teachers and Teaching*, 21(1) pp. 4-21.

Malderez, A., Hobson, A.J., Tracey, L. and Kerr, K. (2007) 'Becoming a student teacher: Core features of the experience.' *European Journal of Teacher Education,* 30(3) pp. 225-248.

Malderez, A. and Wedell, M. (2007) *Teaching teachers: Practices and processes.* London: Continuum.

Manning, C. and Hobson, A.J. (2017)' Judgemental and developmental mentoring in further education initial teacher education in England: mentor and mentee perspectives.' *Research in Post-Compulsory Education,* 22(4) pp. 574-595.

Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Broadley, T. and Weatherby-Fell, N. (2016) 'Building resilience in teacher education: An evidenced informed framework.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 54(1) pp. 77-87.

Marable, M.A. and Raimondi, S. (2007) 'Teachers' perceptions of what was most (and least) supportive during their first year of teaching.' *Mentoring & tutoring for partnership in learning,* 15(1) pp. 25-37.

Martin, D. (1997) 'Mentoring in one's own classroom: An exploratory study of contexts.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 13(2) pp. 183-197.

Martin, J. and Dunlop, L. (2019) 'For-profit schools in England: the state of a nation.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 34(5) pp. 726-741.

Martinez, K. (2004) 'Mentoring new teachers: Promise and problems in times of teacher shortage.' *Australian Journal of Education,* 48(1) pp. 95-108.

Mason, J. (2002) *Researching your own practice: The discipline of noticing*. London: Routledge.

Mason, R., Garber, E., Hochtritt, L. and Sharma, M. (2018) Skilled knowledge and craft education. In Garber, E., Hochtritt, L. and Sharma, M. (eds). *Makers, crafters, educators: Working for cultural change*, New York: Routledge, pp. 216-219.

Mattsson, M. (2008a) *Degree projects and praxis development*. Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Mattsson, M. (2008b) What is at stake? In Mattsson, M,. Johansson, I. and Sandström, B. (eds.) *Examining Praxis. Assessment and Knowledge Construction in Teacher Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 1-15.

Mattsson, M., Eilertsen, T.V. and Rorrison, D (2011) What is Practice in Teacher Education? In Mattsson, M., Eilertsen, T.V. and Rorrison, D. (eds.) *A Practicum Turn in Teacher Education,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 1-15.

Mattsson, M., Johansson, I. and Sandström, B. (2008) *Examining Praxis: Assessment and Knowledge Construction in Teacher Education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Maynard, T. (2000) 'Learning to teach or learning to manage mentors? Experiences of school-based teacher training.' *Mentoring & tutoring for partnership in learning,* 8(1) pp. 17-30.

McAdams, D.P. and Pals, J.L. (2006) 'A New Big Five: Fundamental Principles for an Integrative Science of Personality.' *American Psychologist,* 61(3) pp. 204-217.

McAllister, J. (2015) The idea of a university and school partnership. In Heilbronn. R. and Foreman-Peck, L. (eds.) *Philosophical perspectives on Teacher Education*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 38-53.

McDougall, J. and Potter, J. (2019) 'Digital media learning in the third space.' *Media Practice and Education*, 20(1) pp. 1-11.

McIntyre, D. and Booth, M. (1990) The Oxford Internship Scheme and the Cambridge Analytical Framework: models of partnership in initial teacher education. In Booth, M., Furlong, V.J., and Wilkin, M. (eds.) *Partnership in initial teacher training*, London: Cassel, pp. 110-127.

McIntyre, D. and Hagger, H. (2018) Mentoring: Challenges for the future. In Hagger, H. and McIntyre, D. (eds.) *Mentors in Schools (1996)*, London: Routledge, pp. 144-164.

McIntyre, J. and Hobson, A.J. (2016) 'Supporting beginner teacher identity development: external mentors and the third space.' *Research Papers in Education*, 31(2) pp. 133-158.

McLaughlin, E., Clarke, J. and Cochrane, A. (1994) *Managing social policy*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

McMahan, S., Fredrickson, R.R. and Dunlap, K. (2018) Faculty mentoring through the preservice to in-service teacher pipeline. In Kent, A.M. and Green, A.M. (eds.) *Perspectives on mentoring. Across the domains: Examining best practices in mentoring public school educators throughout the professional journey*. IAP Information Age Publishing, pp. 1-18.

McNamara, O., Jones, M. and Murray, J. (2014a) Framing workplace learning. In McNamara, O., Jones, M. and Murray, J. (eds.) *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education: International policy and practice.* New York: Springer Nature, pp. 1-27.

McNamara, O. & J. Murray (2013) The School Direct programme and its implications for research-informed teacher education and teacher educators. In Florian, L. and Pantić, N. (eds.) *Learning to teach.* York: The Higher Education Academy (HEA), pp. 14-19.

McNamara, O., Murray, J. and Jones, M. (2014b) Workplace learning in pre-service teacher education: an English case study. In McNamara, O., Jones, M. and Murray, J. (eds.) *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education: International policy and practice.* New York: Springer Nature, pp. 183-205.

McNamara, O., Murray, J. and Jones, M. (2016) *Workplace learning in teacher education: international practice and policy*. Dordrecht: Springer.

McQuillin, S., Strait, G., Smith, B. and Ingram, A. (2015) 'Brief instrumental school-based mentoring for first-and second-year middle school students: A randomized evaluation.' *Journal of Community Psychology,* 43(7) pp. 885-899.

Mena, J., Hennissen, P. and Loughran, J. (2017) 'Developing pre-service teachers' professional knowledge of teaching: The influence of mentoring.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 66(1) pp. 47-59.

Mendez, S. L., Tygret, J.A., Conley, V.M., Keith, R., Haynes, C. and Gerhardt, R. (2019) 'Emeriti faculty as mentors: the benefits and rewards of mentoring the next generation.' *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* 27(4) pp. 439-457.

Menter, I., Brisard, E. and Smith, I. (2006) *Convergence or divergence? Initial teacher education in Scotland and England*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publication Ltd.

Mincu, M. and Davies, P. (2019) 'The governance of a school network and implications for initial teacher education.' *Journal of Education Policy*, August, pp. 1-18.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K.M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R. and Collazo, T. (2004) 'Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse.' *Reading Research Quarterly,* 39(1) pp. 38-70.

Moor, H., Halsey, K., Jones, M., Martin, K., Stott, A., Brown, C. and Harland, J. (2005) *Professional Development for Teachers Early in Their Careers: An Evaluation of the Early Professional Development Pilot Scheme.* Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.

Moore, A. (2004) *The Good Teacher: Dominant discourses in teaching and teacher Education*. London: Psychology Press.

Munn, P. (2008) 'Building research capacity collaboratively: Can we take ownership of our future?' *British Educational Research Journal,* 34(4) pp. 413-430.

Murray, J. (2002) *Between the chalkface and the ivory towers?: A study of the professionalism of teacher educators working on primary initial teacher education courses in the English university sector*. PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.

Murray, J., Campbell, A., Hextall, I., Hulme, M., Jones, M., Mahony, P., Menter, I., Procter, R. and Wall, K. (2009) 'Research and teacher education in the UK: Building capacity.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 25(7) pp. 944-950.

Murray, J., Lunenberg, M. and Smith, K. (2017) Educating the educators: Policies and initiatives in European teacher education. In Peters, M., Cowie, B. and Menter, I. (eds.) *A Companion to Research in Teacher Education*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 651-666.

Murray, J. and Mutton, T. (2015) Teacher education in England: Change in abundance, continuities in question. In Teacher Education Group (eds.) *Teacher Education in times of Change*, pp. 57-74.

Murray, J., Swennen, A. and Kosnik, C. (2019) International Policy Perspectives on Change in Teacher Education. In Murray, J., Swennen, A. and Kosnik, C. (eds.) *International Research, Policy and Practice in Teacher Education.* Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, pp. 1-13.

Mutton, T., Burn, K. and Menter, I. (2017) 'Deconstructing the Carter review: Competing conceptions of quality in England's 'school-led'system of initial teacher education.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 32(1) pp. 14-33.

Neuman, L. W. (2002) *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Nokes, J.D., Bullough Jr, R.V., Egan, W.M., Birrell, J.R. and Hansen, J.M. (2008) 'The paired-placement of student teachers: An alternative to traditional placements in secondary schools.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 24(8) pp. 2168-2177.

Núñez, J.C., Rosário, P., Vallejo, G. and González-Pienda, J.A. (2013) 'A longitudinal assessment of the effectiveness of a school-based mentoring program in middle school.' *Contemporary Educational Psychology,* 38(1) pp. 11-21.

O'Kelly, J. (2020) *The value of Initial Teacher Education: generating controlled or activist professionalism?.* Doctoral thesis (Ed.D), UCL (University College London).

Oberski, I., Ford, K., Higgins, S. and Fisher, P. (1999) 'The importance of relationships in teacher education.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 25(2) pp. 135-150.

OECD. (2012) *Public and private schools: how management and funding relate to their socio-economic profile*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://www.oecd.org/education/school/programmeforinternationalstudentassessmentpisa/publicandprivateschoolshowmanagementandfundingrelatetotheirsocio-economicprofile.htm

Ofsted. (2019a) *Education inspection framework: overview of research.* London: The Office for Standards in Education. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/education-inspection-framework-overview-of-research

Ofsted. (2019b) *School inspection handbook.* London: The Office for Standards in Education. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-eif

Oftedal Telhaug, A., Asbjørn Mediås, O. and Aasen, P. (2006) 'The Nordic model in education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years.' *Scandinavian journal of educational research,* 50(3) pp. 245-283.

Oldenburg, R. (2001) *Celebrating the third place: Inspiring stories about the great good places at the heart of our communities*. New York, NY: Marlowe & Co.

Orland-Barak, L. (2001a) 'Reading a mentoring situation: one aspect of learning to mentor.' *Teaching and teacher education,* 17(1) pp. 75-88.

Orland-Barak, L. (2001b) 'Learning to mentor as learning a second language of teaching.' *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 31(1) pp. 53-68.

Orland-Barak, L. (2002) 'What's in a case?: What mentors' cases reveal about the practice of mentoring.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 34(4) pp. 451-468.

Orland-Barak, L. (2005) 'Lost in translation: Mentors learning to participate in competing discourses of practice.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 56(4) pp. 355-366.

Orland-Barak, L. and Yinon, H. (2005) 'Sometimes a novice and sometimes an expert: Mentors' professional expertise as revealed through their stories of critical incidents.' *Oxford Review of Education,* 31(4) pp. 557-578.

Ormston, R., Spencer, L., Barnard, M. and Snape, D. (2014) The foundations of qualitative research. In Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., McNaughton, C. and Nicholls, R.O. (eds.) *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers.* Los Angeles (CA): Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 52-55.

O'Brien, J. and Christie, F. (2005) 'Characteristics of support for beginning teachers: evidence from the new Teacher Induction Scheme in Scotland.' *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* 13(2) pp. 189-203.

O'Hear, A. (1998a) Conservatism. In Craig, E. (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* London: Routledge, pp. 609-615.

O'Hear, A. (1998b) Moral education. In Hirst, P.H. and White, P. (eds.) *Philosophy of Education. Major Themes and the Analytic Tradition, (Vol 4) Problems of Educational Content and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Paniagua, A. and Istance, D. (2018) *Teachers as Designers of Learning Environments: The Importance of Innovative Pedagogies*. Educational Research and Innovation, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Patton, M.Q (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publication Ltd.

Patton, M.Q. (2005) *Qualitative research*. Wiley Online Library. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/0470013192.bsa514/full

Peercy, M.M. and Troyan, F.J. (2017) 'Making transparent the challenges of developing a practice-based pedagogy of teacher education.' *Teaching & Teacher Education,* 61(1) pp. 26-36.

Peiser, G., Ambrose, J., Burke, B. and Davenport, J. (2018) 'The role of the mentor in professional knowledge development across four professions.' *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 7(1), pp. 2-18.

Peiser, G., Duncalf, D. and Mallaburn, A. (2019) 'The role of the mentor in an increasingly school-led English initial teacher education policy context.' *Professional Development in Education*, pp. 1-18. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1694053

Pennanen, M., Bristol, L., Wilkinson, J. and Heikkinen, H. (2017) Articulating the practice architectures of collaborative research practice. In Mahon, K,. Francisco, S. and Kemmis, S. (eds.) *Exploring Education and Professional Practice*, 1st ed. Singapore: Springer, pp. 201-217.

Perryman, J., Ball, S.J., Braun, A. and Maguire, M. (2017) 'Translating policy: governmentality and the reflective teacher.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 32(6) pp. 1-12.

Pollard, A. (2007) 'The UK's Teaching and Learning Research Programme: findings and significance'. *BERA*, 33(5) pp. 639-646.

Ponte, P. (2007) Postgraduate education as platform. A conceptualisation. In Swet, J.V,. Ponte, P. and Smit, B.H.J. (eds.) *Postgraduate programmes as platform: A research-led approach*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing Ltd.

Potter, J. and McDougall, J. (2017) *Digital media, culture and education: Theorising third space literacies.* London: Springer.

Prasad, P. (2005) *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk (NY): M.E. Sharpe.

Radice, H. (2013) 'How we got here: UK higher education under neoliberalism.' *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies,* 12(3) pp. 407-418.

Rajuan, M. (2007) 'The role of the cooperating teacher: Bridging the gap between the expectations of cooperating teachers and student teachers.' *Mentoring & tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* 15(3) pp. 223-242.

Ratner, C. (2002) 'Subjectivity and objectivity in qualitative methodology.' *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(3). [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-3.3.829

Rayner, S.M., Courtney, S.J. and Gunter, H.M. (2018) 'Theorising systemic change: learning from the academisation project in England.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 33(1) pp. 143-162.

Reynolds, R., Ferguson-Patrick, K. and McCormack, A. (2013) 'Dancing in the ditches: reflecting on the capacity of a university/school partnership to clarify the role of a teacher educator.' *European Journal of Teacher Education,* 36(3) pp. 307-319.

Richardson Bruna, K. (2009) 'Jesus and Maria in the jungle: an essay on possibility and constraint in the third-shift third space.' *Cultural Studies of Science Education,* 4(1) pp. 221-237.

Richter, D., Kunter, M., Lüdtke, O., Klusmann, U., Anders, Y. and Baumert, J. (2013) 'How different mentoring approaches affect beginning teachers' development in the first years of practice.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 36, November, pp. 166-177.

Ridder, H.G. (2017) 'The theory contribution of case study research designs.' *Business Research,* 10(2) pp. 281-305.

Rippon, J. and Martin, M. (2006) 'What makes a good induction supporter?.' *Teaching and teacher education,* 22(1) pp. 84-99.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C.M. and Ormston, R. (2013) *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Roberts, D. L. (2019) 'Mentoring in the academic library.' *College & research libraries news,* 47(2) pp. 117-119.

Robinson, I. (1999) 'Learning to live with inconsistency in student entitlement and partnership provision.' *Mentoring & tutoring for partnership in learning,* 7(3) pp. 223-239.

Roehrig, A. D., Bohn, C.M., Turner, J.E. and M. Pressley, M. (2008) 'Mentoring beginning primary teachers for exemplary teaching practices.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 24(3) pp. 684-702.

Rorrison, D. (2008) *Jumping through spinning hoops: Stories of the middle school and secondary practicum*. Melbourne: Cengage Learning.

Ross, E.W. and Gibson, R.J. (2007) *Neoliberalism and education reform*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Rönnerman, K., Salo, P., Furu, E.M., Lund, T., Olin, A. andJakhelln, R. (2016) 'Bringing ideals into dialogue with practices: on the principles and practices of the Nordic Network for Action Research.' *Educational Action Research,* 24(1) pp. 46-64.

Ruohotie-Lyhty, M. (2016) Stories of Change and Continuity: Understanding the Development of the Identities of Foreign Language Teachers. In Kalaja, P., Barcelos, A.M.F., Aro, M. and Ruohotie-Lyhty, M. (eds.) *Beliefs, Agency and Identity in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 172-201.

Sachs, J. (2001) 'Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes.' *Journal of education policy,* 16(2) pp. 149-161.

Sahlberg, P. (2010) 'The secret to Finland's success: Educating teachers.' *Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education,* 2, September, pp. 1-8.

Salvio, P.M. and Boldt, G.M. (2009) 'A democracy tempered by the rate of exchange': Audit culture and the sell-out of progressive writing curriculum.' *English in Education,* 43(2) pp. 113-128.

Sandefur, W.S. and Nicklas, W.L. (1981) 'Competency-based teacher education in AACTE institutions: An update.' *The Phi Delta Kappan,* 62(10) pp. 747-748.

Sandholtz, J.H. and Reilly, B. (2004) 'Teachers, not technicians: Rethinking technical expectations for teachers.' *Teachers College Record,* 106(3) pp. 487-512.

Sandywell, B. (2013) *Reflexivity and the crisis of Western reason: logological investigations: volume one*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Sarı, M. and Yolcu, E. (2017) 'Views of Pre-Service Teachers on Profession: Technician or Professional?' *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences,* 9(1) pp. 13-26.

Sato, M. and Loewen, S. (2019) 'Do teachers care about research? The research–pedagogy dialogue.' *ELT Journal,* 73(1), pp. 1-10.

Schleicher, A. (ed.) (2012) *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world*. OECD Publishing.

Schneider, R. (2008) 'Mentoring new mentors: Learning to mentor preservice science teachers.' *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 19(2) pp. 113-116.

Schön, D. (1983) *The reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schubert, C.B. and H. Martens, H. (2005) *The Nordic model: A recipe for European success?*. Brussels: European Policy Centre.

Schuck, S., Kearney, M. and Burden, K. (2017) 'Exploring mobile learning in the Third Space.' *Technology, Pedagogy and Education,* 26(2) pp. 121-137.

Schutz, A. (1967) *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Seidman, I. (2006) *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and The Social Sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shankar, A. and Goulding, C. (2001) 'Interpretive consumer research: two more contributions to theory and practice.' *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal,* 4(1) pp. 7-16.

Sharma, G. (2018) 'Teacher education and future needs.' *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences,* 8(3) pp. 890-896.

Shaw, J.T. (2018) 'Alleviating praxis shock: Induction policy and programming for urban music educators.' *Arts Education Policy Review,* 119(1) pp. 25-35.

Shulman, L.S. (1987) 'Knowledge and teaching', *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1) pp. 1-21.

Shulman, L.S. (2005) 'Signature pedagogies in the professions.' *Daedalus,* 134(3) pp. 52-59.

Shulman, L.S. (1986) 'Those who understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching.' *Educational Researcher*, 15(2) pp. 4-14.

Simmie, G.M., De Paor, C., Liston, J. and O'Shea, J. (2017) 'Discursive positioning of beginning teachers' professional learning during induction: A critical literature review from 2004 to 2014.' *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,* 45(5) pp. 505-519.

Simpson, T., Hastings, W. and Hill, B. (2007) 'I knew that she was watching me': the professional benefits of mentoring.' *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice,* 13(5) pp. 481-498.

Smith, K. and Ulvik, M. 2014. Learning to teach in Norway: A shared responsibility. In McNamara, O. (ed.) *Workplace learning in teacher education*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 261-277.

Smith, K. and Hodson, E. (2010) 'Theorising practice in initial teacher education.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 36(3) pp. 259-275.

Smith, K. and Maclay, M. (2007) 'Curates' eggs? Secondary trainee teachers' experience of the Graduate Teacher Programme and the Postgraduate Certificate in Education.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 33(1) pp. 35-54.

Smith, T. and Ingersoll, R. (2004) 'What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover?' *American Educational Research Journal,* 41(3) pp. 681-714.

Sorensen, P. (2014) 'Collaboration, dialogue and expansive learning: The use of paired and multiple placements in the school practicum.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 44(1) pp. 128-137.

Spencer, I. (2013) 'Doing the 'second shift': gendered labour and the symbolic annihilation of teacher educators' work.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 39(3) pp. 301-313.

Spooner-Lane, R. (2017) 'Mentoring beginning teachers in primary schools: research review.' *Professional Development in Education,* 43(2) pp. 253-273.

Stitzlein, S.M. and West, C.K. (2014) 'New forms of teacher education: Connections to charter schools and their approaches.' *Democracy and Education*, 22(2), pp. 1-10.

Stoker, G. (2017) *Transforming local governance: from Thatcherism to New Labour.* Hampshire: Macmillan International Higher Education.

Strauss, A. L. (1987) *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stronach, I., Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S. and Warne, T. (2002) 'Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux.' *Journal of Education Policy,* 17(1) pp. 109-138.

Struthers, D. (2017) The Challenge of School-Led Teacher Education for Those Working within Traditional Teacher Education Partnerships: A Case of Roman Riding. In Cozza, B. and Blessinger, P. (eds.) *University Partnerships for Pre-Service and Teacher Development.* Bingley, UK: Emerald Group, pp. 161-176.

Sucuoğlu, H. (2018) Design and Implementation of Mentoring Programs. In Dikilitaş, K., Mede, E. and Atay, D. (eds.) *Mentorship Strategies in Teacher Education*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global, pp. 284-296.

Sundli, L. (2007) 'Mentoring- A new mantra for education?' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 23(2) pp. 201-214.

Svojanovsky, P. (2017) 'Supporting student teachers' reflection as a paradigm shift process.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 66(1) pp. 338-348.

Tadajewski, M. (2006) 'Remembering motivation research: toward an alternative genealogy of interpretive consumer research.' *Marketing Theory,* 6(4) pp. 429-466.

Talbot, D. (2018) Distinguishing spaces of mentoring: Mentoring as praxis. In Kriewaldt, J,. Ambrosetti, A,. Rorrison, D. and Capeness, R. (eds.) *Educating future teachers: Innovative perspectives in professional experience*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 91-103.

Tang, S.Y., Wong, A.K., Li, D.D. and Cheng, M.M. (2019) 'Examining student teachers' engagement with the theory-practice link in initial teacher education.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 45(2) pp. 123-139.

Taylor, S.J., Bogdan, R. and DeVault, M. (2015) *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Taylor, W. (2000) The role of the providers. In Reid, I. (ed.) *Improving schools: The contribution of teacher education and training: an account of the joint UCET/HMI Symposium, Edinburgh, December.* London: UCET.

Teach First. (2017) *Mentor Handbook for England (2017-2018).* London: Teach First internal document. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.teachfirst.org.uk/sites/default/files/2017-12/Futures_Mentor_Handbook_Print_2017_FINAL_DIGITALv2.pdf

Teach First. (2020). *Programme structure.* London: Teach First internal document. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] https://www.teachfirst.org.uk/knowledge-base/about-the-programme/programme-structure

Teacher Education Exchange. (2017) *Teacher development 3.0: How we can transform the professional education of teachers* London: TEE. [Online] [Accessed on 12th June 2020] www.teachereducationexchange.com/publications

Tetnowski, J. (2015) 'Qualitative case study research design.' *Perspectives on Fluency and Fluency Disorders,* 25(1) pp. 39-45.

Thompson, C. (2016) 'The magic of mentoring: a democratic approach to mentoring trainee teachers in post-compulsory education.' *Research in Post-Compulsory Education,* 21(3) pp. 246-259.

Tolan, P.H., Henry, D.B., Schoeny, M.S., Lovegrove, P and Nichols, E. (2014) 'Mentoring programs to affect delinquency and associated outcomes of youth at risk: A comprehensive meta-analytic review.' *Journal of Experimental Criminology,* 10(2) pp. 179-206.

Tomlinson, P. (2019) *Mentor Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Mentoring Strategies*. PhD thesis, School of Education, Walden University.

Townsend, T. and Bates, R. (2007) *Handbook of teacher education: globalisation, standards and professionalism in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Tröhler, D. (2017) The paradox of being a teacher: Institutionalized relevance and organized mistrust. In Siljander, P,. Kontio, K. and Pikkarainen, E. (eds.) *Schools in Transition: Linking Past, Present, and Future in Educational Pratice*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 79-95.

Tseng, V. (2012) 'The Uses of Research in Policy and Practice and commentaries.' *Social policy report*, 26(2) pp. 1-24.

Tuchman, G. (2000) The symbolic annihilation of women by the mass media. In Crothers L. and Lockhart, C. (eds.) *Culture and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 150-174.

Tynjälä, P. and Heikkinen, H.L. (2011) 'Beginning teachers' transition from pre-service education to working life: Theoretical perspectives and best practices.' *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft,* 14(1) pp. 11-33.

Ulvik, M., Smith, K. and Helleve, I. (2009) 'Novice in secondary school–the coin has two sides.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 25(6) pp. 835-842.

Valencia, S., Martin, S., Place, N. and Grossman, P. (2009) 'Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning.' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3) pp. 304-322.

Valenzuela, A. (2005) *Leaving children behind: How" Texas-style" accountability fails Latino youth*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Valenčič, M. and Vogrinc, J. (2007) 'A mentor's aid in developing the competences of teacher trainees.' *Educational studies,* 33(4) pp. 373-384.

Van de Ven, P. H. (2011) Reflections from a Dutch Perspective. In Mattsson, M., Eilertsen, T.V. and Rorrison, D. (eds.) *A Practicum Turn in Teacher Education,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 187-209.

Van Maanen, J. (1995) *Representation in ethnography*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Van Maanen, J. (2011) *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vanassche, E. and Kelchtermans, G. (2014) 'Teacher educators' professionalism in practice: Positioning theory and personal interpretative framework.' *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 44(1) pp. 117-127.

Veenman, S. (1984) 'Perceived problems of beginning teachers.' *Review of Educational Research,* 54(2) pp. 143-178.

Välijärvi, J. and Heikkinen, H. (2012) Peer-group mentoring and the culture of teacher education in Finland. In Heikkinen, H., Jokinen, H. and Tynjälä, P. (eds.) *Peer-Group mentoring for Teacher Development.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 31-40.

Waitoller, F.R. and Artiles, A.J. (2016) 'Teacher learning as curating: Becoming inclusive educators in school/university partnerships.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59(1) pp. 360-371.

Wang, J. and Odell, S.J. (2002) 'Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review.' *Review of Educational Research,* 72(3) pp. 481-546.

Wang, J., Odell, S.J. and Schwille, S.A. (2008) 'Effects of teacher induction on beginning teachers' teaching: A critical review of the literature.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 59(2) pp. 132-152.

Warner, M. (2015) 'Learning My Lesson: The Disfiguring of Higher Education.' *London Review of Books,* 37(6) pp. 8-14.

Waterhouse, J., McLaughlin, C., McLellan, R. and Morgan, B. (2009) Communities of enquiry as a third space: Exploring theory and practice. In: *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, 2-5 September, University of Manchester*. Manchester. [Online] [Accessed on 12th September 2020] https://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/research/projects/super/pubs.html

Webb, P.T. (2002) Teacher power: The exercise of professional autonomy in an era of strict accountability. *Teacher Development,* 6(1) pp. 47-62.

Weiss, C.H. (1979) 'The many meanings of research utilization.' *Public Administration Review,* 39(5) pp. 426-431.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York:Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R.A. and Snyder, W. (2002) *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

West, A. (2015) 'Education policy and governance in England under the Coalition Government (2010–15): Academies, the pupil premium, and free early education.' *London Review of Education*, 13(2) pp. 21-36.

Westbury, I., Hopmann, S. and Riquarts, K. (2012) *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition*. New York and London: Routledge.

Whitty, G. (2000) 'Teacher professionalism in new times*.' Journal of InService Education*, 26(2) pp. 281-295.

Whitty, G. (2006) 'Teacher professionalism in a new era.' *Paper presented at the first General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland Annual Lecture, Belfast, March 2006*. London: Institute of Education, UCL.

Whitty, G. (2014) 'Recent developments in teacher training and their consequences for the 'University Project' in education.' *Oxford Review of Education,* 40(4) pp. 466-481.

Whitty, G., Anders, J., Hayton, A., Wisby, E. and Tang, S. (2016). *Research and policy in education: evidence, ideology and impact*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Whitty, G., Power, S. and Halpin, D. (1998) *Devolution & Choice in Education: The School, the State, and the Market.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Whitty, G. and Wisby, E (2006) 'Moving beyond recent education reform—and towards a democratic professionalism.' *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies,* 38(1) pp. 43-61.

Wilkins, C. (2009) 'The Masters Level Teaching Profession: Enhancing or Managing Professionalism?' *In European conference educational research.* Vienna, Austria, September 2009.

Wilkinson, J., Olin, A., Lund, T., Ahlberg, A. and Nyvaller, M. (2010) 'Leading praxis: Exploring educational leadership through the lens of practice architectures.' *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* 18(1) pp. 67-79.

Williams, J., White, S., Forgasz, R. and Grimmett, H. 2018. Stories from the Third Space: Teacher Educators' Professional Learning in a School/University Partnership. In Fitzgerald, A., Parr, G. and Williams, J. (eds.) *Re-Imagining Professional Experience in Initial Teacher Education*, 1st ed. Singapore: Springer, pp. 19-36.

Wilson, V. (2014) 'Examining teacher education through cultural-historical activity theory.' *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal (TEAN),* 6(1) pp. 20-29.

Wilson, V. and Nel, M. (2019) 'Identities in transition: professional identity construction by student teachers in England and South Africa at the end of their university-based training.' *Southern African Review of Education with Education with Production*, 25(1) pp. 52-69.

Wright, A. (2012) 'Fantasies of empowerment: mapping neoliberal discourse in the coalition government's schools policy.' *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(3) pp. 279-294.

Wright, N. and Bottery, M. (1997) 'Perceptions of professionalism by the mentors of student teachers.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 23(3) pp. 235-252.

Wright, T. (2017) *How to be a brilliant trainee teacher*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Wrigley, T. (2015) 'Evidence-based teaching: Rhetoric and reality'. *Improving Schools,* 18(3) pp. 277-287.

Wrigley, T. and McCusker, S. (2019) 'Evidence-based teaching: a simple view of "science".' *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 25(1-2) pp. 110-126.

Yates, C. (2017) *Mentor Teachers as Teacher Educators: A Qualitative Study of Educative Mentoring*. PhD thesis, Michigan State University.

Yin, R.K. and Campbell, D.T. (2018) *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications Ltd.

Zanting, A., Verloop, N., Vermunt, J.D and Van Driel, J.H. (1998) 'Explicating practical knowledge: An extension of mentor teachers' roles.' *European Journal of Teacher Education,* 21(1) pp. 11-28.

Zeichner, K. (2006) 'Reflections of a university-based teacher educator on the future of college-and university-based teacher education.' *Journal of teacher education,* 57(3) pp. 326-340.

Zeichner, K. (2010) 'Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 61(1-2) pp. 89-99.

Zeichner, K. (2014) .The struggle for the soul of teaching and teacher education in the USA.' *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 40(5) pp. 551-568.

Zeichner, K. (2019) 'Preparing Teachers as Democratic Professionals.' *Action in Teacher Education***,** 42(1) pp. 38-48.

Zeichner, K. and Conklin, H. (2017) 'Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Raising the quality of the debate in teacher education.' *Teachers College Record,* 119(4) pp. 103-138.

Zeichner, K., Payne, K.A. and Brayko, K. (2015) 'Democratizing teacher education.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 66(2) pp. 122-135.

Zwozdiak-Myers, P., Cameron, K., Mustard, C., Leask, M. and Green, A. (2010) *Literature review: analysis of current research, theory and practice in partnership working to identify constituent components of effective ITT partnerships.* London: Brunel University.