

## Thinking Practice: CPD as Ethical Work

*Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education*

School of Education

University of Stirling

Claire Dewhirst

## **Abstract**

This study draws upon a methodological approach based on the use of objects to explore the experiences of a group of teachers undertaking a Masters-level Continuing Professional Development programme. Eight Respondents were invited to bring three objects to their interview that represented significant aspects of their practice in relation to the course. These objects afforded an exploration of respondents' views, experiences and consideration of the impact of the programme on their professional identities. In order to engage analytically with the data the work draws upon notions of spatiality as well as the later work of Foucault on truth and subject formation.

The thesis considers the role of professional learning as shaped by the current policy process and, how professional learning is, in turn, shaped by the teachers undertaking the course. Such a consideration allows for a methodological take on the CPD process as one whereby people, as well as objects, such as 'standards', play equally important roles.

In drawing upon the later work of Foucault (1984a, 1984b) analysis of the data considered the ways in which the practices of the course that the teachers engaged with (*Askēsis*) lead to a desire to speak their mind and express ideals of truth about educational practice (*Parrhēsia*). This means that in *thinking* about their practice through the activities and processes of the programme encourages the development of the ethical work of the teacher. In the light of such problematisation, this study encourages a rethinking of both policy and practice and argues for a change in the discourse of education from the concept of professional development to that of professional learning within a relational and ethical framing.

## **Acknowledgments**

Firstly I would like to thank my Principal Supervisor, Dr. John I'Anson, who has been both patient and supportive throughout this process. John has been continually sensitive in our supervisions for which I am thankful. Furthermore I am grateful to my second supervisor, Professor Julie Allan, for her wealth of experience and challenging discussions. I would like to acknowledge Professors Peter Cope and Nick Boreham, now both retired, of the School of Education. Both Peter and Nick encouraged me to actively engage in academic life many years ago.

I am exceptionally grateful to those teachers who were willing to be part of this study: many of whom have gone on to undertake Doctoral work themselves. I would like to thank colleagues, many of whom have become friends, both past and present who have made life and work in a university environment a memorable experience full of discussion, debate and laughter.

<b>Table of Contents</b>	
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter One: The Personal and Professional Context</b>	<b>9</b>
1.0 Introduction	9
1.1 The Rationale	12
1.2 The Personal Context	13
1.3 Professional Development	17
1.4 The Professional Context: The Role of Policy	23
1.4.1 Shifting Notions of Professionalism: The Framing of Professional Development through ‘Standards’	23
1.4.2 The Policy Process and the Development of Post-Graduate Courses	32
1.4.3 Scottishness and the Development of a Nation: The Dynamics of Power and Knowledge	37
1.5 Do (Professional) Actions Speak Louder than (Professional) Words?	39
1.6 What is Professional Enquiry?	42
1.7 A Summary Overview of the Study	47
1.8 Summary	49
<b>Chapter Two: The Literature Context</b>	<b>50</b>
2.0 Introduction	50
2.1 The Changing Face of Professionalism	51

2.2	Teacher Identities	64
2.3	Teacher Agency: Ontology and Epistemology	68
2.4	Continuing Professional Development	73
2.5	Models of Professional Learning	82
2.6	Compulsory Reflection: Confessional Practices	86
2.7	Conclusion	91
	<b>Chapter Three: Methodology</b>	<b>93</b>
3.0	Introduction	93
3.1	The Research Questions	95
3.2	Sample	96
3.3	Ontology and Epistemology	102
3.4	Digging Deep: The use of ‘Objects’	103
3.5	Interviews and ‘Objects’	106
3.6	Ethics and Data Collection	112
3.7	Spatiality and Data Analysis	113
3.8	Conclusion	115
	<b>Chapter Four: Spatial Analysis through Thirdspace</b>	<b>116</b>
4.0	Introduction	116
4.1	Spatial Theory as an Analytical Tool	116
4.2	A First Reading of the Data: Mobility Between Spaces	124
4.3	Moments of Intensities / Space Shifting	132
4.4	Conclusion	145
	<b>Chapter Five: Beyond Thirdspace: Spatial Analysis through the lens of Foucault</b>	<b>148</b>

5.0	Introduction	148
5.1	Foucault: The Government of Self and Others	149
5.2	A Second Reading of the Data: The Ethical Work of the Teacher	153
5.3	Ethics and Agency	165
5.4	Four Dimensions of Ethical Practice	168
5.5	Transgressions and Intensifications	174
5.6	Conclusion	176
	<b>Chapter Six: ‘Othering’ CPD: Conclusions, Contributions to Knowledge and Further Research</b>	<b>179</b>
6.0	Introduction	179
6.1	Agency and Thinking Practice: CPD as ethical work	180
6.2	Professional Learning / Professional Development: Implications for Providers of CPD	183
6.3	The Policy Process: How Good is Our CPD?	188
6.4	Professional Development as Ethical Work: Relational and Ethical Practices	192
6.5	Contributions of the Research Process	195
6.6	Reflections on Personal Learning	197
6.7	Conclusion	199
	<b>References</b>	<b>201</b>
	<b>Appendix A: Course Structure and Content</b>	<b>214</b>

## **List of Abbreviations**

CT	Chartered Teacher
SCT	Standard for Chartered Teacher
HMIE	Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education
GTCS	The General Teaching Council for Scotland
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CPL	Continuing Professional Learning
PRD	Professional Review and Development
SFR	Standard for Full Registration
HGIOS	How Good is our School?
SITE	Standard for Initial Teacher Education
SQH	Standard for Headship in Scotland
SEED	Scottish Executive Education Department
PD	Professional Development
PL	Professional Learning
PE	Professional Enquiry
PT	Principal Teacher
LEAs	Local Education Authorities
QIOs	Quality Improvement Officer
SMT	Senior Management Team

## **List of Tables**

Table 1: The Standard for Chartered Teacher	<b>85</b>
Table 2: Profiles of the Participants in the Study	<b>97</b>
Table 3: The nature of space	<b>120</b>
Table 4: The objects brought to interview by the teachers	<b>127</b>



## **Chapter One: The Personal and Professional Context**

### **1.0 Introduction**

In this chapter the rationale and personal context for this study will be outlined. This study will consider how a process of academic study impacts upon professional practices and identities. Much of this will focus on a consideration of how professionals learn and the relevance of this question to notions of professional learning and professional development. As part of the broader context for the work this chapter will explore a range of complex issues that have governed the construction of professional development through the policy process in Scotland, for example, the Donaldson Review (Scottish Government, 2011a). Such issues include the manner in which shifting notions of professionalism have shaped the current framing of professional development through standards and the associated development of post-graduate courses. This is important as the links between policy and practice shape our understanding of how agendas around accountability develop. As a result of this exploration the chapter ends with a reflection on the construction of professional enquiry which is central to this study and the identification of the importance of relational and ethical elements of practice in exploring the professional practice of teachers.

Given the ubiquitous nature of global educational change and the increasingly explicit focus on the accountability of teachers, the role of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) of teachers has continued to promote debate in recent years. The key questions of this debate tend to centre around the how and why of CPD as well as considerations of what difference such input makes – and to whom. CPD policy discourses tend to focus on

the ‘development’ of teachers, rather than their learning. Furthermore policy is often connected with notions of raising attainment – which has become associated with the discourses of educational effectiveness and improvement. Much of this discussion and debate has focused around policy makers and the wider population at large (those considered to be the stakeholders in education) – rather than the needs and views of those involved at the very heart of the process – the teachers. If questions about CPD are shifted to focus on teachers then how teachers experience the processes of CPD and what this means for their identities and professional practice become fore-fronted. As such this study is about the dynamics of learning and the associated relations and tensions between all of those (human and non-human) that are part of the CPD process.

Within such a context this study was undertaken at a time in Scottish Education when the role of CPD was yet again being discussed in the policy process (Scottish Government, 2011a, 2011b). In 2010 the Scottish Government established a Review of Teacher Education in Scotland that, as part of its focus, considered the role of Masters-level CPD. As a result, this study is based on interviews with eight teachers on the completion of their Masters degrees in Education at the University of Stirling. The aim of the study was to consider how a process of academic study, such as this, had impacted upon professional practices and identities. As such the initial questions that arose were ‘*Had this academic study made any differences to how individuals practiced as teachers?*’ ‘*What had this meant for their engagement in practice and professional identities?*’ And ‘*what had this meant for their professional development?*’ Following on from this the research questions for this study developed as follows:

1. How do teachers locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational spaces?
2. How do formal discourses (such as those shaped by the government and providers of CPD) construct the aims of CPD and professional identities?
3. (i) How do teachers account for the effects of formal professional development on themselves and other actors? (ii) How might engaging with theory shed further light on the processes involved in CPD?
4. (i) To what extent are the relational and ethical foregrounded in accounts given by respondents? (ii) What theoretical sense might be made of these?

Additionally a number of objectives were developed around these research questions to focus the work of this thesis:

- i. To ascertain the views of practitioners in regard to their experience of engaging with a Masters level programme of CPD
- ii. To consider how engaging with theoretical resources might shed further light on the processes and discourses of learning at Masters level
- iii. To explore the value of relational and ethical practices in professional learning
- iv. To make recommendations as to the form that CPD at Masters level might take that takes into account the considerations of practitioners

Much of the contextual work of questions one, three and four will be explored in Chapters one and two with the analysis being undertaken in Chapters four and five. Question two will be explored more fully in Chapters one, two and six.

## **1.1 The Rationale**

It could be argued that the policy agenda around the appearance of the Standard for Chartered Teacher (SCT) (SEED, 2002a), over ten years ago, allowed teachers to experience a form of professional development that had previously not existed. More recent policy discourse suggests, however, that CPD for teachers in this area has not been delivered as effectively as it might have (Scottish Government, 2011a, 2011b). Although this view has been contested (Smith, 2011). However, whilst standards such as Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH) (SEED, 2005) afford legitimacy through the profile of the individual in their school, other forms of Masters-level study has seen individuals changing their professional identity in a more difficult, somewhat fuzzy and hostile environment. This brings to the fore the need to engage with the role, aims and value of professional development for teachers.

The shifting policy agenda over recent years has meant that teachers in Scotland, as well as globally, have faced an increasing emphasis on career-long CPD. It is important to carefully consider the relationship with the academic Masters level course that has developed in Scotland, its role and future developments. As part of this it is also important to consider if such academic courses, based upon and developed around a defined policy-driven standard, are relevant to those teachers undertaking study and to consider what

impact, if any, such a course may have – and on whom. This is relevant in terms of how teachers engage in professional lifelong learning and the focus of such engagement for teachers. Additionally, unpacking what learning takes place, and the value of this, in post-graduate courses, and why, is a key focus of this study.

## **1.2 The Personal Context**

Texts in many shapes and forms undertake institutional work in terms of both identities creation and professional contexts (Brown *et al.*, 2012). By the time that this research was started I had been teaching in secondary education for ten years. For six of those years I had been a Principal Teacher. I then joined the School of Education at the University of Stirling and had been in post for three years as a tutor. As part of my role as a tutor I was involved in the development of the MEd Professional Enquiry in Education (see Appendix A). This Masters course was created to allow teachers to both achieve a Masters level award as well as Chartered Teacher status within a three-year period. My involvement centred around the development of the course as well as teaching and assessing on the programme.

Within all of these contexts my practice had been shaped by texts that defined what was considered to be appropriate behaviour for teachers by those who were at the helm of educational change. However, the tensions that existed within, and around, such texts were less obvious. Initially, at the start of my career such texts provided a focus on the importance and power of ‘knowledge’. Alongside this CPD tended to be subject-based (for example subject-based conferences) rather than pedagogical. With the onset of ‘Higher Still’ (HMSO, 1994) at the time and a reshaping of the Higher and Advanced Higher

courses there was a need to get up-to-speed with new course content. Knowledge, rather than pedagogy, ruled within this educational context. Policy dominated over theory in guiding practice and, as many argued, neither informed the other. The ‘hearts and minds’ of teaching, which had a focus on *folk pedagogy* (Bruner, 1996) and the experience base of teacher education was lost in a policy agenda keen to improve standards in Scottish school (cf. HMIE, 2007). Theory that informed practice was simply not a priority for educational policy at that time.

These texts, that shape practice, are, as noted above, often institutional-based and as such are carefully controlled ways of expressing views of reason and belief, often implicitly, of those in power. Many schools, and wider educational spaces, published public documents, for example, that expressed the aims and values of their learning communities. Such texts can become a narrowly defined list of competences or activities that shape what it is to be a ‘good’ teacher. As such these texts become powerful actors in the educational setting. With such a negative discourse it can be easy to focus on the lack of achievement in individual practice. Brown *et al.* (2012) suggest that there are three forms of logic, which draw upon the work of Aristotle, and are often used in such texts that shape our practice: *ethos* (moralizing), *pathos* (emotion-evoking) and *logos* (an appeal to the logic). Whichever approach is adopted in the creation of a text, such strategies often reconfigure relations of power and knowledge. Indeed it can be considered that such forms of argument can provide tensions between texts, and those on whom such texts act. Here, then, tensions started to arise within my development as a teacher between the *logos* approach key to the policy texts of teacher education and additionally the school community slant towards *pathos* (often reflected in texts such as school mission statements). Furthermore a third tension existed within the policy arena through the growing role of the GTCS in the

organisation and registration of teachers, which, whilst adopting an explicit *logos* approach also had a deep underpinning current of *ethos* (cf. GTCS, 2002b). Over the years policy texts from the government and associated bodies such as HMIE have focused on the rational approach with a desire for efficient and effective outcomes of *logos*. Such an approach often provides a tension with regards to the moral approach of *ethos* that many teachers follow through a development of practice that is based on what they feel is the right way to manage learning for those in front of them. Any approach that encourages either *pathos* or *ethos* may encourage a loss of power for those developing key policies as this would suggest a more active role for the teacher. Indeed, a *logos* approach, which focuses on efficiency often has targeted and specific recommendations, such as *How Good is our School?* (HMIE, 2007) and therefore allows little scope for disagreement, rather it encourages compliance within a narrow framework of what it is to be ‘good’. And, as such, this impacted upon my own development as a teacher.

Either way, texts are a form of formal power (Brown *et al.*, 2012) and approaches to pedagogy within the policy arena at this time were few and far between. Where these did exist there tended to be a focus on the processes and purposes of assessment, for example, approaches such as *Assessment is for Learning*, as well as around how power relationships developed with learners in the classroom under the guise of behaviour management. However, the texts that underpin such strategies were often rhetorical in nature and drew upon limited research evidence, if any. As such there was little with which to guide thinking beyond what was *not happening* for learners in classrooms and the deficit nature of one’s own practice. It could be argued that this is a clear focus on the deficit rhetoric of ‘developing’ teachers. In part this might have been generated by the confessional nature of what was quite basic reflective practice: a CPD process which was becoming more popular

at the time – but within a rigid accountability agenda. And, as such, is the justification for a *logos* approach to reflection that results in a rhetorically simplistic description of a complex activity.

Texts, with a focus on *logos*, tend to create and shape compliant teachers within a narrowly define competence-based approach. Many teachers excelled at engaging with policy initiatives such as *How Good is our School* (HMIE, 2007). The accountability agenda has developed and embedded within policy throughout my teaching career and, in some ways, it is the only policy process that has impacted upon, and been allowed to impact upon, my professional life.

Texts can also often perform a political role (Brown *et al.*, 2012), and one that is significant in this context. Scotland is a small Nation that is continuing to develop its nationhood. As such there is an increasingly important aspect of ownership, especially with the Scotland Act of 1998 leading to education becoming a devolved power of the Scottish Parliament. As educators working in Scotland, whether the baggage was implicit or not, perceived or reality, could be significant in how teachers engaged with the policy process that followed. As Menter *et al.* (2004: 197) suggest: “there is a greater level of continuity and personal relationship within the policy community, which has facilitated a powerful alliance against the common (‘auld’) enemy to the south”. Whilst this may appear noble on the surface it is a discourse that encourages an emphasis on sticking together and not questioning the policy agenda in order to enhance the greater good of the developing nation. Indeed, Menter *et al.* (2004) develop their argument of the Scottish education system being an important symbol of nationhood, and one that has instilled a more collaborative and participatory policy process. Rather it might be that a *logos*



argument has been carefully constructed to appear as an argument of *pathos* – a clever use of rhetoric within the policy process.

Involvement in the development of the Masters-level CPD course at Stirling led to personal questions about the value of such courses in relation to the policy context in which teachers functioned. It was these thoughts that resulted in this research because the very nature of what it is to be a teacher and to think through practice is paramount to what happens in classrooms. As such this research considers if those teachers who had undertaken the course felt that Masters level work had impacted upon their practice and in what ways. As such, and underpinning this research, there is also a need to explore the current discourses of professional development and the associated policy texts.

### **1.3 Professional Development**

Unpacking the rhetoric of the discourse around Professional Development (PD) is essential in exploring the construction of 'PD' within 'CPD'. Webster-Wright (2009) discusses the need to shift the current rhetoric around delivering and evaluating professional development programmes towards one of understanding and supporting authentic professional learning (PL). In other words there is a need to move away from what is delivered through professional development to a question of how professionals learn and the relevance of this question to PL. Campbell, A. (2003) supports this view by arguing that CPD is often seen as something that is 'done to teachers', an opinion supported by the Donaldson Review (Scottish Government, 2011a). Webster-Wright (2009) draws upon a number of authors (*cf.* Brookfield, 1995, Lave and Wenger, 1991) to explore the idea that Professional Learning should be based upon a learning community that can provide

problem-based, situated learning in a critical process that engages with the implicit assumptions about taken-for-granted practices. Again, a view not only supported by the Donaldson Review (Scottish Government, 2011a) but also by the literature review that was undertaken to support the Donaldson Review (Menter *et al.*, 2010). This is in opposition to what Webster-Wright (2009) considers the current status quo of programmes that are didactic and knowledge-focused within a framework of control and standardisation. Such frameworks are often, as Campbell, A. (2003) notes, about supporting the development of policy initiatives rather than the desires of teachers. Webster-Wright (2009) also believes that the term professional development is, in itself, one that focuses on the professional as deficient and in need of being developed and directed. As Webster-Wright (2009: 704) goes on to note: “the stated aim of much professional development is improvement in practice toward competent or even ‘accomplished’ practice”: a process that is clearly underpinned by an outcomes and competence approach and one that does not give ownership of the process of teaching and learning to teachers. Webster-Wright (2009) suggests the adoption of the notion of professional learning (PL) as a definition that accepts that learning comes from range of experiences, indeed any experience, including CPD where the professional considers that they have learnt something. Such a construction is far more undefined, fluid and embodied in the work of a teacher – and therefore far harder to quantify, control and manage.

Professional Development, at the time of this study, was embedded within a number of policy texts. A series of supporting publications emerged, not least of which was Professional Review and Development (SEED, 2002b) and Continuing Professional Development (SEED, 2002c). Both of which highlight the notion that maintaining high-quality practice is the responsibility of the professional through achieving and maintaining

the requirements of professional standards and registration procedures (Webster-Wright, 2009). Kirk *et al.* (2003) argue that it has been a failing of Scottish education not to have in place a systematic national system to support the CPD of teachers. The aim of this policy process was to provide such a framework. And yet, more recently the Donaldson Review (Scottish Government, 2011a) noted that such a process had not been fully embedded nor adopted, and, as such, suggested that the GTCS take the lead on the development of ‘active’ registration. As such it is important to consider what an appropriate CPD system would be for teachers and why it should be enforced in the way that is it encouraged to be so. This is something that this research will consider.

The aim of the first of the documents, Professional Review and Development (SEED, 2002b), was to focus on a process to ensure “the development and training needs of all staff are identified and agreed in relation to their current practice, the requirements of the school or authority development plan, the wider and longer-term needs of the education service and national priorities” (SEED, 2002b: 4). The document clearly identified this process as a quality assurance strategy to support the raising of achievement as well as the quality of learning and teaching in schools: “successful professional review and development brings about practical improvements in the classroom and directly benefits pupils by raising the quality of their learning experience. It is therefore a crucial part of the quality improvement process which benefits the whole of the education service” (SEED, 2002b: 4). A bold statement to make – and one based on tentative links – and yet a key focus on which professional development was contextualized. Indeed, more widely the document refers to the requirement for teachers to undertake 35 hours of CPD per annum – an outcome of the McCrone process (SEED, 2000) – on more than one occasion in this document. This is a strategy, which it could be argued, was to focus the PRD process on

contractual requirements. As such, this results in a process that is measurable and yet does not focus, or mention, the needs of the teacher and their own professional learning. The advice that is provided for teachers, in the PRD text, which is considered to be indicative, focuses on the development of the teacher around key policy issues. For example, teachers are encouraged to ask questions of their practice such as ‘what changes will improve pupils’ learning?’, ‘how can I better use ICT outside the classroom?’ and ‘what greater contribution can I make to the school plan?’ (SEED, 2002b: 13). Interestingly the document encourages teachers to use Kolb’s learning cycle – although the version of this provided in the document (2002b: 14) is not a direct reference to his work – and indeed his work is not explicitly referenced within the document. It is, as such, a token nod towards theory and its links to practice and experiential learning. It is possible that this is, in itself, an attempt to encourage teachers to consider CPD as something practical that may impact upon the classroom environment. It suggests a serious attempt to engage with theory and to hook teachers into some form of reflective practice – a personal experience rather than one that can be undertaken at a school or indeed a national level. Additionally, there is a direct link made to HGIOS (HMIE, 2007). In this context it aims to provide a CPD framework based around the seven key areas of HGIOS (HMIE, 2007) and teachers are encouraged to use this as a self-evaluation tool. As such, the process of professional development is closed down through the use of criterion that shapes and manages exactly what teachers are allowed to engage with in thinking about practice. It is a process of legitimizing knowledge that is aligned to organisation goals and is a form of teacher control through standardisation of practice (Webster-Wright, 2009).

The second document referred to above is Continuing Professional Development (SEED, 2002c). This document highlights the notion that CPD should be for everyone but that

whilst CPD should consider the needs of the individual that it should do this by “taking account of school, local and national priorities” (SEED, 2002c: 2). So, yet again, this cannot be driven by the desires, or indeed needs, of the individual teacher. In part the focus of this text is to outline the new conditions that the McCrone Agreement (SEED, 2001) brought about in terms of outlining the CPD opportunities that will exist throughout a teacher’s career. The document starts with a reference to the probationary period followed by that of the Standard for Full Registration (SFR) (GTCS, 2006), SCT (SEED, 2002a) as well as opportunities for leadership. This is outlined as being the CPD framework for teachers and one that is still reflected in the current policy discourse (Scottish Government, 2011a, 2011b). As with the previous document on PRD this document ensures that an explicit link to the 35 contractual hours of CPD is made. It also highlights that CPD should be agreed between teachers and their managers at an annual professional review meeting. That said, despite contractual requirements, this is a process that has been ubiquitously difficult for those in education to develop and implement effectively. Additionally, all such CPD has to be undertaken with minimal disruption to the teaching process and must be in addition to the working week. Within the document there is also a requirement for teachers to keep a CPD profile. As such, it could be suggested that tensions invariably exist, between the formally defined and controlled process of CPD and the inherently embodied nature of professional learning that is a complex and messy process which is difficult, if not impossible, to pin down and define.

It is possible to suggest that such a formal and contractually-based process is a form of control and power over teachers. The documents on CPD (SEED, 2002c) and PRD (SEED, 2002b) become a list of processes or performances that are essentially one-dimensional and authoritative, it pre-disposes teachers to engage in unwarranted forms of self-

flagellation (Smyth and Shacklock, 1998). Such a discourse of professional development encourages a legitimisation of certain knowledge, attitudes and behaviours (Webster-Wright, 2009: 724):

*“The implicit assumptions underlying many professional development programs and research is that knowledge can be transferred to practitioners’ minds to be then enacted in practices and that learning can be mandated, if not through attendance, then certainly through engagement in the professional development programs. Such assumptions are problematic, limiting critical inquiry and perpetuating the status quo.”*

Furthermore such a defined process discourages questioning, wondering and exploration: the very things that many curriculum documents, such as those of Curriculum for Excellence purport to support. Which, in itself, contradicts studies that suggest that teachers can benefit from CPD on a number of personal and professional levels in relation to professional knowledge, confidence and professional discourse (Powell *et al.*, 2003) as well as agency and collaboration (Smith and Sutherland, 2003). However, there is, equally, a lack of evidence that such practice has a significant impact in terms of how teachers engage at an institutional level. This would suggest a mismatch of purposes in relation to professional development on the part of policy makers and the professional learning undertaken by teachers. Where the overall aim is one of control and power of teachers within the accountability agenda this may well prove problematic and tensions may result. Indeed, where professional development is linked to either competences or standards the risk is always of having defined what is to be measured and that, in turn, becomes all that there is to measure (Johnson *et al.*, 2005).

## **1.4 The Professional Context: The Role of Policy**

As part of this study into professional learning it is important to consider the context of the work. It would be difficult to understand the creation of one without the other as the framing of professional development is shaped by the context of Scottish education. Indeed, the creation of Masters post-graduate courses was heavily orchestrated through the policy process. Colebatch (1998) argues that there is both a horizontal and vertical dimension to any given policy process, and within both there can be a mobilization of authority, although the vertical process is more concerned with the hierarchical nature of power. In developing a standard such as Chartered Teacher, those in authority are looking to secure compliance (Colebatch, 1998). Whilst in a horizontal policy process policy-making is a collective process that involves contribution from a number of groups and individuals. Chartered Teacher started as a vertical process with the development of a Standard. However as the initiative grew and developed those who achieved Chartered Teacher had a voice in their own right and indeed generated the formation of a national group, who in turn, became stakeholders in the process.

### **1.4.1 Shifting Notions of Professionalism: The Framing of Professional Development through ‘Standards’**

In adopting a methodological approach based on the use of objects it is important to consider the notion of standards. Such an approach allows a study to place humans among materials (Sørensen, 2009) and to ask questions about what practices take place when a

particular arrangement of socio-material components is established (Sørensen, 2009).

Sørensen (2009: 16) suggests that “‘performance’ describes the involvement of a variety of related components: the preexisting reality, the text, and the approach, together forming a socio-material assemblage”. In this framing standards become a key component, one could say an active participant in professional learning, and therefore need to be considered carefully.

As numerous authors have argued (Coulemans, Simpson & Struff, 2012), professional standards are considered to be a means by governments manage educational performance and the professionalism of teachers. Foucault’s (1977) work on ‘docile bodies’ reflects that of Smyth and Shacklock (1998) who argue that there is an operation of power in institutions through which surveillance, normalisation and examination control and manage any given system. This takes place in order to construct a compliant body of practitioners. Gunzenhauser (2008) notes that policies based on accountability, as many of those in Scotland are, are technologies of normalization that outline practices and conditions of practice that can be constraining. In Chapter two, notions of professionalism will be explored in more detail. However, it is important here to consider that the construction of what it is to be a professional shapes the process of professional development. Indeed as Menter *et al.* (2010) note, how you define professionalism shapes how you manage the process of professional development.

Without a doubt, in both the UK overall and Scotland in particular, an education system has developed based on ‘economic usefulness’ (Bottery, 2001). There are, of course, within this, variations in how this is considered achievable. However, ultimately government policy has been focused on developing skilled workers for a global market that



is increasingly focused on the use of technologies. The teacher required to work within such a system has been defined as the ‘effective teacher’ (Menter *et al.*, 2010). This description is reflected by the Scottish Government (2011a: 2) in their comment that “human capital in the form of highly educated population is now accepted as a key determinant of economic success”. Closely connected with this is a growth of teacher development based on the notion of ‘evidence-based’: in other words, that empirical research can tell you how to do a job better – and, in turn, to produce ‘responsible citizens’ (LTS, 2006) who are able to contribute effectively to the economy. Humes (2003: 76) reiterates that this has been the case in Scotland, claiming that there is a leadership class that ‘employed a rhetoric of democratic participation but actually operates in its own interests’. Humes (2003) goes on to suggest that this is achieved through a number of devices such as the careful control of the flow of information, marginalisation of dissent and a concentration on the ‘how’ of procedural matters, rather than the ‘why’ of substantive practice.

It is useful to note that throughout the McCrone report teachers are referred to as ‘professionals’, for example (SEED, 2000: 43) ‘Teaching is a profession, and a profession of particular importance to society’. That said, there is a clear indication that such a view comes with accountability, but with a new construction of accountability that threw out the over-prescriptive ‘Yellow book’ of the mid 1980s and that replaced it with the idea that such accountability should be based on notions of professionalism. (The ‘Yellow book’ encompassed the scheme of salaries and conditions of service for teachers that was agreed by the Scottish Joint Negotiating Committee). In other words as teachers you can be deemed to be a profession, but that that comes with responsibility.

As a Standard for SFR (2006) was in existence, and work was being done on a Standard for Headship (2005), it seemed to follow that other standards would be developed to encourage a lifelong learning engagement with standards in and for professional roles in education. This, the outcome suggested, should include a Standard for Expert Teacher (Kirk *et al.*, 2003). Menter *et al.* (2004) have argued that the focus on CPD in the McCrone process shifted the development of teachers away from an appraisal-based system, such as the one that was concurrently being developing south of the border. As such, this focus, along with the guaranteed induction year, meant that a series of ‘standards’ were deemed as needing to be enhanced and developed to provide continuity within the CPD framework for Scottish teachers. This means that throughout the career of a teacher that competence is confirmed through observable traits that are measurable to one degree or another.

Through the development of the Standard for Chartered Teacher (SEED, 2002a), the standard most closely associated with Masters-level study, ‘desired’ professional practices were defined and outlined by key policy makers such as the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) for those teachers who had been successful classroom practitioners and who had reached the top of the pay scale. Kirk *et al.* (2003: 9), however, highlighted the open and full two-stage consultation of the standard which:

*“...would cover all teachers, education authorities and universities, SEED, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education (HMIE), Learning and Teaching Scotland, Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA), professional bodies parent groups and many more organisations with an interest in the field.”*

The support for the developing standard, through the two-phase consultation process, was therefore considered to be strong (Kirk *et al.*, 2003) and been shaped in part by the wider educational community. Whilst this may encourage ownership amongst teachers it can also pass the buck in terms of responsibility. Campbell, E. (2003) has argued that standards and their development exist to inspire confidence in the profession and yet often provide tensions within the education community. In many ways standards are “societal proxies for values, knowledge and pedagogy” (Johnson *et al.*, 2005: 91). If this is accepted as an argument then standards become key players or participants in a system. However such standards tend to be generated as a set of ‘thou shalt not’ for teachers, partly because such an approach is easier to enforce. Campbell, E. (2003: 109) goes on to suggest that these are “devoid of ethical principles, but also oppressive and deprofessionalizing for the messages they convey about their priorities”. Indeed by being part of the policy process standards become, in a way, contractual. As a starting point for the process of shaping professional development this can be considered problematic. This is because standards, such as Chartered Teacher, were to be used to underpin and shape the professional development offered by providers. Courses that were to be developed had to be built upon the standards. Furthermore a requirement of the relevant Masters provision was that it was to be accredited by the GTCS.

So, as helpful as this standard has been in allowing the development of Masters-level courses by providers such as universities to take place, it tends to define a bounded, objective and measurable framework of the key policy players. The discourse of the document reflects this with regular reference to key words such as ‘professional’, ‘quality indicators’, ‘self-evaluation’ and ‘effective’. This, undeniably, is the language of both SEED and HMIE. Such a framework as this therefore provides a list of indicators and

consequently may fail to fully acknowledge the actual resulting professional and personal disturbance that has allowed teachers to develop and become agents of change within their educational community. Indeed there is, within the standard, a conflict between the requirement for CTs to be ‘autonomous’ and ‘independent’ but to also, within the same breath, to be guided by policy texts such as *How Good is our School* (HMIE, 2007). Ryan (2011: 883) talks of the growing global quest for achieving standards. It was noted that:

*“...what constitutes ‘good teachers’ of ‘good teacher educators’ is part of a centralised system of control and accountability”*

In other words, these standards are used as a measure of quality to regulate professional practice (Christie, 2003) at all levels, and that includes those providing the professional development. Christie (2003: 962), who was part of the team who initially developed the Chartered Teacher standard, and also claimed that its development was a more collaborative process involving the teacher profession noted that “A cynical view might be that, despite the trappings of professional involvement, the collaborative approach which has characterised these developments merely masks central control by a policy elite dominated by the Scottish Executive”. However, at this point in time the Scottish Executive were already beginning to provide some distance between themselves and both HMIE and the GTCS – a result of policy development in a small nation that had, some argued, become over-familiar. The development of standards, one could also argue, reflects a global focus on an outcomes-based curriculum that, in turn, has led to complex State documents that attempt to direct teachers’ work, such as Curriculum for Excellence (LTS, 2006). Davies (2006) argues that this raises questions about both power and freedom

in the world of everyday classroom practice. As providers of one such course – The MEd (Professional Enquiry into Education Programme) there was increasing awareness of the nature of the identity disturbance that can result from such policy processes and the impact that this can have on individuals and their professional practice. It is clearly important to address this professional change if the role of the teacher is to be understood more fully.

Tensions, as discussed above, are evident in reading the Standard for Chartered Teacher (SEED, 2002a). Within the same opening page it is argued that the standard has developed from “the views of Scottish teachers and the wider educational community” (SEED, 2002a: 1) and that “if higher standards are to be achieved and all pupils are to be effectively supported in achieving their best potential, it is essential that teachers are well prepared for their work and that they have opportunities to extend and revitalise their skills throughout their careers” (*ibid.*). Whilst the standard outlines as the first of four key components (professional values and personal commitments: professional knowledge and understanding; professional and personal attributes and professional actions) as “professional values and personal commitments” – a statement, which it could be argued, is wide-ranging. These are then clearly defined as (SEED, 2002a: 1):

*“The basic assumption is that the Chartered Teacher is characterised by four central professional values and personal commitments:*

- a. Effectiveness in promoting learning in the classroom;*
- b. Critical self-evaluation and development;*

- c. *Collaboration and influence; and*
- d. *Educational and social values”*

This, then, does not leave much room for any professional hoping to achieve the standard to define their own professional values and personal commitments. Indeed these values are defined further (SEED, 2002a: 6) as “the chartered teacher is committed to core educational and social values, such as concern for truth, personal responsibility, equality, social justice and inclusion, and to pupils’ personal, social, moral and cultural development”. Kirk *et al.* (2003: 18) argued that these specific values “give point to the teacher’s work in the classroom and the school”. The standard goes on to state (SEED, 2002a: 3) “The four professional values and personal commitments, the knowledge and understanding, the professional and personal attributes, and the modes of professional action are all judged to be essential and inter-dependent”. A further hint at links with previous policy agendas and indeed the saturation of the education system with the accountability agenda is referred to (SEED, 2002a: 5):

*“One of the key features of the Standard for Chartered Teacher is the emphasis it places on critical self-evaluation and a commitment to improved practice. Other key documents in Scottish education have a similar emphasis. For example, How Good is our School? is widely used as a means of school self-evaluation. The Standard for Chartered Teacher may be seen, therefore, as part of a culture of self-evaluation that has developed in Scotland, and to represent for the individual teacher the same standard of critical self-evaluation and reflection that How Good is our School? does for schools.”*

Not only is there an assumption here that *How Good is our School?* (HMIE, 2007) is a good thing, but that all aspiring CTs should be aiming to achieve such a defined goal. Indeed, Kirk *et al.* (2003: 35) in their commentary of CT describe HGIOS as “widely regarded as the bible of school self-evaluation in Scotland” and highlight their belief that it has a significant transformative effect on Scottish schools. Of course, there is also an assumption that the tick-box approach of *How Good is our School* (HMIE, 2007) does indeed allow for critical self-evaluation and reflection. On reading further, it is also possible to argue that as the standard is outlined fully (SEED, 2002a: 7) that it merely provides a list of governmental priorities for education, for example ‘education assessment and its interpretation’ or ‘ICT and its importance in teaching and learning’. Within such a defined standard does room exist for a professional to choose their route through CPD? Yet, on the very last page of the standard (SEED, 2002a: 12) the final paragraph reads:

*“Articulating a personal, independent and critical stance in relation to contrasting perspectives on educational issues, policies and developments*

*For example, by:*

- *Undertaking critical evaluations of official educational documents, research reports, articles or books in relation to the current debates in the educational and wider community*
- *Engaging with others in the critical discussion of educational policy and practice”*

Here there is, at least, acknowledgement that teachers looking to achieve the SCT may express personal opinion, but is it a case of being both last and therefore least?

#### **1.4.2 The Policy Process and the Development of Post-Graduate Courses**

Mapping the road to the development of post-graduate courses in Scotland is part of the network that has developed around CPD. Much professional development had been traditionally non-certificated and based around subject development or thematic approaches with the primary context. The Donaldson Review (Scottish Government, 2011a) suggested that the impact from CPD based on one-day events, or courses, tends to dissipate quickly. The development of Masters-level CPD, if not teaching as a Masters profession can be traced back to the Sutherland Report in 1997 (Kirk *et al.*, 2003) that called for the structuring of all CPD within a national framework that could be accredited and which was followed by a national consultation through SOEID in 1998. The following year, 1999, saw the establishment of the McCrone Committee, which was to lead an independent inquiry into the pay and conditions of service for teachers in Scotland. The committee was convened following a breakdown in negotiations on pay and conditions for teachers through the Millennium Review and the breakdown of the Scottish Joint Negotiating Committee (MacDonald, 2004). Whilst these were the latest events, pay and conditions for teachers in Scotland had long been a thorny issue, which had proven itself to be problematic over recent decades (SEED, 2000). In the background of this process there was also a growing belief that low pay was leading to a problem with the recruitment of teachers into education. However it was also clear that a pay rise was not going to be offered without changes to conditions, and, in part, any such changes to conditions



concerned the CPD of teachers. It was in this report that the notion of both a ‘Chartered Teacher’ and an ‘Advanced Chartered Teacher’ were mooted.

The ensuing McCrone Report (SEED, 2000) is cognisant of the stresses that teachers faced, and has an air of patience, but it also acknowledges that changes are required and need some give and take from all involved. It is at such points in the report that more managerial language tends to creep in, for example around aspects of CPD as well as notions of performance management of which it states that the current conditions, at the time, were “most unsatisfactory” (SEED, 2000: 54). As such, the SCT was developed (SEED, 2002a) and then revised in 2009 in an attempt to clarify the role and contribution to leading learning beyond the classroom (Scottish Government, 2011a).

As part of the McCrone Agreement (SEED, 2001) there was a requirement for all teachers to agree a programme of CPD with their line managers and to maintain a record of their CPD. As part of this a maximum additional contractual 35 hours of CPD was added to every teachers’ contract. In other words undertaking professional development through CPD was now a condition of service and outlined as one of the duties of a teacher in Annex B (SEED, 2001). The wording of the justification for this in the Agreement is interesting. The document states that through CPD it intends to “enhance the opportunities available to all teachers for professional development and minimize the incidence of teachers undertaking work which is not directly related to their key role in teaching and learning” (SEED, 2001: 16). This statement is not explored any further within the document, nor explained. Agreeing to such changes was all in return for a 21% pay increase to be introduced over three years and a 35-hour working week. At the time 80% of teachers who voted on the agreement were in favour of the settlement (Menter *et al*, 2004):

although many teachers in staffrooms across the country claimed that they had not voted for any such settlement.

The document also noted concern that those teachers who were promoted spent far less time actually teaching – when this is what they were ‘trained’ to do – and often had been promoted, in part, for excelling at. As part of this the committee recommend the development of a Standard for Chartered Teacher to be constituted as a personal achievement rather than a post, although such Chartered Teachers would be considered to be ‘role models’ for more junior members of staff. It was felt that the majority of teaching staff would be capable of achieving such a standard. It was this construction of a Chartered Teacher – and the ethos behind it – which directly shaped the courses that universities started to conceptualise and develop. In many ways this led to the concept of the CT as a form of incentivized CPD with a salary scale to recognize the experience and expertise of those teachers who undertook one of the potential routes to achieving the Standard. However, there was also a firm belief – as supported in the policy texts – that Chartered Teachers were about keeping excellent and reflective teachers in the classroom and to reward them appropriately for this.

Interestingly the report suggests that the process had been “a unique opportunity to address the question of teachers’ esteem, professional autonomy and public accountability in a way which would enhance the capacity of school education to meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (SEED, 2001: 2). The Agreement is a list of statements many of which do reflect the discussions of the Report whilst others do not. For example, the undertaking of a job-sizing activity for those in promoted posts, which the Report had dismissed as unnecessary. In turn this is balanced with some rhetorical statements, for example, that the Agreement

puts in place “a new framework which promotes professionalism and which places teachers at the heart of teaching and children at the heart of learning” (SEED, 2001: 5).

Rather quickly, and following on from this were a number of publications. One of the first was the publication by SEED (2002c) of a document entitled *Continuing Professional Development*. Rhetorical in nature, as a result of starting to map new territories, the document (SEED, 2002c: 3) describes CPD as:

*“The range of experiences that contribute to teacher development is very wide and should be recognised as anything that has been undertaken to progress, assist or enhance a teacher’s professionalism. When planning CPD activities, teachers and their managers should consider the particular needs of the individual, while taking account of school, local and national priorities.”*

In 2010, in the wake of the demise of Chartered Teacher, the Scottish Government established a review of teacher education in Scotland, which considered the development and value of current Masters level study. This review reported in 2011a as *Teaching Scotland’s Future: Report on a Review of Teacher Education in Scotland*, otherwise known as The Donaldson Review. The review stated that CPD presented one of the biggest challenges facing Scottish teacher education. Whilst Masters-level provision was considered a part of this report its provision and value was growing in the wider educational context. Not only is Scotland reflecting the work of its neighbours by the formal recognition of Masters-level work within ITE, but also the wider European context of The Bologna Agreement and Process required a reframing of Masters-level work (Smith, 2011). As such the Donaldson Review called for Masters-level credit to be built

into the CPD process, starting from ITE, for a wider provision of accredited CPD to available and for every new teacher to have a 'Masters Account'. However, the Review stops short of a 'Masters-only profession' as a key policy driver. Smith (2011: 33) argues that, as such, "The failure to insist upon an all-Masters profession leaves the future of Scotland's teaching profession adrift of what can increasingly be seen as the European benchmark. Smith (2011) also argues for the development of CT to more widely encompass Masters-level study. However the negativity of the Donaldson Review (Scottish Government, 2011a) was explicitly reflected and built upon in the McCormac Review (Scottish Government, 2011c) that called for the CT to be scrapped. Whilst contractually this could be argued for it appears to have been a decision based on little evidence (Smith, 2011) and, as such, loses the strengths of the CT process along with the contractual problems that existed. Indeed Smith (2011: 34) goes on to argue, "moving into the continuum beyond ITE, the Report has missed opportunities to push for a fully Masters-level teaching profession which could have been based on the CT scheme".

Still, on a more positive note, the Report acknowledges, "the most powerful forms of development are local, collegiate, relevant and sustained" (Scottish Government, 2011a: 9). The authors encourage the notion of CPD as site-based and reflecting the school culture and ethos. The Report suggests that there should be greater encouragement for teachers to gain advanced qualifications and that advanced study can lead, in their view, to enhanced professionalism. The Report also acknowledges that there is an international movement towards a Masters-level profession. Indeed, the Scottish Government, in responding to the Report (Scottish Government, 2011b: 14) noted that connecting professional learning with Masters-level credit would increase "rigour and challenge".

So, in making recommendations to the Scottish Government (Recommendation 44) the Report suggests that:

*“A greater range of CPD should be formally accredited. Masters level credits should be built into initial teacher education qualification, induction year activities and CPD beyond the induction year, with each newly qualified teacher having a ‘Masters Account’ opened for them.”* (Scottish Government, 2011a: 76)

### **1.4.3 Scottishness and the Development of a Nation: The Dynamics of Power and Knowledge**

Interestingly the policy process around education appears to have occurred simultaneously with that of the changing national picture. This included the referendum in 1997, followed by the Scotland Act in 1998 that opened with the words ‘There shall be a Scottish Parliament’. There can be no doubt that the focus on education at the time (one of the devolved powers) was central to this wider political picture as it was an aspect of society and culture that was traditionally valued in Scotland and an area in which it was possible to show change taking place. This is highlighted in the McCrone Report (SEED, 2000: 4) when it sets as one of the contexts for the report the fact that “Scottish education has a proud tradition, and has many strengths. In particular, it can pride itself on the fact that 48 per cent of Scottish school leavers go on to further or higher education – a significantly better record than the rest of the UK; and that our brightest and best pupils have risen to positions of prominence in industry and government unmatched by other home nations”. In 2000 the first education bill passed through the Scottish Parliament (Scottish Government,

2000) and this, significantly, especially looking back from 2013, allowed the GTCS to expand its remit to cover the career development of teachers.

No matter how you define the policy context it will always shape practice in one form or another. Colebatch (1998) argues that at its simplest level policy is about choosing and implementing goals. Menter *et al.* (2004) undertook an analysis of the Chartered Teacher development alongside that of Performance Threshold Assessment in England (a process which allows teachers to make a claim, through their schools, based on excellent teaching for an enhanced salary), which was taking place at the same time. They note (*ibid.*: 203) that:

*“Thus, although the language of the two documents is very similar, closer analysis reveals differences in how the discourse of each document is positioned in relation to the teaching workforce. The Scottish document starts from the position and experience of teachers. It focuses from the outset on their pay, promotion, and conditions of service, making them the subject of the policy with their concerns and priorities being placed centre stage. By contrast, the English Green Paper positions teachers as the objects of policy, defining them as carriers of policy initiatives set at a distance.”*

In part, the McCrone report is placed within the context of the economy (section 2) and starts by stating (SEED, 2000: 4) ‘Scotland’s future prosperity depends crucially on the skills of its people – the people educated in Scottish schools’ and “The modern economy is a high-skilled “knowledge economy”: there is far less demand for unskilled labour. The increasing globalization of economic activity has intensified international competition, and

reinforced the demand for high-skilled workers'. The committee then aim to make a clear link between education and the economy.

Whilst most of this Chapter has focused primarily on the context for the second research question it is important to now turn to the contexts for remaining research questions, which, in turn shape much of the exploration of the data in this thesis. The remainder of this Chapter, and the following Chapter, outline some of the key issues around teachers and CPD.

### **1.5 Do (Professional) Actions Speak Louder than (Professional) Words?**

Whilst it may appear rhetorical, much of the policy paper trail surrounding CPD describes professional learning as being an 'active' process. It is, in turn, this active engagement with professional practice that shapes and informs so much of what a teacher does, how they do it and where they do it. A ubiquitous assertion of teachers is that practice is of more value than theory and many teachers talk anecdotally of how being in a classroom is more important than being in a teacher education college or undertaking CPD. This notion has always underpinned the manner in which teachers engage with the professional development process. However, this, it could be argued, is a false dualism that those involved in teacher education are more than aware of. It also reflects the tensions that exist in what is deemed to be suitable CPD by those in power compared to the professional learning that teachers would desire. Kirk *et al.* (2003) have argued that the inclusion of professional actions in the Standard for Chartered Teacher allows a very practical way in which to evidence the attainment of the standard through the notion of work-based learning. This is a process that could be considered one of professional learning, as

opposed to a process of professional development. Freire (1970) describes the notion of *praxis* and argues it is a combination of both reflection and action that results in transforming action. Reeves (2007) discusses the way in which the Standard for Chartered Teacher (SEED, 2002a) requires teachers undertaking the course to exert an influence upon their colleagues in schools and considers how these are tied up in their professional actions. It could be argued that such a key aspect of the Standard for Chartered Teacher - the nine professional actions, suggests that underpinning the standard was a clear link to practice and the active 'doing' nature of teaching. Indeed SEED (2002a: 8) state within the SCT that:

*“As noted earlier, these professional values and personal commitments, knowledge and understanding, and professional and personal attributes must interact and result in professional actions of various kinds. The consultation process confirms support for identifying nine forms of professional action.”*

These nine professional actions were outlined (SEED, 2002a) as follows:

The Chartered Teacher should demonstrate the capacity to:

1. Effect further progress in pupils' learning and development;
2. Create and sustain a positive climate for learning;
3. Use strategies which increase pupils' learning;
4. Evaluate practice and reflect critically on it;
5. Improve professional performance;
6. Ensure that teaching is informed by reading and research;



7. Contribute to enhancing the quality of the educational experience provided by the school and to the wider professional context of teaching;
8. Relating teaching to wider school aims and social values;
9. Articulating a personal, independent and critical stance in relation to contrasting perspectives on educational issues, policies and developments.

The explicit link to the consultation process here is important as it places the responsibility for the development of the professional actions within the stakeholder community. Within this study it will be important to consider how the teachers undertaking the programme engaged with the professional actions as a key aspect of their professional learning. These professional actions, as outlined in the CTS, require a great deal of teachers. For example, the professional actions note that teacher should work out with their balkanised classroom walls or departments, which can be problematic, particularly when many teachers undertaking such a course are not in a promoted post. The policy texts clearly state “The Chartered Teacher will not have any additional management burden to that experienced by a teacher at the top of the main grade” (SEED, 2002d: 2). However, this slightly contradicts the language of the standard itself (SEED, 2002a: 4) that states “the Chartered Teacher has acquired and displayed the qualities of a team leader and is acknowledged as such by colleagues” and that “the Chartered Teacher will be committed to influencing and having a leading impact in team and school development” (SEED, 2002a: 6). It is then, no surprise, that there have been tensions around how to read the requirements of the standard and what this means for individual teachers, schools and local authorities. It will also be relevant to consider in this study what professional actions teachers identified as important and why this might be the case.

## 1.6 What is Professional Enquiry?

How CPD is enacted within practice and therefore how it is framed is important to unpack before exploring the research questions in the context of the data collected. As discussed above, there have been frequent debates over the years about the quality of CPD and its relevance for teachers. What then, might be the difference between CPD and Professional Enquiry? What is the difference between an enquiring professional and professional enquiry? In part, this difference comes down to a pre-planned, structured process (Whewell, 2006:1):

*“Professional Enquiry is an active, more structured process that involves explicitly asking questions of practice that can then lead to a proposed change in practice. This is a deliberate and planned activity and requires paying attention to evidence seeking.”*

As Kirk *et al.* (2003: 19) note in their discussion of the development of CT:

*“It is surely more than a little presumptuous for anyone to set all such pedagogical knowledge to one side and to proceed, empty-headedly, to teach according to their own instincts. To teach is to participate in a tradition of enquiry into how teaching and learning are best conducted and to contribute to the enrichment of that tradition.”*

This rather dismissive comment suggests that teachers cannot trust their own instincts. An assumption that seems somewhat unjustified for teachers and yet it does suggest a link between theory and practice. However, this raises some important questions for those

engaged in professional development around what forms of development are useful and lead to change, what traditions of enquiry do teaching professionals engage with, what forms of CPD are most relevant, to whom and why. Over recent years there has been a significant push towards ‘evidence-based’ practice, although, it could be argued that this has been less pervasive within educational environments. Hammersley (2002) argues that this approach to research is about monitoring inputs, processes and outputs to make education more ‘effective’. However, Hammersley (2002: 22) critiques such an approach as useful in teaching which is considered to be “a matter of making judgements rather than following rules”. In other words it is argued that teaching depends upon experience, wisdom, local knowledge and judgement.

There is also an additional point that is important to make here. Evidence-based suggests drawing upon the past – to base practice upon what has happened elsewhere. However professional enquiry is also about moving enquiry to an active process of enquiring in practice. Whilst Biesta (2007) acknowledges that in education there have been attempts to shift towards ‘evidence-informed’ research there is an important question to be asked about where ‘values’ might lie within such practice. Professional Enquiry resulted, in part, from the tensions that existed within the desire to bring scientific research into the moral practices of education. As such, professional enquiry has both an ethical and moral focus on learners (Whewell, 2006) that is about prioritising the benefits to learners and reducing potential harm. As Biesta (2007: 5) states, quite clearly, the tension lies in “what counts as ‘effective’ crucially depends on judgements about what is educationally desirable”. What are the issues that worry away at teachers when they think about their work lives and are these really encapsulated within a defined set of standards?

A key aspect of the course was to ensure that students could explore their practice in context. Whilst such an approach can be informed by evidence, it cannot be based on evidence that has taken place in another context. As teachers how can there be certainty that such practice would work in a different context and result in a positive rather than a negative outcome? However, herein lies an initial tension with the programme because it is based on the construction of ‘professional actions’ as an intervention (Biesta 2007). As Biesta (2007: 10) goes on to argue the problem then lies with the fact that education is a moral practice rather than a technical one. That:

*“The most important question for educational professionals is therefore not about the effectiveness of their actions but about the potential educational value of what they do, that is, about the educational desirability of the opportunities for learning that follow from their actions.”*

In other words the teacher undertaking professional enquiry is not a researcher because the teacher takes an ethical stance in relation to their class as primacy rather than the research process itself (Whewell, 2006). As such teachers enquire with the professional obligation of improving conditions of learning for those that they teach. Therefore, this is why professional enquiry, as it constructed in the context of this course, is important as it acknowledges the workplace as a space of knowledge creation (Whewell, 2007).

To add further complication the course that teachers were undertaking, and which is the focus of this thesis, required collaborative professional enquiry. The standard (SEED, 2002a: 6) denotes that “the chartered teacher will be committed to influencing and having

a leading impact in team and school development, and to contributing to the professional development of colleagues and new entrants to the profession. As a member of a wider professional community, the teaching professional will be committed to influencing the development of teaching and learning, and to strengthening partnerships with other professional groups, parents and other agencies”. In other words the teachers not only had to achieve a focus on professional enquiry in their own classrooms but they also had to include others in their enquiring. Kirk *et al.* (2003: 18) argue that:

*“The evidence – particularly the evidence from Scottish teachers – strongly indicates that accomplished professional performance in teaching is collaborative. The Chartered Teacher will be the teacher to whom others will turn for advice and support who can play a leading role in a team or school-working group, and who can model the development of teaching with colleagues.”*

However, this is where many of the issues around teacher professionalism, standards and CPD have started to surface. As Reeves (2007) notes one way to consider these tensions is that it is about the tension between different discourses of education within the schools in which the teachers were working. As Reeves (2007) goes on to argue, this was not just an issue with colleagues, but also with line managers. Not only were the teachers seen to be acting ‘above their station’ by colleagues and peers but there were also often perceived to be stepping on the toes of senior managers. Reeves (2007: 71) suggests that “as with their teaching colleagues, many managers were inclined to regard a display of activism on the part of a class teacher as surprising and, in some cases, highly inappropriate” and “other line managers were extremely suspicious, possibly suspecting some form of usurpation of

their own role, and wanted to keep a very tight rein on what was happening, which participants felt made it difficult for them to apply collaborative principles in their work with colleagues”. It was also felt that a clash existed between professional enquiry as an approach, with a focus on processes of learning and learners, rather than an accountability approach to tasks, based on school development plans, which required tighter turnaround times and a tick-box approach (Reeves, 2007). Quite rightly then, a question can be asked about ethical responsibilities for providers of CPD or Professional Development, or even Professional Enquiry. No matter what it is called, providers need to consider the support provided for teachers engaging in a shifting landscape of professionalism with changing cultural, structural and social contexts.

It could be argued that such a process of enquiring is closer to those constructions of action research developed by authors such as Stenhouse (1975). However, it can also be argued that even these processes of looking at practice have become hijacked through the academisation of education as a subject of study in Higher Education and the desire of those managing such institutions to have more of a focus on research than professional actions. The bottom line is that you cannot be an objective researcher if you are the class teacher, and why, indeed, would you want to be? Leat (1999: 388) puts this as such, when discussing ‘settlement’ - the last phase of curriculum implementation: “In the last phase, settlement, teachers have looked for spaces to manoeuvre in the National Curriculum framework in order to reinstate some of what they value in teaching”. As teachers, the focus has to be on moral and ethical responsibility (Biesta 2007) and, as such, careful consideration has to be given to any classroom interventions, enquiry or indeed professional actions.

## **1.7 A Summary Overview of the Study**

If the professional learning of teachers based upon their desires and needs in the classroom, is to be taken seriously then a number of lines of enquiry become important for this research project. These centre on the experiences of the teachers themselves, as reflected in the research questions. Importantly this work explores what professional learning is for teachers and attempts to move beyond a 'need' to focus on the value of what is done as a provider of CPD. It also requires a refocusing beyond the requirements of the broader policy agenda and therefore ensuring a focus on teachers and young learners.

As such Chapters one and two of this thesis set the context for the work through outlining the professional and personal contexts as well as the literature surrounding some of the key issues such as notions of reflective practice and models of professional development. In particular the first two chapters focused such discussions around the policy process surrounding the development of Masters-level provision in Scotland.

Chapter three explores the methodology undertaken, which in this case is an approach inspired by work from anthropology and the use of objects or artifacts. The use of objects to elicit exploration of texts in interviews is somewhat unique within an educational research setting.

Chapters four and five open up two explorations of the data collected from different theoretical angles – although both readings are inspired by an interest in spatial aspects of theory and what new insights these might bring to work within this area. Chapter four

closely explores the data, through the notion of spatial theory, which relates to the first and third research questions. Namely, *How do teachers locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational spaces and how do teachers account for the effects of formal professional development on themselves and other actors? How might engaging with theory shed further light on the processes involved in CPD?* Related to these questions are the objectives around the research work in this area. Namely these are *to ascertain the views of practitioners in regard to their experience of engaging with a Masters level programme of CPD and to consider how engaging with theoretical resources might shed further light on the processes and discourses of learning at Masters level.* Chapter five also draws upon the third research question. However, using the work of Foucault, it also explores, through the data, the fourth research question: *To what extent are the relational and ethical foregrounded in accounts given by respondents? What theoretical sense might be made of this?* This final question relates to the objective *to understand the value of relational and ethical practices in professional learning.*

Finally, Chapter six considers the implications for practice and what two such readings of the data, as well as the methodological approaches of this work, might mean for future CPD and indeed research. This Chapter closely relates to a key objective of this work that is *to make recommendations as to the form that CPD at Masters level might take that takes into account the considerations of practitioners.*



## **1.8 Summary**

This Chapter has outlined, and explored, the context for the second research question, which, in turn shapes the analysis of the data that follows later in this thesis. It has also started to ask important questions that relate to the remaining research questions and objectives. It has therefore explored how the formal discourses of CPD might start to construct shifting professional identities and the reasons for these.

## Chapter 2: The Literature Context

### 2.0 Introduction

In this Chapter the literature surrounding notions of professionalism – and a critical engagement with such constructions – will be explored. As part of this discussion aspects of professional identities and teacher agency will be considered. Additionally a closer look at CPD as well as models and practices of professional learning will also be unpacked.

Whilst this Chapter sets the context for all of the research questions it continues to focus on the second research question: *How do formal discourses (such as those provided by the government and providers) construct the aims of CPD and professional identities?* In part this Chapter starts to focus on the contexts and aspects of practice that shape professional identities and, as such, starts to focus on the remaining research questions around professional identities and the effects of formal professional development.

Changes in educational policy usually surface debates around teacher identities, professionalism and professional development. The current shifts in educational debate and the resulting policy process have ensured that discussions about teacher professionalism have dominated the educational media. Within such discussions differing views exist (*cf.* Hargreaves, 1994) and many of these views are shaped by how epistemologies and ontologies inform thinking about teachers and their work. Out of such debates arise some key arguments that are outlined below that require critical engagement. This is because they deal with debates that shape beliefs about what it is to be a teacher.

## 2.1 The Changing Face of Professionalism

In Chapter one both professional *development* and professional *learning* are considered as important aspects of the discussion around CPD. Both are used within the literature and yet hold such different approaches to what a professional experiences throughout their career. However, the connection between these two disparate terms is the word ‘professional’ and, as such, it is important to explore how this term is constructed, understood and used within the policy process. One of the key issues with the notion of professionalism is that it is a term that is used ubiquitously, but rarely clearly defined. Such a complex notion as professionalism is unlikely to ever be clear-cut. Sachs (2003) has suggested that the terms ‘professionals’ and ‘professionalism’ have such common currency in everyday language that the concepts are becoming meaningless. There are deeply embedded, and often contextual, assumptions amongst all those involved in education about what it is to be a professional and these shift according to the experiences of those individuals. Consequently such a definition is, and can never be, static, despite any attempts within the literature to create it as such. Professionalism, as a concept, is always, therefore, in a state of flux. This can be evidenced as follows: Goodson (2003) considers that professionalism is the process through which teachers define the art and craft of teaching whereas Whitty (2002) draws upon the work of Hoyle to define professionalism as to be about improving the status, pay and conditions, whereas, it is argued that professionalism is about the knowledge and skills used by teachers in teaching. Evans (2008: 23) supports Whitty (2002) and suggests “in one sense, then, professionalism may be interpreted as what is effectively a representation of a service level agreement, imposed from above.”

Menter *et al.* (2010) carried out the literature review that informed the Donaldson Review. They found that within the broader literature that four models of teacher professionalism exist: the effective teacher, the reflective teacher, the enquiring teacher and the transformative teacher. Depending on which ‘model’ policy focuses on can define and shape the CPD process that is outlined for teachers to follow. Menter *et al.* (2010) suggest that all four of these models are relevant when considering the Scottish context suggesting a hyphenated approach or identities for teachers. The effective teacher is based upon an economic take of preparing pupils to work in a global economy demonstrated through a discourse of standards, accountability and performativity. Whilst this is a policy focus that can be identified with, Menter *et al.* (2010) suggest that three models that then follow on from this are developed from within the teaching profession and its wider community. They note these as the reflective teacher, based largely upon the work of authors such as Schön (1983), which stresses the significance of values and theory in informing decision-making. The enquiring teacher, based upon the work of Stenhouse (1975) and the notion of ‘teacher as researcher’ encourages a model of practice that involves undertaking an enquiry in the classroom that is then shared with other professionals. Finally, the transformative teacher is a notion that builds upon the previous two models. This draws upon an ‘activist’ dimension to teaching (Sachs, 2003) whereby teachers focus upon a contribution to social change.

The debate around professionalism is a complex one, not least because commentators such as Hoyle (2008) consider that the issue is one of an evaluative concept rather than being descriptive in nature. This, therefore, involves value judgments about teachers and their work.

Whilst some authors propose that a reprofessionalisation of teaching is taking place, to allow education to be more future-focused, others suggest that a deprofessionalisation is a more accurate take based on a culture of blame and accountability (Whitty, 2002).

Hargreaves (1994) takes a slightly different stance here suggesting that within professionalisation that re-professionalisation is about seeing teaching as more complex and skilled whereas de-professionalisation is about a process wherein a teacher's work becomes more routinised and, as such, deskilled. As a debate this appears to be more focused and open to evaluation. This is an argument based upon practice and one that will, in turn, shape how teachers' professional learning is shaped. Other commentators on the policy process of professional development (Kirk *et al.*, 2003) have strongly argued that the policy process and the development of an associated standard (in this case the Standard for Chartered Teacher) has led to an extended notion of what it is to be a professional. However, that said, such commentators are, at times, more closely involved in the shaping of the policy process itself.

As a result it hard to find concordance within the literature beyond the acceptance that the notion of professionalism within education is facing change and that this, in part, is being shaped by a shift in policy focus towards a governmental agenda that draws upon the wider global notion of school improvement and effectiveness. This is a ubiquitous notion that has gained much support in the western world over recent years (Bottery, 2001). These assumptions, which are often implicit, require unpacking in order to inform the discussions around professionalism in this study. As a possible starting point, Carr (1999: 34) suggests that:

*“Conceptual analyses of the idea of a profession standardly focus upon five principal criteria of professionalism, according to which: (i) professions provide an important public service; (ii) they involve a theoretically as well as practically grounded expertise; (iii) they have a distinct ethical dimension which calls for expression in a code of practice; (iv) they require organization and regulation for purposes of recruitment and discipline; (v) professional practitioners require a high degree of individual autonomy – independence of judgement – for effective practice.”*

How you then define such aspects of ‘profession’ is often where policy starts to shape discourse. Carr (1999) argues strongly that it is the *ethical dimension* within this list that makes a professional a professional. Indeed, it could be argued that this is the most complex aspect of the definition provided and the one that is less open to control or measure by external forces. Indeed, any attempt to define an ethical element of practice is likely to be rhetorical in nature and one that simplifies what is an exceptionally complex notion. Professionals, Carr (1999) argues, have a set of values, beliefs and attitudes that promote the needs of others – for example – the learners in front of them - over their own self-interest. Bottery (1998) develops the notion of ethics further and argues there are five ethics for professions, these being an ethic of provisionality, of truth seeking, of reflective integrity, of humility and of humanistic education. Here there is some overlap and similarities between the two authors, and an issue that is worthy of consideration. Maybe such an approach based less on the technical focus that standards can sometimes encourage, may well develop further the notion of the professional within the policy agenda. Indeed, it is a professional’s ability to make such ethical decisions that make them autonomous to some extent. However, levels of autonomy, and indeed what this means in

both policy and practice, is an aspect of professionalism that needs explored more carefully.

The autonomy of professionals cannot be addressed without considering the culture and views of society towards teachers. Significantly, what appears to have shifted over the years is the way in which teachers are perceived within the wider public eye – not least the eyes of stakeholders including learners and those who hold responsibility for them. As a result of this it is essential to return to the debate within the literature as to whether the professionalism of teachers has become *deprofessionalised* through policy reforms and a growing accountability agenda or whether more teacher control over shifts in notions of professionalism has led to a *reprofessionalisation*. Either way, both debates have an implication for the levels of autonomy that a teacher can experience, and both are shaped by how teachers are viewed more widely in society.

Rightly or wrongly this process has positioned teachers, particularly within the policy arena, as those who provide the skills required by the future employees of the global market (SEED, 2000). This is where it is possible to turn more firmly to a current construction of professionalism as a form of deprofessionalisation. In this case a deprofessionalised discourse that adopts a deficit model of defining the teacher as a professional. Indeed, when one looks at the language of key documents on professionalism, it can be argued that the gatekeepers, such as the GTCS, define professionalism in negative terms. The language often reflects that of biblical law: *thou shalt not*. Here, then, the deficit discourse continues by encouraging a consideration of practice that is largely based on the morals and values of wider society; but not necessarily those of the teacher. This level of power and control leaves little space for educators to

make experiential or indeed intuitive decisions. What is missing is a level of trust in teachers to make decisions – and that, in itself, has to be a consideration of what it is to be a professional. Bottery (1996) argues that, in part, this came about because the autonomy of professionals, such as teachers, was not seen as desirable by the State. Within such a discussion the notion of power clearly needs explored and addressed. This, in turn, involves a consideration of how teachers have engaged with the process of professional change. Bottery (2001), for example, argues that whilst teacher professionalism has been restricted that teachers have, in fact, accepted this quite happily.

Foucault's (1977) consideration of docile bodies can be useful in unpacking issues of power and discourse within the notion of teacher professionalism through the policy process. Foucault (1977: 136) suggests, "a body is a docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved". It is argued that this takes place through disciplines that act upon the individual in a number of ways and which are often adopted, as policy is, in response to particular needs. What is interesting, in relation to this study, is the way in which Foucault (1977: 138) suggests that this may occur, that is it not a sudden occurrence but:

*"It is rather a multiplicity of often minor processes, of different origin and scattered location, which overlap, repeat, or imitate one another, support one another, distinguish themselves from one another according to their domain of application, converge and gradually produce the blueprint of a general method."*



Here the sense of time and the building of consensus are evident, the multilayered way in which practice builds through a range of individuals and stakeholders, some with more power than others. This is often the way in which policy becomes shaped in practice. Discourses around concepts such as professionalism can also develop in this way. Foucault (1977) discusses the ways in which individuals can become docile bodies. The use of space, hierarchy and the control of activity, all of which can be seen, or perceived to be seen within the educational policy process are discussed. It is easy to layer on the concept of standards and other policy texts to add to the notion of control of individual teachers.

Dwyer (1995), in considering this notion, cautions against that which might be too simplistic an approach. Dwyer (1995) suggests that while the imagery of the docile body is appealing that teachers should engage with this more critically in applying it to policy processes in education. Dwyer (1995) argues that Foucault (1977) fails to consider the concept of resistance or counter-discourses. That, in Foucault's mind, the only agency is that within the confines of the controls of those in power. Dwyer (1995: 475) argues that there is evidence of resistance to policy in teachers' practices and that there is an "assumption that because the policies are being implemented that they are therefore being 'put into practice' – that the word or 'truth' of the policy formation is read univocally at the level of operation". Indeed, as Dwyer (1995: 476) concludes it is important to remember, "power is not some static or unique possession and that power 'circulates', but there is more than enough evidence to suggest that it is also 'located' to the structural advantage of key players". This, too, can occur at a number of levels be it national or local.

Having considered the notion of docile bodies, it is important to turn to the counter-argument to the deficit discourse of professionalism. Nixon, Martin, McKeown and

Ranson (1997) take a difference stance and have argued that teachers have reshaped, or reprofessionalised, their professional standing through such processes as ‘collegiality’ and ‘partnership’ rather than through the post-war model of autonomy and self-regulation based upon specialist knowledge; an autonomy of which the State did not approve of. This would appear to be a more positive discourse from the teachers’ point of view and one that can emphasis a more active definition of professionalism for teachers. Such an argument suggests, and runs counter to much policy discourse, that teachers have taken ownership of, and proactively changed the discourse of professionalism. Such a situation would be one constructed by the desires of the profession and what they value in terms of working practices. It would be shaped by what is important to individual teachers at the micro level of their individual practice. Such a construction would lead to tensions within educational arenas and needs more careful consideration. This is because the balance of power with the State would be hard to manage in such a situation and would inevitably lead to some negotiation around the management of practice and its accountability.

Within the confines of academic debate, one can see how confusion can arise through differing takes on a key concept. However, what is clear is that through the policy process that resulted in the SCT (SEED, 2002a) ‘professionalization’ (Eraut, 1994; Goodson, 2003) is occurring as an active *process* rather than a predefined product. In this context the occupation of teaching is seeking to gain status and privilege partly through ‘academicization’ (Goodson, 2003). Power and influence are seen in the rise of knowledge monopolies and subsequently certification (such as the MEd at University of Stirling) becomes a form of gate keeping.

Despite the uncertainty that is generated through definitions what can be argued is that professionalism – as a process – is tightly connected, within the context of this work, to the development of standards. This, in turn, through those that manage the policy process, clearly defines a particular and politically preferred approach to professional development. An optimistic reading of the Standard (SEED, 2002a) provides evidence of the ‘transformative professional’ (Sachs, 2003) based upon learning, participation, collaboration, cooperation and activism. Others, too, have identified this process in terms of the ‘fourth age of professionalism’ (Hargreaves, 2000) or a ‘democratic professionalism’ (Whitty, 2002). However, the development of standards could suggest a weakened professionalism that is considered ‘semi-professional’ (Bottery, 1996) or ‘quasi-professional’ (Whitty, 2002). Here teachers are perceived as implementers of policies constructed elsewhere and by other people. It is about living and working in an ‘audit society’ (Sachs, 2003) and the rituals of verification that go with this such as HMIE, Quality Improvement Officers (QIOs) within Local Authorities, and so on. This is simply based on the governmental desires for economy, efficiency and effectiveness (Bottery, 1996). Teachers, in this model of professionalism are controlled through specifying skills and competences. They become technicians of the state (Sachs, 2003). Whitty (2002) argues that standards reduce the amount of autonomy that teachers have and replaces this with a form of technical rationality.

Sachs (2003) continues this argument and develops the argument around the notion of standards. It was suggested that standards allow governments to define a centralised specification of ‘effective’ teaching – which not only shapes how teachers are ‘educated’ but also how a defined curriculum is delivered. Sachs (2003) suggests that through this

practice becomes defined through the codification of knowledge. Without a doubt it is implicit in the development of standards that 'best practice' is being defined as this is reflected in the language used. This is a form of practice through which gate keeping of the profession is managed. Sachs (2003) argues that there are four types of standards that this might be achieved through. Firstly standards as 'common sense' that tends to oversimplify complex practice, such as the ethical practice cited earlier, and which benchmarks a minimum level of achievement (in other words a competence rather than a standard). Secondly Sachs (2003) suggests a model of standards for quality assurance, which is about public accountability and demonstrating value for money in what is, essentially, a public service. Standards for quality improvement are about shaping a developmental approach. And, indeed, it is possible to argue that this is what Chartered Teacher has been about. Such standards focus on the teacher as an individual (remembering that Chartered Teacher is an opt-in standard), but in this context quality improvement is about making explicit desired and accepted norms of professional conduct. Finally Sachs (2003) suggests a model of standards as being about certification and control. In part this is an attempt to place more value on the work of teachers and to provide incentives to move towards higher standards of practice through a process of acceptable academic study.

Eraut (1994) problematises the notion of standards through the discussion of competences and the assumptions made about educational practice within these. It is important to note here that neither standards nor competences are value-neutral terms in education. Eraut (1994) argues that competences are normative and by relying on observation to confirm whether these have been achieved or not means that practice becomes a technical matter. These then, in turn, refer to the specific capabilities of an individual and their practice.

However, given that teaching is subjective in practice, compromises and judgements will always have to be made as to what is an appropriate ‘standard’ or not. In particular any observation of practice will be heavily based upon the judgements of the observer.

In this thesis notions of ‘professionalism’ are important because it is a key term that is explicitly mobilised throughout the SCT (SEED 2002a) and other related documentation (SEED, 2001; SEED, 2002d). Within the SCT and the defined list of ‘professional knowledge and understanding’ the statement that a Chartered Teacher has to achieve ‘the nature of professionalism’ is listed tenth out of twelve activities. Still this is only part of the story, as Sachs (2003) suggests:

*“The politics of professionalism are partly about government action that affects teachers, but they are also about the ways in which teachers choose to respond and to depict themselves.” (ibid. :7)*

This would appear to be an optimistic reading in that a defined process of learning, such as reflective practice within standards can appear to implicitly reduce the autonomy of teachers still further. Indeed some authors within professional development (Taggart, 2013: 6) suggest, “it would be wrong to argue for a generation of maverick individuals, each working from individual ideals and purposes. Of course, we need boundaries and guidelines”. To use ‘of course’ here is particularly definitive and yet the reasons for such language use are left unexplored or justified. In terms of this discussion around professionalism it is worth considering the level of control here, which, it could be argued that policy makers now have over the teaching profession. Not only are there a range of texts that outline the role of the teacher, such as the McCrone Agreement (SEED, 2001)

and their professional lives (SEED 2002b, SEED 2002c). But there are a plethora of documents from a range of consultative or advisory bodies that have a significant influence over how teachers are allowed to be, as well as texts on practice such as that cited above (Taggart, 2013). Moral and ethical guidance is provided from the GTCS and pedagogic advice is provided by LTS as well as curricular and assessment advice from the SQA. Performativity and accountability is probably most obvious through the range of HMIE texts such as *How Good is our School* (HMIE, 2007). Reeves (2007) notes that this adds to the concept of ‘them’ and ‘us’ in schools given that senior managers in schools are clearly tasked with development planning, the setting of targets and the monitoring and evaluation of teachers’ work. With such a range of policy texts with which to work it is not hard to see why teachers have been faced with a discourse of distrust, which results in ensuring conformity in practice.

To end this section, and for the development of this thesis it is important to return to the ethical work of the teacher. Hoyle (2008: 295) discusses the notion of *Samizdat Professionalism*. Intrinsicly this process of professionalism is about teachers making decisions that they believe are in the best interests of the pupils through ‘underground’ activities:

*“Teachers develop strategies of adaptation whereby they ‘work round’ the requirements of policy and management and do their best by their pupils based on their professional judgment of contingent conditions – what we have termed ironies of adaptation. We have also inferred that many heads and teachers have succeeded in this through what we have termed ironies of presentation,*

*strategies whereby they ostensibly appear to meet the demands of accountability but allow themselves space in which to make judgments in what they see as the best interest of pupils.”*

Whilst there are many arguments to be made with this, not least around how one might define what is in the best interest of pupils, Hoyle (2008) notes that it is maybe a good thing for teacher professionalism that there is an attempt to maintain a focus of pupils' needs rather than forms of system-centred managerialism. Hoyle (2008) goes on to argue that the development of school-based collaborative work can be a positive influence, but also warns of the potential problems surrounding notions of 'collaboration' and 'collegiality' and the threat that such concepts may pose to teacher autonomy when put into practice. This is a tension that has existed in education for many years. Osborn (2008: 72) in developing the work of Hoyle through research studies has suggested that data shows teachers as 'creative mediators'. In other words they were "able to take active control of the changes and put them into practice in a creative, albeit selective, way". In turn this allows teachers to shape their practice through their own beliefs, values and attitudes. So, whilst there are a range of definitions around notions of professionalism it is maybe right to be hopeful that no matter the levels of control and power generated through the practices of accountability that teachers will choose their ethical work to lead their practice.

## 2.2 Teacher Identities

Within the literature on teacher professionalism there is often a gap in linking the management of teacher professionalism with teacher identities. This follows through to a lack of reference to teacher identities within the process of professional development. Yet, they appear to be intrinsically linked, in particular as notions of professional development over recent years have started to include personal qualities and values (MacLure, 1993). Increasingly these are often expressed within standards such as Chartered Teacher, which, in turn link to professional development.

Part of the importance in considering the notion of identities in this work is because, it is, in essence, not stable and open to shift and change (Du Gay, Evans & Redman, 2000).

Identities are not simply about the individuals but also about groups, systems and institutions: communities. Identities are a complex and messy development of the individual that often results in a hyphenated form of identities collected and experienced over a lifetime. Indeed MacLure (1993: 311) goes on to suggest that “while identity is a site of permanent struggle for everyone, teachers may be undergoing a particularly acute crisis of identity, as the old models and exemplars of teacherhood disintegrate under contemporary social and economic pressures”. One of the issues here, then, is that professional identities and policy processes can become conflated with teacher identities, partly because professional identities are easier to quantify and define than those of personal identities. Osborn (2008: 67) notes that “the affective and emotional dimensions of teaching are central, yet, in practice, teachers have often been besieged by external directives of controls which mitigate against these aspects of education.” An issue which Ball (2003: 221) picks up by saying that:



*“A kind of values schizophrenia is experienced by individual teachers where commitment, judgement and authenticity within practice are sacrificed for impression and performance. Here there is a potential ‘splitting’ between the teacher’s own judgments about ‘good practice’ and students ‘needs’ and the rigours of performance.”*

So, it appears that teachers are aware of the emotive aspect of teaching and all that that can entail. Yet it is not always what governments and policy makers perceive to be a key aspect of education. This can only result in conflict, tension and a use of power to gain the upper hand. It is not possible to correlate the emotive nature of teaching with increased grades, and yet, realistically it is not impossible to see that there may be some form of causal link. This, Osborn (2008: 68) argues brings into conflict the accountability agenda with the “more personal and moral dimensions of professional responsibility”. Indeed, Osborn (2008) argues that there is a belief amongst teachers that what they are asked to do by management and policy makers is not always educationally desirable and that this can lead to disillusionment and a decline in the intrinsic satisfaction of teaching for individuals. Evans (2008: 27) interestingly links the identities of teachers with professionalism in that:

*“To be real, professionalism has to be something that people – professionals – actually ‘do’, not simply something that the government of any other agency wants them to do, or mistakenly imagines they are doing. Above, I liken professionalism to a service level agreement, but it is only such when it is accepted and adopted by the professionals at whom it is directed. Until that happens it is merely a service level requirement. In enacting or reifying*

*professionalism professionals inevitably shape it by allowing their professional culture to influence it, yet their professional culture is also shaped by the enactment of professionalism.”*

Hoyle (2008: 286) develops this argument and makes links to professional learning by stating that “the quality of education is ultimately in the hands of teachers and hence the professionalization and professional development of teachers are central to the improvement of education.” Indeed Hoyle (*ibid.*) also noted that:

*“Management to excess, management as an ideology embodying the view that not only can everything be managed but that everything should be managed. This excess would appear to have had a deleterious effect on teaching. It has especially had a negative impact on the diffuse role of the teacher – a role that eludes the usual methods of accountability – as well as considerably reducing the work satisfaction of many teachers.”*

Within this developing argument Hoyle (2008) suggests that profession as a notion has a symbolic element through the defining of one’s own worth through work, but, that, inevitably, this is not something that can be easily measured within an accountability agenda. MacLure (1993: 312) goes on to argue that:

*“It may be that the old iconographies of teacherhood, with their virtues of vocation, care, dedication and self-investment, are being eroded under the pressures and interventions of the late twentieth century, while the new*

*identities of 'professionalism' which are being offered by employers and policy-makers are becoming ever more difficult to believe in."*

Ball (2003: 215) discusses the impact that the performativity agenda has on teachers in that it "requires individual practitioners to organize themselves as a response to targets, indicators and evaluations". In other words, as argued above the shift on policy impacts on teachers "it does not simply change what people, as educators, scholars and researchers do, it changes who they are" (Ball, 2003: 215). Ball (2003: 223) like MacLure (1993: see quote above) also makes links to the past by stating that "Beliefs are no longer important – it is output that counts. Beliefs are part of an older, increasingly displaced discourse". So, in this context, what is this new agenda and how does it play out? Ball (2003: 216) defines it as so:

*"Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change – based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate to represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgement. The issue of who controls the field of judgement is crucial."*

MacLure (1993: 311) suggests that maybe more practically that teacher identities are, in and of themselves, a form of argument, that it is "a resource that people use to explain, justify, and make sense of themselves in relation to others, and to the world at large". This

is because, as Ball (2003) argues, such struggles between who we are as educators and the system within which we work are hugely personal. Ball (2003: 216) argues that “the struggles are often internalized and set the care of the self against duty to others” – and in the case of this thesis it is the focus on *which others* (policy makers, learners, school leaders and so on) that becomes important in the work of the teachers studied.

MacLure (1993) suggested that teachers in their research often defined themselves as ‘what they are not’ in order to take an oppositional stance in defining themselves (spoiled identities). For example, not wanting to be a member of the SMT, but rather to stay based in the classroom, or a denial of some part of what society defines a teacher to be (subversive identities). In part this helps to reflect the tensions that policy change and the accountability agenda have brought about for teachers and that their subjects (MacLure 1993: 318) “all looked back to a time when the profession was other (and more propitious) than it is now. But in important ways each was remembering a *different* profession, and claiming a different teacher identity”. Still, what is often left unexplored is the manner in which a consideration of teachers’ identities relates to, and informs their engagement with professional learning. This is a key issue that this study hopes to engage with.

### **2.3 Teacher Agency: Ontology and Epistemology**

Many authors (for example Sachs, 2003; MacLure, 1993; Ball, 2003) have argued that with an increase in accountability comes a decrease in a teacher’s sense of agency. Here, then, it is important to consider the notion of teacher agency and what this means for the professional development of teachers. It would seem obvious that agency could be enhanced through a process of professional learning, but whether this could be the case

through professional development, as has been outlined so far, is an important issue to address.

Agency can be linked to identities, and, in part this is embedded in the notion of subjectivity - Zembylas (2003: 113) amongst others (Biesta, 2007; Ball, 2003) has worked with this notion and suggests that “the concept of subjectivity implies that self-identity, like society and culture is fractured, multiple, contradictory, contextual, and regulated by social norms. Subjectivity is produced, negotiated, and reshaped through discursive practices.” Who you are and how you are you, is tied up in the experiences of life, and in the case of teachers, the career journey. It could be argued that it goes even deeper than this. Ball (2003: 220) suggests that:

*“We become ontologically insecure: unsure whether we are doing well enough, doing the right thing, doing as much as others, or as well as others, constantly looking to improve, to be better, to be excellent. And yet it is not always very clear what is expected.”*

This tension between ontologies and the ethical work of teaching with what will be argued is a focus on the epistemology of standards, is an issue that this thesis will return to.

Central to the whole notion of professional learning is one’s ontological belief about who one is as a teacher. This is, it could be argued, in stark contrast to the epistemological focus of professional development. In other words epistemological approaches provide a clear focus on the content of what you are being ‘developed’ around and are required to deliver within an educational setting. Such diverse approaches to the professional learning of a teacher can only create fractures and tensions. Embedded within this lies another important

aspect of education that needs explored. In an increasingly defined notion of what it is to be a teacher (in others words do you do what policy tells you to do) CPD becomes a narrower experience defined by those standards that outline what it is that you do as a teacher. It could be argued that such an approach misses out key aspects of what is it to teach and as such models of professional learning, as well as notions of CPD needs to be critically addressed.

Forde, McMahon, McPhee and Patrick (2006) suggest that the requirement to deliver, for example, a prescribed curriculum has reduced the professional freedom, or autonomy, of teachers. As teachers they deliver these curriculum and policies that in turn reduces their professional autonomy (Taylor *et al.*, 1997) and agency. Carr (1999: 45) argues this clearly in the paper on professional ethics and stated that in conclusion “from this point of view, what better route to the de-professionalisation of teachers could there be than to turn them into mere deliverers of a body of knowledge pre-determined by others”. Carr (1999) further argues that professionals need to make their own moral decisions and not those based on the views of others. This might be the professionalism that Humes (2003) refers to. The GTCS has, over the last ten years, gained increasing power in the management of a profession. They have, for the last ten years, had control over teacher development throughout their career. Whilst the current consultation process of the standards may appear to be moving the development of teachers and the related standards on, what it does do, ultimately, is force all teachers into a developmental process controlled by standards throughout their career, with a formal process of reaccreditation. This is no longer about standards for personal development or what Sachs (2003) would refer to as quality improvement, rather it is about standards for quality assurance as well as for certification and control.

Sachs (2003) discusses the notion of the 'transformative professional' which is based upon learning, participation, collaboration, cooperation and activism, which, leads to a greater sense of agency. Much of this, it appears, is about an engagement with thinking and, as such, moving beyond epistemological constructions of knowledge to a deeper, wider, ontological thought process. If this approach is to be adopted then how teachers might engage proactively to counteract an epistemological approach needs to be considered.

There are several authors who have tried to outline practical suggestions for how teachers might engage with the power games that exist in education. Gunzenhauser (2008) suggests two approaches to the resistance to normalization, these are:

Modified forms of critical reflection;

And intersubjective engagement (through social relations).

Gunzenhauser (2008) argues that educators should aim for a form of resistance "characterized by vigilance against subjugation and by intersubjective engagement". This is a selfhood that is continually open to possibilities but through this is vigilant and resistant to normalizing tendencies. Zembylas (2003) also suggests a couple of 'strategies of resistance'. These are:

To become aware of technologies that govern one's emotions and subjectivities;

To create strategies of resistance and self-formation through reformulating emotion discourses and performances.

Here resistance is about the struggle to free oneself from subjection and to consider what alternatives exist in practice. As Zembylas (2003: 125) goes on to suggest:

*“In pursuing these ends we need to challenge the widespread notion that self-disclosure constitutes a knowing of one’s self. No amount of intellectual self-reflection is enough to initiate such dramatic transformations; rather, self-formation is constituted through the power relations and the resistances that the self reshapes through performances that create greater freedom.”*

Bottery (1996: 187) noted that:

*“Teachers, like all other professionals, need to consider their attitude to new legislation, the manner in which they will initially approach it, the way and degree to which it will be implemented. This needs to be flexible rather than doctrinaire, yet principled rather than opportunistic, and may run all the way from ‘defy’ through ‘subvert’ to ‘ignore’, on the ‘ridicule’, then to ‘wait and see’, to ‘test’, and in some (exceptional) cases to ‘embrace’, but needs to be underpinned by a clear sense of institutional purpose and professional ethics.”*

This is an interesting take on the policy process, but one that has some resonance of truth in the development of the Chartered Teacher programme. Maybe, in ticking a wider range



of professional development boxes at a national level the Nation has lost those teachers who may well have ensured that Curriculum for Excellence became a success. Indeed, in the same article Bottery (1996: 191) argues that:

*“Teachers in a rapidly changing world cannot be content with teaching a fixed body of knowledge, but must be rather more concerned with teaching pupils to learn how to learn, to ask rather than accept.”*

This is not an alien concept in relation to the aims of Curriculum for Excellence (LTS, 2006). All in all policy about the professional development of teachers in Scotland is currently at a crossroads. As Bryce and Humes (1999) note there is an incompatibility between institutional uniformity through standards and the genuine ownership of policies by teachers.

## **2.4 Continuing Professional Development**

Evans (2008: 20) argues that the current take on professionalism is that:

*“Professionalism, it is generally believed, is not what it was, Depending on one’s perspective, it may be seen to have either taken a knock and emerged with the scars to prove it, or had a style make-over and image-change. Some would argue that it has undergone both, with the one necessitating the other.”*

Post-devolution Scotland generated a shift in defining the role, and therefore professional identities of teachers, that in policy terms had explicit references to Professional Review

and Development (SEED, 2002b) in tandem with Continuing Professional Development (SEED, 2002c). The McCrone Agreement (SEED, 2001) states that every teacher is contractually obliged to undertake 35 hours of CPD per annum. However, it would appear that there is some distance between constructions of the role of the teacher in terms of compliant deliverers of the curriculum and what is known to make good professional development. Forde *et al.* (2006) suggest that autonomy and agency are both essential to the process of professional development. However both autonomy and agency have been in decline as teacher development is used as a mechanism to control professional practice. Senge (1990) talks of the 'drive-by' staff development that is embedded in the needs of the policy makers to cascade out the latest policy information rather than the needs of the community in which the professional development is taking place.

As a consequence the Scottish Executive (2003) publishing a national framework for CPD that highlighted the 'milestones' that a teacher may face during their career. This CPD framework is based around three standards: the Standard for Full Registration (2000), the Standard for Chartered Teacher (SEED, 2002a) and the Standard for Headship (2005). In this framework clear links are made between professional development and such standards. However, the use of separate standards such as these (although it can be argued that there are some connections between differing standards) may lead to several short professional development journeys rather than a longer, more continuous one throughout a career in teaching. This process of policy development at a Government level tends to encourage a focus on the activity of CPD events rather than the holistic professional journey that might be taken. Indeed a careful consideration of such standards allows professionals to reflect on how CPD, tied up in a contractual 35-hour package, might come to be constructed for teachers.

Evans (2008) argues that there is a lack of definition in the literature about what professional development actually is. In the end drawing upon the work of Day (1999: 4) who defines professional development as “the process by which, alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching; and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills, planning and practice with children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives”. Evans (2008: 30) however prefers a wider definition that reflects the perception of enactment: “the process whereby people’s professionalism and/or professionalism may be considered to be enhanced”.

Whilst professional ‘development’ may suggest a change in how an individual might use their professional knowledge and skills over time, the link to standards might imply that any change must be beneficial to all learners. So, for example, in The Standard for Chartered Teacher (SEED, 2002a: 8) one of the first professional actions states that:

*“The Chartered Teacher should demonstrate the capacity to:  
effect further progress in pupils’ learning and development.”*

Therefore by defining such standards governments are able to shape, to some extent, teaching professionals as they develop from Initial Teacher Education (ITE) onwards. It could be argued that this becomes a form of control in order to deliver to and reflect the society that governments envisage, and this, in turn, may reflect the current educational focus on accountability and raising standards (Day & Sachs, 2004). That said it is important to consider other factors that may also shape the development and growth of a

teacher. These can range from personal experiences of education, teaching contexts, personal values and attitudes as well as a wide range of socio-economic factors. It is the balance of these competing elements that need considered in a discussion around professional development. Evans (2008) interestingly discusses the concepts of functional development. This is defined as the way in which individual performance is considered to be improved and the attitudinal development that reflects the process through which an individual's attitude to their work may be modified. Evans (2008) further splits attitudinal development into two parts – intellectual and motivational and functional development into procedural and productive. It could be argued that CT aimed to achieve both aspects of teacher development as defined here in that it was 'measured' against a standard but that it also required work on attitudinal aspects of practice.

Forde *et al.* (2006: 128) argue that CPD should be seen as “a professional obligation and responsibility on the part of both the individual and employer” in order to “maintain and develop their professional practice throughout their career, reviewing practice, acquiring new skills and knowledge, sharing good practice and experience with colleagues and new entrants to the profession”. In many ways it is important that beginning teachers see the links between their ITE course and their continuing professional development throughout their career: gone are the days when it was believed that once trained, an early career teacher was the completed article on leaving college (Bezzina, 2006). Bubb and Earley (2006) also note that professional development must be seen as continual throughout a teacher's career. Without this, they argue, 'educational vandalism' takes place because:

*“There are two groups of learners within schools – young people and adults. We neglect either at our peril. If teachers and other staff are not seen as continuous*

*learners by the school itself, how can adults engage youngsters in any meaningful pursuit of learning?” (ibid. 11)*

The apparently interchangeable use of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and Professional Development (PD) highlights the confusion that has arisen over terminology when discussing processes of professional growth. Evans (2002) suggests that there has been a lack of definition of teacher development and calls for those involved to clearly define what they mean by the terms used in discussing the wider field of CPD.

Kelchtermans (2004) suggests that CPD, teacher development and so on are seen as variants of professional development whilst Bubb and Earley (2007: 3) suggest that CPD is “all formal and informal learning that enables individuals to improve their own practice”.

However the Scottish Executive (SEED, 2002c: 12) go on to define a CPD activity as:

*“Anything that has progressed, assisted or enhanced a teacher’s professional practice and might include issues of personal development as well as specifically educational issues.”*

So, it is possible to see why there is some uncertainty over the terminology. Kelchtermans (2004) argues that a consideration of the literature in and around this area identifies some key characteristics. These key characteristics might then allow us to evaluate what ‘good’ professional development is. Kelchtermans (2004: 220) suggests that:

*“CPD is a learning process resulting from meaningful interaction with the context (both in time and space) and eventually leading to changes in teachers’ professional practice (actions) and in their thinking about that practice.”*

Indeed the consensus would seem to indicate that Professional Development is more than the CPD events and processes that might occur during a teacher's career. A useful framework in which to consider this is one suggested by Biesta (2009). Biesta discusses three functions of education: qualification, socialisation and subjectification. In the context of professional development those processes involved with qualification relate to specific CPD events, or indeed mentoring processes, that might impart specific knowledge and skills. Moderation meetings or SQA input might be examples of these. This allows for knowledge and skills to be developed and to ensure that the process of planning for teaching and learning can be relevant and up-to-date. A consideration of the CPD on offer might highlight the dominance of this type of activity. Such CPD is often a short-term input, sometimes set up as information giving events where dissemination (through the cascade model at a later date) to a wide audience is often required. The impact of such CPD is often explicit and immediate. In the recent past the introduction of Higher Still was handled in such a way.

Whilst it is easy to identify examples of CPD such as qualification, professional development requires teachers to move beyond this. As such both socialisation and subjectification can be considered. Biesta (2009) argues that socialisation is about the ways in which an individual becomes part of the culture of a community, be it professional or geographical. It involves aspects of the socio-cultural, moral and political ways of seeing, being and doing. For many professionals achieving standards, such as that for full registration (GTCS, 2006) is about fitting into this community. This is the explicit nature of the socialisation of a professional. However there are also more implicit notions of socialisation at play, such as those that are often driven by narratives in the school. Here

less formal mentoring allows for the individual to learn how to be accepted and to fit into a community, even down to the discourse used and positions adopted as a member of staff. More explicitly a school's values and aims might paint a very clear picture about how all members of such a community are expected to behave. Sachs (2003) argues that teachers need to be autonomous professionals. This means that professional growth would require an element of what Biesta (2009) refers to as subjectification. Autonomy by definition requires something of the individual. Whilst it could be argued that standards allow for a profession to set gate-keeping regulations developing as a teacher is also a very personal thing. Higgins and Leat (1997) argue that not enough attention is paid to such individual development needs. As such the reflective and critical processes of professional development can be central. Here then the importance of socio-constructivist approaches to professional development and growth becomes important.

Therefore professional development and growth needs to draw upon all three dimensions of this framework, an argument not dissimilar to that developed by Sachs (2003). Sachs (2003: 31) suggests that learning is core to practice for both teachers and pupils and that this can have three dimensions, the personal, professional and political:

*“The personal relates to their own growth and understanding of the world about them; the professional requires that they continue to develop skills, context and competencies as these relate to their own areas of expertise; the political is in the sense that an informed and educated teaching force will be able to mount compelling arguments for and against the implementation of some policies that may or may not be in the best interests of students and other stakeholders.”*

The development – in whatever form it takes can encourage and support the growth of the individual. Professional development can be seen as the context of the process of professional growth. Where this is specifically focused on the development and growth of the individual teacher, the process of teacher development should be considered. Indeed professional development can often be the stimulus of teacher development and professional growth. Whilst professional development may be organised and sometimes imposed by structures and systems, professional growth is very much focused on the individual.

Day *et al.* (2007) have noted that CPD is central to teacher effectiveness, but that this is very much dependent on the quality of the experience. The context in which the CPD occurs is part of this. Thurston, Christie, Howe, Tolmie and Topping (2008) note that good CPD underpins the development of new pedagogic strategies in schools. In turn this CPD is not just about the ‘materials’ that teachers will use but is also based upon their motivation to engage with these as well as collaborative and collegial working. In this study the positive evaluation of the CPD provided in a research study on group work showed that teachers “highly valued the opportunity that the CPD programmes gave them to network and share issues / solutions with other teachers and that the project had a positive impact on the ability of teachers to manage group work.” (*ibid*: 274). This cooperative nature of the CPD was seen as highly important by the teachers who evaluated the project indeed “the dialogue and sharing of practice with other teachers appeared to reassure teachers and give them confidence to persevere with changing their own practice (Thurston *et al.*, 2008: 276). There was also a clear indication that as teachers worked more closely with the pedagogic approaches, that they took on more ownership of the ideas and beliefs in the use of the techniques indeed “once this attitudinal change was



established, the teachers implemented change in their own classrooms and then started to facilitate change in the classrooms of others” (*ibid.* 277).

Still, with all that considered, there is an additional problem and this lies with the expectations of the teachers in Scotland and their place within the educational system. This involves an implicit set of beliefs and baggage that has developed with staffroom chatter and anecdotal on-the-job experiential learning. MacDonald (2004: 413) outlines it as such “the tendencies of teachers to adopt a subordinate persona, and to comply with the wishes of the hierarchy despite their own professional reservations, point towards the existence of a hegemonic system in which collegiality has little locus”. Teachers in Scotland, pre-McCrone, were used to a more accountable, compliant life. As MacDonald’s (2004) work shows – they are happy to adopt the CT discourse of collegiality – but a lot less willing to adopt it as practice. To suddenly encourage a culture change in which teachers were encouraged to enjoy more autonomy was going to prove problematic. This is a feature that was also noted by Reeves (2007). Indeed, MacDonald (2004: 415) suggests that “orientation towards collegiality within the profession is currently weak, and that Scottish primary teachers may be agents of their own marginality”. Whilst this argument is based, in part, on the changes to the hierarchical structures in primary schools and the introduction of Principal Teachers post-McCrone, the same argument could be made of the secondary school context whereby the balkanized approach of subject departments, and indeed the new faculty structure, could also encourage such a lack of collegiality. MacDonald (2004: 417) argues that a hegemonic state of play has developed in which “the establishment in securing the active consent of teachers to their own marginalization” is evident. Indeed, for many teachers, the implementation of the McCrone agreement was the

job of the 'Heidie' (Head Teacher) (MacDonald, 2004). Reeves (2007) also drew attention to the role of the Head Teacher who carried a high degree of authority, which was explicitly available for all to see. In part, it could be argued that this character trait of teachers was about their experiences and beliefs of how power worked in schools. However, the language of McCrone and what it said of collegiality would suggest an increased demand on teachers in terms of their work commitments cannot be ignored. Still, as Reeves (2007) notes these are a 'soft' form of managerialism. This is an issue that was clearly highlighted in the 23% pay increase. For more money teachers were required to do more. It is possible that dressing this up in a discourse of collegiality was merely semantics. Furthermore, the definition of collegiality in this context is important. Friere (2005: 12) argues that "teachers should always stick together as they challenge the system so that their struggle is effective". Whilst the work of Friere reflects a language of struggle that is slightly out-of-place in this context it does reflect an ideal that collegiality is about sharing beliefs and values (an ontology so to speak) rather than creating the perception that all staff in a school are pulling together to achieve a pre-determined plan of action that is shaped by government agendas and policy discourses.

## **2.5 Models of Professional Learning**

These documents and much of the recent policy process, and indeed practice, have implicitly encouraged and promoted a model of professional learning that is based upon the concept of reflective practice and experiential learning. Many teachers have become familiar with the work of Kolb (1983), Schön (1983) and Tripp (1993) amongst others, in terms of providing a range of simplistic frameworks through which to think about practice.

However, such models also tend to appear in hackneyed format within the policy framework. Such models of learning tend to explicitly assume that reflection is a useful process and a 'good' thing that produces better practice. Implicitly, however, such a process can be highly problematic. As Fejes (2011) notes, it is the engagement with such work as Schön (1983) and the Reflective Practitioner that has led to the adoption of reflective practices as a conspicuous part of education and work life. The language of such reflective practice frameworks has become deeply embedded within policy, and not least within the standards that teachers are required to achieve. For example part of The Standard for Chartered Teacher (GTCS, 2002a) is presented in Table 1. This document notes that (see next page):

Table 1: The Standard for Chartered Teacher

<p>4.2.1</p> <p>Reflects and evaluates on practice and constantly seeks to improve learning experiences</p>	<p>Generates and analyses evidence on pupils' learning, the impact of teaching and the relationship between these;</p> <p>Works with colleagues and observes and discusses each other's teaching to further develop practice;</p> <p>Develops and uses a range of methods for evaluating learning;</p> <p>Identifies and addresses professional learning needs.</p>
---	---

Whilst it may be a useful notion to think about practice in such a way, critics of such reflective practice models highlights the implicit power and control that is evident within such practice. As Fejes (2011) suggests such mobilizations of reflective practice start to underpin the development of neoliberal models of governing. In the example above the focus of a teacher's reflection appears to be upon the supposed need to 'improve learning experiences'. There is little room to manoeuvre or for flexibility, nor is there any explanation for why learning experiences should be improved specifically. Notably the manner in which teachers at this stage of their career should 'reflect' is also defined. They must analyse evidence, work with other colleagues and watch them teach and consider a range of methods for evaluating teaching. So, not only is the manner and technologies

through which teachers learn defined, but also the perimeters and evidence sought are clearly laid out. Zembylas (2003: 121) further notes, “continuous self-observation and monitoring by administrators and fellow teachers enforced the notion of a ‘normal’ teacher-self against which all teachers measure themselves”. As part of this the way in which suitable evidence is collated and reported to the appropriate body becomes almost confessional in nature. As Foucault (1984b) explores in his work, it is easy for reflective practice to become a practice of confession, and one that encourages normalization related to Christian practices of the confession and the notion of disclosure of the self. Wider questions surrounding practice against such standards, therefore, become important. Colebatch asks (1998) an important question in relation to this and that is how do those involved in enacting such policies mobilize the language in a way that supports their own needs and perspectives?

Asking questions about teacher professionalism is different to asking about teaching as a profession (Sachs, 2003). This is because professionalism – and what counts as professional action and knowledge – shifts with the social, economic and political climates. Sachs (2003) considers if professionalism is about control or autonomy. Whilst this, it could be argued, is a simplistic dualism, it does, at its heart, reflect the key tension that exists in teacher professionalism and as such, this shapes models of professional learning. Where control is more explicit then professional development is shaped by what those in power wish to be seen in practice, particularly in the classroom. Often this is managed through a policy process of legislation. Ball (2003: 219) develops the notion of the manager being the “new hero of educational reform” whose aim is to instill “the attitude and culture within which workers feel themselves accountable and at the same time committed or personally invested in the organization”. Evans (2008) argues that any

‘new’ views of professionalism are defined by precisely this shift in power, and, as many have argued, that autonomy has given way to accountability. However, there are other ways in which this concept and exploration can be shaped. Hoyle (2008: 291) talks of *restricted* and *extended professionalism*.

*“A restricted professional was construed as a teacher for whom teaching was an intuitive activity, whose perspective was restricted to the classroom, who engaged little with wider professional reading or activities, relied on experience as a guide to success, and greatly valued classroom autonomy. An extended professional was construed as a teacher for whom teaching was a rational activity, who sought to improve practice through reading and through engaging in continuous professional development, who was happily collegial, and who located classroom practice within a larger social framework.”*

Hoyle (2008) argues that a restricted professional is not a negative connotation but rather that they may be a professional who is outstanding in their field. Further it was noted that the growth of the reform agenda in education led to the notion of an *extended-but-constrained* professionalism as teachers engaged in linking classroom practice to appraisal procedures and the growth of policy agendas.

## **2.6 Compulsory Reflection: Confessional Practices**

Given the focus on Kolb’s learning cycle in key policy texts (SEED, 2002b) – as well as more generic references to the process, or indeed, product of reflection it seems key to consider the role of CPD in the process of teacher development. Kirk *et al.* (2003) argue

that, for many, the notion of reflective practice has allowed teachers to make the link between theory and practice. Indeed, as Williams and Grudnoff (2011: 281) note “In teacher education in particular, the notion of reflection has taken on somewhat mantra-like dimensions”. They also note that no matter how vague definitions of reflection and reflective processes are, that there is both an implicit and explicit assumption that reflective practice will make you a better teacher. Taggart (2013: 2) provides such an example, stating in the opening pages of his text on *Reflective Practice and Professional Development*, “through reflection, we can begin to move from novice to expert” and that “one of the benefits of reflection is its impact on professionalism. Through reflecting on our practice, we become more aware, more in control, more able to see our strengths and development needs.” Indeed it would be hard to find anyone who has been through any form of teacher education to have not heard of, or engaged with the work of Schön (1983) and his notion of reflection-in-action that is based around a tacit knowing-in-action. What Schön (1983) argues is that within the hurly burly of the classroom professionals often have to make decisions about practice which are based upon their previous, practical experience but which bring immediate solutions to the issue that has arisen. Schön argues strongly that a technical rationality model, based on research findings, has no such place within such a process. After any such event Schön (1983) suggests that there is scope for reflection-on-action whereby one can reflect back on any given incident and possibly take something of value from the experience in terms of practice. Eraut (1995) argues that it is reflection outwith the classroom environment that is more likely to lead to learning and change in practice.

However, in starting to consider the work of Foucault (1984b) for this thesis the entire concept of reflective practice was challenged. Edwards (1997: 150) defines reflective practice as:

*“The process of reflecting on and analysing particular circumstances gives rise to the concept of the ‘reflective practitioner’, someone who is able to cope with and shape change and uncertainty by interpreting and responding to the particularities of the circumstances they find.”*

Edwards (1997) and others, such as Foucault (1984b) have noted that the notion of reflective practice can be confessional in nature and as such can lead to a negative response to practice. As such Whewell (2005: 2) drawing upon the work of Edwards (1997) considers if a concept of reflexivity might be more useful: “Whilst reflection requires individuals to consider the situations in which they find themselves (Edwards, 1997), reflexivity requires an individual to consider the self that they find there”. In other words, what one is aiming for here is a focus on the self in context rather than aspects of pedagogy as abstract concepts. Brookfield (1995), amongst others, has tried to develop this, with a focus on using a range of ‘lenses’ through which one can think about one’s own practice. The lenses developed are the lenses of theory, our own autobiographies as learners, our colleagues as well as our learners.

For the course that was developed at Stirling, it was fairly easy to fall into developing the approach of confessional practice and reflection. In part this was because as a notion of practice that was clearly linked with policy, and had been for many years, it was part and



parcel of the implicit baggage that had developed for individuals. Educators had professional lives that had been shaped by the policies of reflective practice. Learning Journals (Moon, 2006) were issued to students and described as being for use as individual and private spaces. It was made clear that the journals themselves were not assessable. This is, in fact, quite a common practice on courses of both initial teacher education as well as CPD (Williams & Grudnoff, 2011). In and of itself this can lead to the negative nature of confessional writing as the space in which you write becomes private and not shared – it becomes a space for confessional thinking about practice. That said, students were also provided with some focus questions based on the work of authors such as Tripp (1993). In some ways these questions asked individuals to focus on reading and the implications that this may have on their thinking about practice.

Significantly, as the course developed was the idea that learning appeared to take place in the dialogue that followed tasks that were undertaken in the learning journals, within the active domain of talking and listening. Students appeared to develop a ‘voice’ from having written about the context of individual practice and then following this through in discussion with others. Fenwick (2000) makes this link between reflection and experiential learning in reflections on the processes of cognition and the links that exist between formal and non-formal learning. Indeed Williams and Grudnoff (2011) note that in their study that more experienced teachers were able to use the processes of reflection with greater effectiveness as they had experience of teaching – or tacit knowledge – to draw upon. In turn, the study showed, that teachers who had been teaching for some time, used reflective processes to unpack their implicit beliefs. This was in contrast to novice teachers, which the study found tended to be descriptive about their practice when asked to engage in

reflective processes. This link between reflection and dialogue is also reflected more extensively in the literature, for example, Carnell and Lodge (2002: 15), argue that “dialogue prompts reflection, critical investigation, analysis, interpretation and reorganisation of knowledge”.

What was interesting about Williams and Grudnoff’s (2011) study was that they found that reflection in more experienced teachers led to a widening of their ‘lens’ beyond that of their classrooms to the school at large. This had three impacts. Firstly teachers started to challenge the routines and norms of the schools that they felt were unjustified. Secondly it led to a change in the ways in which they participated in their schools – and the assertive nature in which they did this. Thirdly, the teachers spoke about becoming more confident. In part this was because as the teachers became more experienced in the process of reflection, it moved from being a solitary activity to a shared approach with other colleagues. Indeed as the authors argue (Williams & Grudnoff, 2011: 289) “that participation in the reflective practice course gave them the tools to talk about and justify their practice in front of their colleagues, something in which they did not appear to engage prior to undertaking the course”.

So, the issue here is not that teachers should not be challenged to *think* about the complexity of practice, but rather that more attention may need to be paid to how teachers *think* about such things. Rather than a solitary confessional practice, the processes of reflection, or indeed reflexivity, are more useful as a social tool. This is a theme to which this thesis will return in considering the work of Foucault.

## 2.7 Conclusion

Chapters one and two of this thesis have started to explore the complex landscape within which Professional Development takes place. The complexity and overlap of conflicting constructions of professionalism and identity within the policy context has led to aspects of uncertainty with the development of standards such as Chartered Teacher on which Masters-level courses are built. Reeves (2007: 60) highlights that this confusion leads to a institutions ‘speaking in tongues’ which results in teachers

*“Entering a space between three competing discourses of teacher professionalism: the ‘old’ bureau professionalism, managerialist views of teachers as operatives and progressive managerialism’s construction of new professionalism. This contestation leads to the opening of a space of indeterminacy between the three discourses where sites which entail sense-making, such as that of chartered teacher status, surface the tensions and fractures what it creates.”*

As such the first two Chapters have highlighted the importance of the research questions. In the first Chapter, in particular, it has been possible to trace how formal discourses construct the aims of CPD that, in turn, impact upon professional identities. In this Chapter this theme has been developed and, as part of this the literature around teachers’ identities and how they might experience CPD has been explored. After the next Chapter – on methodology – this thesis will return to the notion of space in which to explore professional development. And, to consider what Reeves (2007: 62) ponders about the development of teachers:

*“Those attempting to promote and enact the role will find themselves having to invent it in practice in a context where the teacher professionalism advocated by the standard will be vigorously contested. Whether chartered teacher status becomes a successful Trojan Horse for the new professionalism or it becomes hybridized or swamped by one or both of the other discourses will depend on the outcome of the complex politics of the system during the initial stages of the implementation.”*

This Chapter has explored and engaged with the literature around some of the key themes, such as notions of professionalism and models of professional learning that shape the experience that the teachers face. This is helpful in setting the wider context in which the data for this thesis was collected and therefore the manner in which teachers will have engaged with the research process. As such it has been useful in exploring what the key current themes are in CPD and the implications of these for this study.

## **Chapter Three: Methodology**

### **3.0 Introduction**

Sørensen (2009) argues for a methodological approach to research that places humans among materials. This is important in this study given the framework through which teachers often experience a CPD process is one in which ‘standards’ are a key actor. In order to engage fully with the research questions for this study it is important to acknowledge that such an approach may be important in both collating and analysing the data. Given this argument this Chapter will outline the approach taken to the data collection process, with a focus on the use of objects to incite narrative, for this thesis and explores why such an approach was considered important in exploring how teachers experience the CPD process.

The changing identities of teachers during a period of transition is not something that can be found, counted or proved, rather they are complex constructions, that are generated from a variety of sources and in a number of different ways and may therefore be considered fluid (Sørensen, 2009). Turner (1974) suggests the process of liminality as a way in which to conceptualise individuals or groups as they move from one place to another. This may of course be represented both as a physical journey (such as changing jobs) or a mental journey (such as a shift in attitudes). Consequently the research processes that are adopted to explore these changing identities result in complex dialogues that are created by both the participant and the researcher (Hoskins, 1998). By adopting a narrative approach based upon the use of objects, it is hoped to give up some of the researcher’s communicative power and to follow the participants in the study as they consider the

meaning of the objects that they have selected. Objects are entangled in everyday practices and are therefore bestowed with values and significance, which enable narratives and stories to develop around them (Whewell, 2006). In this context the role of the researcher becomes more that of listening and, if appropriate, confirming or clarifying the information shared. How these objects, and their associated narratives are acknowledged and engaged with are important parts of the research process. Zembylas (2003: 107) notes that narrative research has encouraged researchers to “explore teacher identity formation as articulated through talk, social interaction, and self-presentation” and that “drawing upon such views, one can formulate a teacher-self that is a polysomic product of experience, a product of practices that constitute the self in response to multiple meanings that need not converge upon a stable, unified identity”. The guiding methodologies for this research, therefore, draw upon the use of objects and their ability to incite narrative in the research process.

Whilst narrative can generate accounts based on chronological order, which often encourage the temporal, the use of objects focuses on an issue or aspect of practice. The semiotics of these objects focuses on the *how* of representation, whilst the discourse around them then considers the *effects* and *consequences* of this representation. Narrative in this context is a social process that enables a ‘telling’ of the stories that are constructed around the objects. The use of the objects allows an organisational framework through which individuals can organise their thoughts and experiences in a way that makes sense to them. In other words the objects become heuristic in nature.

### 3.1 The Research Questions

As outlined in Chapter 1 the research questions for this study are as follows:

1. How do teachers locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational spaces?
2. How do formal discourses (such as those provided by the government and providers) construct the aims of CPD and professional identities?
3. (i) How do teachers account for the effects of formal professional development on themselves and other actors? (ii) How might engaging with theory shed further light on the processes involved in CPD?
4. (i) To what extent are the relational and ethical foregrounded in accounts given by respondents? (ii) What theoretical sense might be made of this?

Of particular relevance to the methodological approach adopted in the thesis are the objectives that are also outlined:

- i. To ascertain the views of practitioners in regard to their experience of engaging with a Masters level programme of CPD
- ii. To consider how engaging with theoretical resources might shed further light on the processes and discourses of learning at Masters level
- iii. To understand the value of relational and ethical practices in professional learning
- iv. To make recommendations as to the form that CPD at Masters level might take that takes into account the considerations of practitioners.

Drawing upon the work of Sørensen (2009) helps to frame this study in the context of the questions. Sørensen (2009) notes that a key question in research is about what practice takes place when you have a particular combination of events occurring. In relation to the research questions of a study Sørensen (2009) encourages the researcher to consider learning as a socio-material achievement. It being argued that if you simply focus on the social that you invariably miss key events or issues. As a result of this the methodology, through the use of objects, should allow the data collection to be opened up rather than closed down.

### **3.2 Sample**

The sample was composed of eight teachers. There were seven females and one male teacher. Their level of experience ranged from 7-15 years. At the time of starting the MEd they were each in a class teacher post in special education setting secondary school (one participant), primary school (4 participants) or mainstream secondary school (3 participants). Further details of those who were interviewed for the data in this thesis are provided below:

Table 2: Profiles of the Participants in the Study

CT1

CT1 was a male teacher working in a school that provided alternative provision for those children who had been excluded from mainstream provision. The school had recently



acquired 'excellent, ambitious' funding and, as a result, was experiencing increased visits from both the LEA and HMI. Additionally, at the time of interviewing, the school had just had a return visit from HMI after a previously unsuccessful inspection that had followed on from a number of Council Reviews.

Whilst CT1 had trained as a music teacher he taught a range of skills and subjects within his current post. CT1 was, during the timescale of the Masters programme, promoted to the Senior Management Team (SMT) to focus on teaching and learning in the school and to ensure that it was 'as good as it can be' (CT1). As such he felt part of the SMT but without the 'management whip' (CT1), as such he felt that encouraging colleagues to work collegially was vital to his success in this role.

CT1 requested that his interview take place at his school. He identified three objects as follows:

- British Sign Language Symbol for a group
- Folio of evidence for Access 3 music
- HMIE pelt

### CT2

CT2 was a female teacher working in a large, Roman Catholic Secondary School where she was teaching within the Home Economics Department, and had been for 13 years. CT2 was clear that she wished to remain as a classroom teacher. CT2 described herself as keeping her head down and avoiding volunteering for anything which she attributed strongly to a lack of confidence and her ability to make pedagogic decisions about what

would be best in the classroom for her learners: “When I...when I started the M.Ed, I suppose I was....I was an ok classroom teacher. I was very quiet.....I was never kind of pushing myself forward for things. Whereas now I’m much more ‘come and see what I’m doing within my classroom’ and ‘come and see how well these kids are achieving in my classroom.’” (CT2).

CT2 requested that her interview take place in the university. She identified three objects as follows:

- A school tie
- Handout of a presentation given
- Hand outs of formative assessment and positive discipline

### CT3

CT3 was another female Home Economics teacher who was working in a large Secondary School. At a couple of points in the interview CT3 describes herself as an ‘older’ member of staff: “at my age it was a huge personal achievement to do a Masters degree”. As part of this undertaking the course had been about “that sort of proving to yourself thing” (CT3).

CT3, at the outset of the course, was feeling increasingly frustrated that her colleagues did not share her desire to keep “moving, changing and challenging” but that the course had provided her with a personal focus to achieve this without “distracting others” (CT3).

Additionally there was a sense of insecurity “..but I was kind of insecure at that point and I was quite insecure about (pause) I was insecure about who was on the group and how I saw myself in the department and maybe had a chip on my shoulder” (CT3).

CT3 requested that her interview take place in her school. She identified the following four objects:

- Traffic light tins
- Mobile 'phone
- Laptop provided by the LEA
- Chartered Teacher trophy from the school

#### CT4

CT4 was a female infant classroom teacher in a large primary school of 15 classes. The school is a pro-active environment which has been involved in Succeeding Together and action enquiry projects. CT4 completed an MBA in Educational Management several years previously through an open learning route. As a result a key difference with this course was the contact between the members of the course group and the requirement to work collaboratively with colleagues in her school.

CT4 requested that her interview take place in her school. She identified the following three objects:

- Magnifying glass
- Microphone
- Set of keys

#### CT5

CT5 was a female Secondary teacher working in a middle-size school (which she had joined as a probationer). She was a mature entrant to the teaching profession, having had a range of previous careers. In terms of study she had, in the four years previous to starting

the course, completed her probation, acquired a Masters in Special Education and a Certificate in Philosophy and Philosophy Education. She taught Philosophy and RMPS in a Department where she frequently had to step up to being Principal Teacher (PT) for significant periods of time. As such the conditions under which she was required to work sometimes caused concern for herself. Whilst many of the other students interviewed came from the same local authority this student was the only one on the course from her local authority. CT5 felt that this impacted upon her experience of the course – especially in relation to how the course community developed and supported each other as well as the support that they received, as a group, from the local authority.

CT5 requested that her interview take place in the university. She identified the following three objects:

- Serrated knife
- Ink pad
- Pine cone

### CT6

CT6, like CT5, was the only teacher from her local authority on the course, although she felt that being closer geographically to the other students, that she did have more support than CT5. That said, CT6 did sense that there was little understanding in her own school of what she was undertaking by doing the course. Her sense was that her own local authority did not acknowledge the course nor see it as any form of achievement to be valued. As such this has left her with a sense of frustration about the situation that she is in. CT6 was a classroom teacher in a primary school and previous to this course had had some experience

of open learning 7 years previously.

CT6 requested that her interview take place in the university. She identified the following four objects:

- Thinking cap
- Pile of books
- Clip art of lady on top of mountain
- Magnifying glass

### CT7

CT7 is a primary 1 teacher in a primary school with a school-wide responsibility for both ICT (as part of the Local Authority cluster group) and Enterprise. The school building is dated but going through a 'modernisation' programme – although this is mainly providing prefabricated huts for the growing pupil population.

CT7 requested that her interview take place in her school. She identified the following three objects:

- Contacts list
- Over-flowing diary
- Laptop

### CT8

CT8 is a teacher in a small primary school which had been involved in the Succeeding Together initiative but had felt that the CPD to support this initiative had been lacking.

CT8 felt that this had led to a lack of support in her own development between leaving her

teacher education course and starting the Masters course.

CT8 requested that her interview take place in the university. She identified the following three objects:

- computer
- mobile 'phone
- knowledge clipart

### **3.3 Ontology and Epistemology**

What has become clearer as this research project has developed is that both ontology and epistemology are concepts that are much bigger and meaningful than simply a sub-heading in a thesis. Indeed, the notions of epistemology and ontology shape the whole reason for this research work. It is how the educational world thinks about these two concepts that have shaped educational reform and standards in recent years. Biesta (2007) asks an important question. What kind of epistemology is appropriate in order to understand the role of knowledge in professional actions? Dewey suggests the idea that knowledge is a way of knowing that is based upon doing through experience. In other words knowledge is created of practice through a contextual experience. As part of this the consequences of practice in what are complex educational settings requires to be understood.

In terms of both ontology and epistemology this research will adopt an interpretative paradigm. The social world is fundamentally different to the natural world (Atkinson, Delamont & Hammersley, 1998) and as a consequence requires a different approach for collecting and analyzing data. Within this research the subjective world of the individual is

considered (Cohen *et al.*, 2000) as being an interpretation of experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Radnor, 2001). In turn it is accepted that social life and constructs such as educational spaces are only interpretations. Furthermore an awareness of interdependence is required. Human beings may be actively creating society but at the same time they are themselves created by society. This research will look for clarification as to how these interpretations, constructions and understandings are formulated and given meaning in the context of Masters-level CPD.

### **3.4 Digging Deep: The Use of ‘Objects’**

In relation to this research the use of objects are important. Sørensen (2009: 61) notes that:

*“This is because I believe we in educational research are more in need of words that draw our attention to what we used to call ‘things’ than we are in need of words that remind us of accounting for what through the processes of purification are called social or human relations.”*

Key questions in considering the methods used in this research was to ask what the benefits of using objects are and what role do objects play in the collection of data? Choosing an object that represents an aspect of a person’s practice allows for a clear focus and orientation. If you were to be asked ‘Tell me about your job?’ you would invariably provide an answer that would be different were you asked to bring an object to the interview that answered the question ‘What do you do in your job’? Not only does this use of objects pull towards a focus on practice, but it also encourages a more in-depth consideration of the space in which they are embedded. The objects become part of the

interview in that, as Knorr Cetina (2001) suggests, that they unfolding and signifying. The objects therefore provide a framework for responses and take the narrative to a different level of exploration. In other words objects:

1. Access desire;
2. Pull an individual towards a focus in a particular space (positionality);
3. Draws the individual towards a discussion of their practice.

As a researcher a constant worry is the active, ultimately leading role that the researcher can develop in both collecting and analysing data. Although research of this nature can never be neutral it is hoped that through the use of objects to collate data that some of the leading questions often generated by researchers in interview schedules might be avoided. In part this is because it allows the respondent to set the agenda through discussing the objects that they choose and therefore focus on issues and experiences that are important to them. Knorr Cetina (2001: 181) expresses this far more eloquently:

*“The everyday viewpoint, it would seem, looks at objects from the outside as one would look at tools or goods that are ready to hand to be traded further. These objects have the character of closed boxes. In contrast, objects of knowledge appear to have the capacity to unfold indefinitely. They are more like open drawers filled with folders extending indefinitely into the depth of a dark closet. Since epistemic objects are always in the process of being materially defined, they continually acquire new properties and change the one they have.”*



The idea of using objects was considered after reading anthropological texts such as Hoskins (1998). Considered in tandem with texts more traditionally associated with education it was possible to see how objects might be used in a constructive way to generate data. By participating in a course that was Masters-level CPD; participants give meaning to the objects, people and events that surround them as they journey through this process. As Hall (1997:3) posits:

*“Things ‘in themselves’ rarely if ever have any one, single, fixed and unchanging meaning. Even something as obvious as a stone can be a stone, a boundary marker or a piece of sculpture, depending on what it means – that is, within a certain context of use, within what the philosophers call different ‘language games’ (i.e. the language of boundaries, the language of sculpture, and so on).”*

Consequently the manner in which the objects are thought about and spoken about, results in them representing meaning. By integrating objects into practice meaning is generated in terms of how these are used and represented. Again, Hall (*ibid.*) comments:

*“In part, we give things meaning by how we represent them – the words we use about them, the stories we tell about them, the images of them we produce, the emotions we associate with them, the ways we classify and conceptualise them, the values we place on them.”*

Within this framework it is hard to separate the meaning that is placed on those objects, people and events that surround people from the shifting nature of culture and identity.

Hoskins (1998) found that in work, the more personal accounts of peoples' lives came from discussions generated by objects. As interactions take place between objects, people and events meanings are produced which in turn feed into identity and culture. Objects become entangled in life. As objects are integrated into everyday practice and bestowed with value and significance, narratives and stories develop around these. In turn these signify the meaning that has been placed upon them because they become symbols of the meaning that is to be communicated. Objects then can be used as a "narrative scaffolding device" (Weber, 2005: 13) to explore identity and practice either through the stories associated with the object or through the use of metaphor. Furthermore it can be argued that:

*"By looking at the subjects that people choose to dwell on in narrating their lives, we are in a position to see what most matters to them, from their point of view."* (Narayan & George, 2001: 817)

So, in one sense objects can be used autobiographically, to become a storytelling device, a prop or even a mnemonic for experiences (Hoskins, 1998). Objects can be a prompt to retrieve memories (Mitchell, Weber & O'Reilly-Scanlon, 2005) as well as to reveal what people cannot or will not say (Eisner, 1991). Indeed objects themselves are often imbued with meanings that are particular to specific events and processes.

### **3.5 Interviews and 'Objects'**

Eight students from the pilot group of the MEd agreed to take part in the data collection for this study. All of the students were from the same cohort therefore having undertaken, to

an extent, a similar experience. These students were approached to take part in the study immediately after the completion of their Masters.

Individuals were interviewed at a time and in a place of their choosing. In advance of the meeting the individuals were asked to identify and bring along three objects that they felt answered the question ‘How has the MEd PEEP course impacted upon what you do?’ (In this instance PEEP refers to the name of the Masters course: Appendix 1) Choosing the correct question in itself was important. Some questions, such as what, why, or when naturally preference a temporally based answer. Other questions such as where, which and how can encourage a consideration of the spatial. The focus on a ‘how’ question, in constructivist terms, encourages a discussion of important practices and the role that these have on constructing professional identities. Again, this, in turn, has a tendency to move away from the temporal narratives that a ‘what’ question, such as ‘What happened during the MEd PEEP course?’ might have. Additionally the focus of the question on the ‘MEd PEEP’ course makes a direct link to policy and, as Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard and Henry (1997: 42) noted:

*“Remember that when people are being interviewed, they will provide an account from their perspective which may include a distorted or magnified perception of their role in relation to a particular policy.”*

As each interview started individuals were asked to describe each object and then to explain the significance of the object. Aberton (2012) discusses the way in which ‘things’ can become material extensions of one, that it is a material enactment of one’s identity. Such a notion exists even within a temporary project, such as a four years Masters course.

The new project, which is temporary in nature, is a network or assemblage in which those involved “are co-constituted by temporary attachments and relationships” (Aberton, 2012: 122). Once all three objects had been described and their meaning explained the individuals were prompted to explore any connections between the objects. It was hoped that by semi-structuring the interviews in this way that the stories told through the chosen objects would not be closed down. This closing down can occur through the researcher controlling the conversation through pre-determined, often closed or dualistic questions that can lead to short answers. Additionally, where the researcher is more in control of the conversation narratives can be closed down or cut short. In turn this might lead to the respondent believing that their stories are not valid in this context.

By asking the CTs to identify three objects it was hoped that the multiplicity would allow for the participants to consider the wider impact of the course (Grumet, 1991). As Eisner (1991) suggests there are multiple ways in which the world can be known and that this is often shaped by the forms in which these are represented. Furthermore the use of multiple objects allows for the participants and the researcher to construct a discussion together to explore the question asked. Whilst one object may focus on the singular and indeed may provide closure on the discussion, three objects allow for inter-textuality whereby the objects can disturb each other.

All of the interviews were audio recorded on a Sony Mini-Disc Walkman digital recorder. In part this ensures that the researcher is able to listen carefully to the stories, rather than being worried about taking accurate notes. Paying attention to the stories can implicitly reflect a genuine interest in the discussion. Recording the conversations also ensures that accurate transcriptions can be made. There are many arguments based around time and

cost, amongst others, to support not transcribing interviews. However in the case of this research all of the interviews undertaken were fully transcribed by the author. Dunn, Pryor and Yates (2005) discuss the benefits of carrying out full transcriptions noting that summaries of texts can lead to a ‘flattening’ of the texts whereby essential elements or fine details, such as pauses, are left out. In addition by undertaking the transcriptions personally the researcher is able to begin to engage with analysis of the texts (Elliot, 2005).

Elliot (2005) discusses that narratives can be defined as either first-order or second-order. First-order narratives are those where an individual tells stories about themselves and their experiences. Second-order narratives are constructed by researchers to understand other people’s experiences or the social world. The use of transcripts as raw data for analysis allows for engagement with first-order narratives. It is also generally accepted that capturing all of the meaning from a conversation in a transcription is difficult. Indeed the excessive use of coding, for example to signifying actions, can interrupt or slow up the reading of a transcript. Yet a ‘clean’ transcript that has been edited fails to represent the words as they were actually spoken, the natural pauses and verbal tics have been removed. The aim in transcribing the interviews for this research was an attempt to capture some of the additional meaning (for example pauses and rhythm), but not to interrupt the reading of the transcripts through an overuse of codes. Consequently this means that as the researcher carrying out the transcriptions that some initial analysis has already occurred.

*“Recent theoretical interest in the study of personal narrative has highlighted the extent to which storytelling is a formative process: Through “telling their lives” people not only provide information about themselves but also fashion*

*their identities in a particular way, constructing a “self” for public consumption.*” (Hoskins, 1998: 1)

Narrative has, over recent years, developed as a form of educational research through which telling, listening and responding allows for the exploration of the spontaneity, complexity and ambiguity of human experience (Grumet, 1991; Riessman, 2001). Indeed Eisner (1991) notes that qualitative studies of an educational manner are usually expressed in stories. In turn this approach does not assume objectivity instead it privileges positionality and subjectivity (Riessman, 2001). Consequently using narrative and storytelling is both a relational and collaborative practice.

The use of objects in this research would hopefully prompt participants to tell their stories rather than relying on a series of questions developed by the researcher. Through narration there is an order and sequence provided to the conversation – prompted by the objects.

More often than not there is more than one ‘story’ in relation to an event and more than one way to tell that story. However, it is through the stories that are told about practice that identities can come into focus (Pagano, 1991). Schubert (1991) develops the notion of ‘teacher lore’ an idea that reflects the ‘folk pedagogy’ work of Bruner (1996). Here teacher lore is defined as the study of the knowledge, ideas, perspectives and understanding of teachers – an inquiry into the beliefs, values and images that guide teachers’ work. In other words, to explore what teachers learn from their experiences. Schubert (1991) suggests the use of the term *praxis*. This defines the blend of theory and practice that teachers often function within in their day-to-day practice. In considering this

definition the boundaries between the notions of praxis and professionalism blur (Goodson, 2003).

Schubert (1991) notes that this exploration often takes place through the use of stories. Narayan and George (2001) differentiate between personal narratives that they see as idiosyncratic and folk narrative that are collective. Whilst personal narratives are uniquely individual and shaped by experience, folk narratives are shaped more by collective traditions and are therefore shared cultural representations. Narayan and George (2001) go on to suggest that personal narratives are shaped not only by these shared folk narratives, but also through the personal re-telling of these.

In a parallel field the work on reflection, Schön (1983) highlights the necessity to draw upon practitioners' knowledge or stories into explorations of their work. Reflection, or indeed reflexivity in this case, is seen as an examination of personal experience within the context (for example political or social) of the individual's practice. This often involves an in-depth consideration of values and attitudes as well as a careful questioning. However, in this case the narration is generated not through the confessional approach of reflective practice (Bolton, 2005), but through the indirect medium of objects (Hoskins, 1998).

Stories are remembered and retold because they are personally, as well as socially meaningful. This means that the stories hold currency or value for an individual or group. By exploring teachers' experiences through discussion based around multiple objects these narratives can be collaboratively considered. Eisner (1991) has drawn upon the work of Geertz (1973) and his use of 'thick description' to consider the construction of meaning in this context. As Eisner (1991: 15) suggests:

*“Thick description is an effort aimed at interpretation, at getting below the surface to that most enigmatic aspect of the human condition: the construction of meaning.”*

However, it is worth considering that narrators will often reveal a preferred self, selected from a multiplicity of selves that they can draw upon (Riessman, 2001). Often this will be negotiated through the stories that are developed collaboratively and in this study the objects used will help to construct the narrative in a particular way. These negotiated stories necessarily provide an interpretation of the past rather than a reproduction of the past as it was, life as told rather than life as lived or experienced (Hoskins, 1998). In the context of this study, participants are being provided with another opportunity to re-tell their stories (Narayan & George, 2001).

A key role for the researcher in this process is to listen to the narrations and, at times, hold back on questions so that the narrator can shape the story being told in their own way. Equally, it may involve responding to questions from the narrator and thus engaging in dialogue.

### **3.6 Ethics and Data Collection**

Education is, if nothing else, an ethical practice. It is a practice based on morals, values and democracy (Biesta, 2007). As such the processes of education are not technical practices that can be objectively dissected and analysed. Rather thinking and talking about



practice is a subjective and messy business. Thrift (2007: 14) describes becoming ethical as a means of:

*“Becoming critical of norms under which we are asked to act but which we cannot fully choose and taking responsibility in a sense to be specified for the dilemmas that subsequently arise.”*

This, Thrift argues, opens up to a consideration of life through ontological involvement.

This research adhered to the British Educational Research Association’s (BERA) ethical guidelines for research (BERA, 2004) as well as the advice provided by the ethical committee of the School of Education, University of Stirling. Initially participants were contacted by email allowing them the time and space to consider participation in the research. Participants were also able to identify a time and place to meet that suited their needs. Within the initial email contact the purposes of the research as well as voluntary informed consent, and the right to withdraw at any point during the study was covered. It was also important to have cognizance of the tensions that existed on the dual relationships of tutor / student and researcher / participant. Whilst it would be naive to assume that power can be removed from either of these relationships, the process through which the research is approached can be framed carefully.

### **3.7 Spatiality and Data Analysis**

Initial analysis involved careful reading, and re-reading, of the data – ‘engaging’ with the data (Stronach, 1997). This allowed patterns to emerge from the data (Gill, 2000). A key

approach was to be able to spot the ways in which texts were ‘stitched together’ (MacLure, 2003). This can often occur, for example, through the setting up of binary oppositions – dualisms that marginalized others. Black and white or right and wrong where one position is always privileged over the other. Patterns emerged from the continual close reading of the data and constant comparative analysis over the timeframe and therefore could not be predetermined at the point of data collection (Atkinson *et al.*, 1998). Transcripts were made of each one-to-one interview. Whilst this was a time-consuming process, producing the transcripts involved a very close engagement with the data and could therefore be seen as the initial analysis stage. The transcripts were made in such a way that analytical notes could be created alongside the verbatim text. Once the data was collected further reading and consideration of the data took place and interpretation emerged from the data. Staying close to the data was to a powerful approach (Janesick, 1998) allowing for a consideration of how language was used. Gill (2000) suggests four main areas in which discourse analysis can help to consider texts. These are a concern with the discourse itself, a view of the language used as constructive as well as constructed, and an emphasis on discourse as a form of action as well as a conviction in the rhetorical organization of the discourse. The aim of analysis in this case is to share the ‘shaking up’ and mobilization of the data. This can be achieved by reading the text against itself. This is then an interest in the text in its own right. In this approach the text is not considered as a vehicle to find out about some assumed reality. In considering that identities may develop as an assemblage of the structures of society it is useful to look to the analysis of texts as rhizomes which provide multiple readings, directions, narratives and interpretations (Honan, 2005). In this approach it is linkages rather than differences that are explored within the texts. This is an attempt to move away, and discourage, one reading of the texts – often that of commonplace understandings – and to appreciate the multiplicity of linkages that can exist.

In discussing the three objects common linkages between the different aspects of the images may begin to emerge.

In terms of generalizability, the conclusions of the research will be relevant within the setting of the group studied. Furthermore the findings from this research process will be the construction of those involved in the process; without doubt this means that the findings will reflect presuppositions and sociohistorical circumstances of their production. As well as this the final text produced will impose, to some degree, the views of the researcher and supervisors on the subject matter. This is, inevitably, a key part of the research process. It would be unwise, therefore, to suggest that this knowledge would be universally valid (Atkinson *et al.*, 1998). The data will be presented in a form close to its original genesis, although analysis will have taken place and patterns in the text identified.

### **3.8 Conclusion**

This Chapter has argued for the use of objects in the data collection process as a way to acknowledge a methodological approach to research that requires developing approaches that allows equity between humans and materials and to afford the inclusion of all materials as central to the narratives that teachers tell about their CPD experiences. As this Chapter argues this is central to not only the data that collected but, in turn, shapes the analysis of such data. Analysis of data is an important process that will now be discussed in the thesis.

## **Chapter Four: Spatial Analysis through Thirdspace**

### **4.0 Introduction**

This study first turns to the theory of Thirdspace to analyse and theorise the manner in which a specific CPD activity had impacted upon the practices of a group of teachers. The aim of this Chapter is to explore the work of Lefebvre (1974) and Soja (1996) in shaping a theoretical lens through which to read the data and, as such to engage, in detail with two of the research questions. Firstly, *How do teachers locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational spaces?* And, secondly, *How do teachers account for the effects of formal professional development of themselves and other actors? How might engaging with theory shed further light on the processes involved in CPD?* Engaging with these questions starts to allow an exploration of two of the objectives of this work. Firstly it allows the data to provide a lens to ascertain the views of practitioners in regard to their experience of engaging with a Masters level programme of CPD and also to consider how engaging with theoretical resources might shed further light on the processes and discourses of learning at Masters level.

### **4.1 Spatial Theory as an Analytical Tool**

Within the data collated for this project there is a notion, concept or construction of something that is ‘spatial’ that exists. At the very least the teachers interviewed talk of spaces such as the ‘University’, the ‘School’, the ‘Classroom’ and their movement between these. Beyond this there is discussion of other, ‘mental’ spaces. The complexity, however,

arises in such a notion as to how space is dealt with and how it is used, or might be used, to construct meaning. Massey (2005: 17) highlights this problem stating that:

*“Henri Lefebvre points out in the opening arguments of The production of space (1991) that we often use that word ‘space’, in popular discourse or academic, without being fully conscious of what we mean by it. We have inherited an imagination so deeply ingrained that it is often not actively thought. Based on assumptions no longer recognized as such, it is an imagination with the implacable force of the patently obvious. That is the trouble.”*

The use of spatiality as a data analysis tool in this thesis requires drawing upon cultural geography and the development of the ‘spatial turn’. The spatial turn identified new ways of thinking geographically which occurred at a time when other discipline areas beyond Education became interested in the notion of using space as an analytical tool. As Allen (1997) notes, no event can take place without space and that to remember a time is to remember a place. So, where does this take the development of space as an analytical tool?

At this time a number of authors including Soja (1996) were asking critical questions around the nature of space, its meaning and construction. The debates here were key issues in areas of sociology and cultural studies. It is important in adopting such an approach to be clear about what ‘space’ is. Is it simply a defined physical area? Or does it go beyond this? Additionally the issue of whether spaces become places when association with feelings and identities requires consideration. Fenwick, Edwards & Sawchuk (2011: 129) develop some important questions that they feel required to be asked such as how do

spaces become specifically educational or learning spaces? How are they constituted in ways that enable or inhibit learning? How do spaces create inequalities or exclusions? How do spaces open or limit possibilities for new practices and knowledge? How is space represented in the artifacts used in educational practices? What knowledge counts? Where and how does it emerge in different time/spaces? How are subjectivities negotiated through movements and locations? And how is learning involved in the making of spaces? Whilst these spatial questions, which are derived from a socio-material approach, are useful as a starting point in reading the data, the work of Lefebvre (1974) and Soja (1996) will be considered in more depth as a theoretical framework for discussion of the data.

Lefebvre's (1974) *The Production of Space* was both an exploration and challenge to what was perceived to be the struggles over the meaning of space. As a Marxist the focus of the work was on a key concept of *production* of space and how it might be actively (and socially) produced. In doing this Lefebvre wanted to tackle the false dualisms reported to exist between time (history) and society and additionally attempted to consider why what can be considered to be *le perçu* or perceived space – that of the everyday lives that we live, was often ignored by, or manipulated by, 'professionals' in preference for *le conçu* or a theoretical conceived space: that which is pre-defined by others. As Merrifield (2000: 175) outlines, "In our society, in other words, what is lived and perceived is of secondary importance compared to what is conceived." For good or bad, the structure of society often comes from that which is conceived by those professionals in power. In other words, that there is a preference to read space as the products of history and society rather than the spatially of everyday lives and social relations. Lefebvre (1974) believed that the everyday had been increasingly colonized by capitalism and therefore the day-to-day lived spaces of people were being suffocated by the abstract space of capitalism (Holloway & Hubbard,

2001). As an antithesis Lefebvre (1974) proposed a Thirdspace that could rebalance *le perçu* and *le conçu*. In other words, at the core of what Lefebvre is arguing is that time, *space* and society are mutually constitutive and that one cannot be prioritized over the other (Hubbard, Kitchen & Valentine, 2004). All three of the spaces described in more detail in Table 3 combine to make up space.

Table 3: The nature of space

<p><i>Spatial Practice (Le perçu)</i></p>	<p>Lefebvre defined this space as that of social relations. This space is about daily routines and that which is perceived. Hubbard et al (2002) suggest that this space is about being the ‘concrete’ processes, flows and movements that we perceive in the everyday. The routines, the movements as well as the daily migrations and travels that we adopt. These are perceived to be social practices. This space, however, does not included the ‘lived-in-ness’ of the Thirdspace – spaces of representation. Rather it represents feelings, beliefs, actions and reactions to social relations and daily routines</p>
<p><i>Representations of Space (Le conçu)</i></p>	<p>As discussed Le conçu is the space that is conceptualized, shaped and constructed by others, usually professionals. Given its creation ideology, power and knowledge are all embedded and represented through signs and other forms of codification (Merrifield, 2000). These codifications can be ‘things’ such as images, maps and books (Hubbard et al, 2002) that work ideologically to legitimate or contest spaces. As noted above these are often produced by those professionals who state that they offer an objective view. Indeed knowledge and power is the central tenant of such a construction of space. Lefebvre (1974) considers this to be a dominant space of any society given its link to production. This is because such a space is seen as the state mode of production (Soja, 1996). As Allen (1997: 11) states:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“We all have conceived spatialities, but these formally educated and powerful people, especially in a capitalist system, have the means to identify what is socially lived, perceived and conceived, and then structure their own versions into what becomes disciplinary knowledge and institutional control.”</i></p>
<p><i>Spaces of Representation (L’espace vécu)</i></p>	<p>Lefebvre describes this space as that which is directly lived, the space of everyday experiences. At times Lefebvre suggests that this can develop an ‘underground’ element whereby those in such a space do not always follow defined rules but rather resist or transform these. It is infused with complex symbolism. Indeed complexity of such a space is what makes it hard to define. What Lefebvre suggests here is that the inhabitants of such spaces dominate and as such a coherent system of non-verbal signs and symbols can develop. Soja (1996: 35) in discussing such a space focuses on Lefebvre’s notion of <i>le droit à la différence</i>, or the right to be difference; to be able to challenge hierarchical and organized power.</p>

Soja (1996) draws heavily on the work of Lefebvre. Indeed Soja (1996: 3), like Lefebvre argues for a construction of space that is a “simultaneity and interwoven complexity of the social, the historical, and the spatial, their inseparability and interdependence”. In arguing for this Soja, like Lefebvre, is looking to contest conventional dualisms of space by developing a Thirdspace that disrupts and disorders. Soja (2009) reasserts this belief in later texts by highlighting the dualistic nature of many geographical concepts that could lead to binaries of polarization.

Like Lefebvre (1974), Soja (1996) looks to develop a ‘trialectics of spatiality’. However, these are defined as Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace. These constructs of space map well onto the three spaces outlined by Lefebvre. Therefore, given the ease of language, these terms will be used in the analysis of the data over those proposed by Lefebvre. Soja proposes the notion of ‘thirthing-as-othering’ as a way to break open binaries and to open these up by introducing the possibilities of an ‘Other’. “Thirthing introduces a critical “other-than” choice that speaks and critiques through its otherness” (Soja, 1996: 60). This is developed further in Soja (2009) who discusses the possibility of a ‘both/and also’ logic. Whilst the spaces that Soja (1996) outlines map onto the work of Lefebvre (1974) and therefore may read as repetition, for the purposes of this analysis it is important to outline them.

For Soja (1996) Firstspace is about the spatial practices of a society. It is the way in which we materially produce the social. Lefebvre defined this as ‘*La réalité quotidienne*’ or those routines, often repetitive, of everyday life. These practices are often perceived to be objective and material. Very much as the notion of Euclidean space that privileges the



quantitative, the scientific and the mathematical. In Secondspace, as does Lefebvre (1974), Soja (1996) connects this space with power and knowledge. Furthermore it was suggested that an element of control and surveillance exists within such a space. There is an implicit notion that such spaces are presumed to be reality for society and that the knowledge within them is created through discussion. Soja (1996: 56) defines Thirdspace as:

*“Everything comes together in Thirdspace: subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, the knowable and unimaginable, the repetitive and the differential, structure and agency, mind and body, consciousness and the unconscious, the disciplined and the transdisciplinary, everyday life and unending history.”*

This, according to Soja (1996) is directly lived space. It was argued that these are “spaces of resistance to the dominant order arising precisely from their subordinate, peripheral or marginalised positioning” (Soja, 1996: 68). Neither Lefebvre (1974) nor Soja (1996) are clear about why such a Thirdspace might be a space of struggle, of liberation or emancipation. It may simply be that it is this ‘Third’ space, the ‘othering’ that challenges binaries and dualisms. Allen (1997: 12) suggests that Thirdspace is about change and appropriation and a sense of unknowability:

*“These lived spatialities retain, or even emphasize, a particular unknowability through a non-verbal subliminally, a characteristic that the scientifically minded find disturbing. They are in a sense spaces of “resistance” since to be “fully-known” is to be essentialized.”*

What Soja (1996: 73) argues for here is that to have a Thirdspace, to think differently, ontology needs to be considered in that “all excursions into Thirdspace begin with this ontological restructuring, with the presupposition that being-in-the-world, Heidegger’s Dasein, Sartre’s être-là, is existentially definable as being simultaneously historical, social and spatial”. Soja (2009) talks of the Thirdspace as being a precondition to resistance of all forms of power.

Both Lefebvre and Soja argue that many theoretical approaches often form false dualisms, for example, between time and space. As such they both chose to adopt a trialectical approach that they consider to challenge such issues. Reading the data from a trialectical approach allows for an opening up and wider reading of the texts whilst acknowledging the tensions that can exist in day-to-day practices and how these can shift and change. Rather than closing down thinking or accepting practices as the norm, such approaches allow thinking to remain open and to open up further paths and ideas. Rather than adopting an either / or approach it encourages a wider and more open approach.

The work of both Thrift (2007) and Sørensen (2009) help in unpacking the notion of Thirdspace more carefully. Thrift (2007), in his work on non-representation theory explores the notion of “*the geography of what happens*” (*ibid.*: 2). The notion that life is based on and in movement, and that the on flow of everyday life, the ‘becoming’ is about fighting concepts of ‘frozen states’ was discussed. This idea of changing states is a helpful notion in considering changes in teachers’ identities. In the sense that spaces are practices: very much reflected in the teachers’ data and that the notion of site should be engaged with as “an active and always incomplete incarnation of events” (Thrift, 2007: 12) that assembles itself through varying conditions. In this Thirdspace, or indeed any space, be it

first, second or third, requires consideration as a new combination of objects and events, that, because they are new, contradicts or challenge conventional practice. This creates a new sense of space (Thrift, 2007). It was suggested that:

*“Spacetime if seen as arising out of multiple encounters which, though structured, do not have to add up: as myriad adjustments and improvisations are made, so new lines of flight can emerge. The fabric of space is open-ended rather than enclosing.”* (Thrift, 2007: 98)

In this light Thirdspace can be seen as an encounter – you do not have to become, or indeed physically move, to Thirdspace. Indeed acting or thinking differently leads to a refocusing – a different take. In encountering it you create something different, but something that still has traces of other experiences and places: “nearly all spaces bear the freight of their past” (Thrift, 2007: 121). Indeed as Sørensen (2009) notes participants have a share in practices and that they have histories that allow them to connect to practice in different ways. Thrift (2007) follows this argument through to suggest that there is no defined space, no last word, only infinite becoming.

Sørensen (2009) also explores the notion of ‘becoming’ as an ontological rather than epistemological stance. This was proposed as a process (2009: 13) by which humans and things come to be “as effects of the arrangements in which they are entangled”. In reading and exploring the data of the teachers it is helpful to bear in mind the following words (Sørensen, 2009: 10):

*“Performance describes the involvement of a variety of related components: the pre-existing reality, the text, and the approach, together forming a socio-material assemblage.”*

Such a take is helpful especially given that, as Sørensen (2009) notes, Lefebvre focuses on space as purely social. If the material aspects of practice are ignored then gaps can appear. It was suggested that different materials contribute to constituting different forms of knowledge. Rather usefully Sørensen embeds this argument in the construction of space as:

*“An expanded web of relations that may have nothing to do with geographic terrains, that is, space consists of emerging relational formations in which human and non-human components that do take part contribute to performing these spatial formations.”* (Sørensen, 2009: 74)

And

*“Space is not a container in which objects are located. Space is an association of parts that make up an expanded web of relations.”* (Sørensen, 2009: 87)

#### **4.2 A First Reading of the Data: Mobility Between Spaces**

As outlined in Chapter 3 as part of the interview process students were asked to identify three objects that represented how the MEd course had impacted upon their practice. These are presented in Table 4. In adopting such an approach it allows the material to be valued as much as the dialogue of the interview process. This is because the objects essentially

represent something of value to the individuals interviewed. Given the objects-based methodological approach to the data analysis it is important to highlight the objects identified and to consider what meaning the respondents attributed to these. In reading the data objects can be / have representational attributions.

Table 4: The objects brought to interview by the teachers

CT	Objects	Ascribed meaning by the teachers
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. British Sign Language symbol for a group</li> <li>2. Folio of evidence for access 3 music</li> <li>3. HMIE pelt</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The importance of working as a group</li> <li>ii. Proof that changes are working</li> <li>iii. The course has taught the skills needed to counteract HMIE</li> </ol>
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A school tie</li> <li>2. Handout of a presentation given</li> <li>3. Hand outs of formative assessment and positive discipline</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Increased awareness of pupils in classroom</li> <li>ii. Represents an increase in confidence</li> <li>iii. A keenness to try out new things that benefit learners</li> </ol>
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic light tins</li> <li>2. Mobile 'phone</li> <li>3. Laptop provided by LEA</li> <li>4. Chartered Teacher trophy from the school</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Represents how work has impacted upon the pupils</li> <li>ii. The importance of dialogue with others on the course</li> <li>iii. The importance of the work on the laptop and the confidence in presenting</li> <li>iv. The acknowledgement of the school of achievements</li> </ol>
4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Magnifying glass</li> <li>2. Microphone</li> <li>3. Set of keys</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Looking more closely and deeply at everything they do</li> <li>ii. Course provided more of a voice</li> <li>iii. Course has opened doors to new knowledge and understanding</li> </ol>
5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Serrated knife</li> <li>2. Ink pad</li> <li>3. Pine cone</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Doing their job better</li> <li>ii. Being in the classroom and implementing 'stuff'</li> <li>iii. Attracts attention but hiding seeds of knowledge</li> </ol>
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thinking cap</li> <li>2. Pile of books</li> <li>3. Clip art of lady on top of mountain</li> <li>4. Magnifying glass</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Increased confidence</li> <li>ii. Thinking about what they are doing more</li> <li>iii. Interest in reading about education</li> <li>iv. Feels like they have got to the top of the mountain</li> <li>v. Examining everything</li> </ol>
7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contacts list</li> <li>2. Over-flowing full diary</li> <li>3. Laptop</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Social friendship and professional networking</li> <li>ii. Increased responsibility in job</li> <li>iii. Increased knowledge and greater awareness of where things come from</li> </ol>
8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Computer</li> <li>2. Mobile 'phone</li> <li>3. Knowledge clipart</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Accessing information</li> <li>ii. Lifeline to sanity: good discussions</li> <li>iii. Acquiring knowledge has been empowering</li> </ol>

In simply looking at the meaning ascribed to the objects selected by the teachers, what is immediately apparent is that the objects identified are indicators that something significant has happened to practice. This is a notion that an object, a noun, represents a process, a verb, and that transitions and shifts have occurred and as such the objects have become tokens of space shifting. Indeed, some of these themes emerge in more than one interview. All of the objects represent changes or shifts in practice, or, at least they represent a claim on the part of those interviewed that a shift, a movement, had occurred. Therefore, an essential question to ask here is on what grounds might one make a claim to have made such changes? How do those interviewed express such changes? How might the objects validate such claims? These are questions that will be considered more fully within this Chapter. Here the first research question that this Chapter addresses starts to be answered in terms of how the teachers locate themselves and construct their professional identities within educational spaces. Through the use of spatial analysis a consideration of the second question around how teachers experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional training can also be considered.

Sørensen (2009: 126) suggests that mobility is created by “drawing in new parts that make the process move and alter” as such, discussing the objects and what these represented to the teachers allowed a discussion of how practice has moved. The first theme that emerged from the objects chosen was a notion of ‘ethics of care’. Those interviewed were keenly aware of the impact that the course had had on their practice in terms of a refocusing on the learners in their classrooms. This represents a movement from less considered practice to thinking more about what they were doing in terms of what they felt was best for the pupils. In turn they were willing to try out new pedagogic strategies and argued that they were doing a better job as a result. They suggested that they could see positive changes happening which benefitted the learners in front

of them. Firstspace in the context of the data focuses on the daily practices of learning and teaching; the accepted norm of what happens in classrooms but as a practice that has become routinised and as such requires little thought. The teachers are aware of a shift from the routine of day-to-day practice to, on one level or another, thinking about that routine and what alternatives might exist. As CT2 notes *“I do a lot of my teaching because it is how I like to do it but it is not necessarily how the children like to learn”*. This is an awareness of a space that had developed around the social practices of learning and teaching but had become accepted and no longer thought through. All of the teachers interviewed, felt, on a number of levels, more engaged or re-engaged with the classroom space and particularly the learners themselves. It is almost as if the pupils become more fore-grounded and human as the teachers have engaged with the course. There is a sense of the complex notion of ethical and moral sense of teaching resurfacing. For many of the teachers there was an element of shock and surprise around re-engaging with the pupils at this level. For most of the teachers this led to a change in practice that was more focused on the pupils, their learning and attainment:

*“The fresh approach that I’ve had to my teaching....far more relaxed in the classroom, allowing pupils far more time to have their own space...I used to be tied that I had to fulfill every single lesson plan and it was like my agenda far more than their agenda.”* (CT5)

Furthermore, one of the other teachers (CT6) noted that:

*“Life was easier (pause) pre MEd (pause) because you just, you just did your job. You came in the morning, you did your job and then you went away at the end of the night. Now you come in and your constantly thinking about (pause) how will I*



*change that? How will I adapt that? ...I no longer assume that if the children aren't learning it's their fault."*

What appears to have happened is that the teachers, in undertaking the course, have become more "*pupil-orientated*" (CT5) because the course has encouraged them to look at their practice through a more thoughtful and active process. Practice has changed as the teachers have engaged in a process of thinking and taking ownership back around what happens in their classrooms. Interestingly much of the grounds for making such claims came from the evidence generated from professional enquiries rather than the reading of theoretical and policy texts (although there is an implicit link here). This, in turn, raises questions about how teachers engage with policy texts as a Secondspace that has led to informing practices. Many spoke of their personal practice changing (the day-to-day routines of Firstspace) and not that of the Secondspace, in other words, the State mode of production. This starts to open up a focus on the self and practice, a theme that will be developed in Chapter 5.

However, as suggested there is an implicit link in changing practice to an association with and a direct connection to a perceived increased in knowledge. What this knowledge consists of is often left unexplored or explained, so for example:

*"Opening a door for my pupils as well because I think you know if I can be more knowledgeable then that is obviously going to impact on their experience."* (CT4)

In turn this linked to a second key shift around the acquisition of knowledge and understanding. Whilst some of those interviewed felt that new knowledge was confidence-building and empowering others felt that it opened new doors and encouraged them to explore and examine

everything about their practice in depth. This was about looking more closely and deeply at what they did. This new knowledge, in turn, impacted, they felt, positively on their classrooms. A key question here, though, is what sort of knowledge was this? Where did it come from and why? It could be argued that such questions can only be explored contextually. There is also something here about why knowledge was seen to be important to the teachers. So, for example, in the case of CT1 the authority of HMIE was replaced by the authority of key texts on the Masters course that allowed them to challenge and question HMIE, and others in authority. For others, such as CT3, it was about the knowledge connected with a national research project. Whilst such knowledge is often associated with a notion of Secondspace, who owns and controls that knowledge is often important. The data here suggests a colonization of Secondspace by the teachers as they engage in study at a Masters level.

Along with an increased confidence emerged a third theme from the objects, that of 'voice'. Where individuals felt that they had more of a lonely experience they felt the need to develop skills to counteract 'others'. For some 'others' were colleagues in the school or the Senior Management Team (SMT), for others it was external agencies such as HMIE. In all cases there was a feeling of having more of a voice and a confidence in their own abilities and knowledge to speak out. For some teachers who felt more secure in their context voice was about the importance of 'group'. Not only was the group who meet on the course a source of support but there was also an acknowledgement that the dialogue was key to their development and practice. This was through a number of sources, dialogue, professional networking, and social friendship groups- all of which appeared to provide a 'lifeline to sanity'.

All of the teachers on the course were aware of the 'power' that the evidence they had collected for their studies was seen as holding in schools and the wider educational community. Indeed the

objects, if seen as validator of their claims of change and shifts often represent the evidence that teachers collated to support their claims about practice. However, how such evidence might be considered within the theoretical framework tends to fit within the concept of Secondspace. Indeed on returning to the arguments from the previous Chapter then it could be proposed that Secondspace is about power and knowledge embedded and represented through signs and other forms of codification (Merrifield, 2000). These codifications can be ‘things’ such as images, maps and books (Hubbard, Kitchin, Bartley & Fuller, 2002) that it could be argued is ‘evidence’. Whether the teachers were aware of such a tension is questionable. CT1 noted that HMIE, in particular, ‘liked’ evidence. This may well be for the obvious reasons stated in Lefebvre’s definition of Secondspace although it was justified as being proof that change was working. Again, a tension arose around this in relation to the Local Authority:

*“They’re kind of all talk and vision and not, not really clued up on the practical side...So every policy document that they fire in on us we are actually reading and able to read As an educational, umm, ideological artifact.” (CT1)*

Like CT1 many of the other teachers feel that the course has encouraged them to question the power and artifacts produced in Secondspace. However, the questions must be asked as to whether they did this through the creation and recreation of a new Secondspace? What the data suggests is that many of the teachers mirror back the language and artifacts of Secondspace through having adopted control, or colonization, of these. This is because they felt that they had a greater understanding and had acquired more knowledge. Again, though, it poses the question about what this knowledge actually is. CT5 talks of ‘*ticking the boxes*’ as being less important whilst CT6 talks of not being afraid to question or argue with those in authority. This is also supported by CT7 who says, “*I know I’m more vocal and I kind of feel I can back up what I’m*

*saying*". Interestingly the teachers, as the course has progressed, appeared to have become sources of 'knowledge' in schools. There is a notion that acquired knowledge is something that is passed on to others, that colleagues approach them to ask questions or to get advice. As CT8 notes it is all too easy to become complacent and just accept information that is cascaded down. Whilst a tension exists as to what knowledge and whose knowledge they have acquired, the teachers all note that they are now far more proactive in engaging with Secondspace because they feel that the course has provided them with the tools with which to do this.

In reading the data it is hard, at times, to differentiate between a Second and Thirdspace. In part this is to do with how such spaces are defined, and shaped by words. In addition it is connected with how the teachers think about practices and the work that they do. It is also important here, to consider that Thirdspace is not a 'space' as such but rather a new place in a process.

Thirdspace is often seen to be about an 'other than' choice, the right to be different and to challenge. It is, by its very nature messy, but it is what comes together at that point in time and space. In some ways for the teachers this space can be seen to be about links, connections, networks and meshing together. It should not necessarily be viewed as an 'underground' activity (as Thirdspace is often defined), but as a way to strengthen, challenge and tackle issues of justice. All of the teachers talk extensively of increased confidence and the ability to 'resist' conventional practice and rules – this is closest that the data gets to a notion of Thirdspace.

### **4.3 Moments of Intensities / Space Shifting**

Thrift (2007) in his discussion of non-representational theory talks about the 'jolt' that arises from new encounters, new connections and new ways of proceeding. Such jolts are experiences or exchanges that encourage thinking differently about aspects of practice. As such these are

likely to be different from standard, sometimes routinized, practice. These result from the need for new things to be tried out and ultimately settled upon as a new configuration of time / space and practice. Some of these moments create 'ghosts' and do not develop into a more defined approach or a way of being whilst others create a moment, or a point of creation of a new experience that leads on to new practices. As such the moment of activity or thinking has to be significant to the extent that it grows and develops as a new practice, hence the notion of intensity as in strength or magnitude. The strength or magnitude of a moment of practice can prompt one to think differently about practice. Such moments could be considered to provoke a shift in practice whereby a new way of working is adopted. In reading the data it is clear that there are significant moments of intensity that occur and such that could be considered 'jolts'. This could be those moments of Thirdspace whereby teachers experience a new way of thinking or being- *an other* as Thirdspace is often considered to be. The teachers, in discussing the objects, and their significance, identify awareness and movement in practice, a sense of a shift in thinking that is taking place. For each of the teachers interviewed moments of intensity varied and were linked to contextual experiences. In other words Thirdspace is about creating spaces of transformations. Even a flash of such a Thirdspace can provide a new way of thinking and possible next steps. It can lead to the awareness of a future goal. For some, this allows a new choreography of practice shaped by such moments of intensity.

Soja (1996: 81) suggests that the starting point for Thirdspace is "the provocative shift back from epistemology to ontology." Indeed if standards shape the epistemology of practice (the *how*) then those moments of intensities experienced by the teachers do appear to open up the bigger questions of ontology and how these, often more personal belief systems, shape the *why* of practices, or as Soja (1996: 82) more eloquently puts it "a critical and inquisitive nomadism in which the journeying to new ground never ceases".

CT2 had always considered herself to be a good teacher because she has always geared her teaching towards the pupils. However, she refers, early on in her narrative, to a key point where this changes for her and she thought: “*no, actually, I’m not (a good teacher)*”. For her, there was a realization that she felt different about her previous practice, through her new practice, and that “*I do a lot of my teaching because it’s how I like to do it but it is not necessarily how the children like to learn*”. This realization provides a flash of thinking differently, a movement from an accepted practice that was comfortable to one that required a questioning of *her* current practice. It is this moment of pausing and thinking that creates a possible Thirdspace for CT2.

Sheehy (2009) notes the strangle hold that Secondspace can have on teachers and students. There are often the daily routines that become so routinized in schools and classrooms that new practices are difficult to adopt because it is hard to question the folk pedagogy that has developed around our practices. Not only are practices accepted as the norm but they are often embedded in policy as ‘best’ or ‘good’ practice (HMIE 2007). As Ryan (2011) suggests, the conceived spaces of professional standards, such as SFR (GTCS, 2006) and CT (SEED, 2002a), are there to produce the ‘ideal’ and as such these are reflected in university structures and school procedures that the teachers engage with. Such ideals can be hard to question or conflict with. Davies (2006) refers to this as ‘teaching-as-usual’, a dominant discourse in which the teacher has developed a sense of unquestioningly knowing and who therefore believes that they have the authority to assert the correctness of that view. In part this is because by promoting, accepting and achieving standards as teachers we believe that we are the ‘teacher’, the finished item, once the standard is achieved. As a result, acceptance of being the finished result can mean a lack of any further engagement with practice. However, Sheehy (2009) goes on to suggest that a Thirdspace can interrupt such assumed logic and create a space of action that sits within and

between and is manipulated by first/Secondspace. What Ryan (2011) would suggest is a space to 'reimagine': a way in which to reconfigure and create new orientations that may not have been previously possible. This is emphasized in the narrative of CT2 through a shift in the narrative from 'the children' (of a standard) to 'my' children (of ownership and belonging). Whilst some of the interview talk was about actual practices in the classroom in the form of grouping pupils and collaborative working with other members of staff, this did not provide the intensity of discussion in the interview that the pupils themselves did.

Many writers who have engaged with the notion of Thirdspace, such as Ryan (2011) suggest that it is through the process of deeper reflection, often supported through practices such as professional enquiry that can lead to a more critical engagement with standards. However, with CT2 the talk around such professional enquiry practice was less intense and acted more as an opening of the door rather than stepping into new thoughts and imaginings of practice. Yes, reference to professional enquiry was there but this was not the Thirdspace that had been created. For CT2, the object – a school tie – clearly represents "*the children in front of me*". In the past what had come first was teacher-led learning, now, however, it was thinking about the pupils' learning first and foremost that appears to have shifted both the focus of the teacher and her practice. In the following quote CT2 acknowledges that her increased confidence has led to the pupil noticing the difference in her "*Oh Miss, you're cracking much more jokes than you used to.*" This focus is highlighted above those other aspects that have been impacted upon by increased confidence such as presenting at conferences – which is referred to in a far more incidental manner within her narrative. It is almost as if the original moment of intensity has invoked a change that becomes embedded and foundational to everything that then follows. This is like the ripples on a pond's surface cause by the initial moment of throwing in a stone. That initial flash provides momentary glimpses of a Thirdspace that grows and becomes more

embedded, defined and practiced: the rationale for all that follows. In some ways the moment of intensity is the loose thread that then unravels all that had been built up in the past and yet, at the same time, provides a new way in which to stitch things together.

Throughout her narrative CT2 refers to the importance of the group of teachers that she worked with and her increasing confidence however, her reasoning always returns back to the original point of intensity and the point of shift, that of the pupils: *“The people were really important, they really were. And it goes back to, you know, what I was saying with the kids...”* Here, even changes in practice are based on the foundational concept of the pupils: *“and to just get things that are going to benefit the kids on board”*, *“let me see if the kids are going to like this. Let me see if it’s going to benefit my kids”*. This personal possession of the pupils: *“my kids”* and the continual return to the pupils throughout the narrative increase the intensity of the original moment. Indeed, the language of the Secondspace policy texts would refer to pupils not kids. There is something more deeply personal and important to the self about *‘kids’*. It indicates ownership and care.

The second two objects that CT2 refers to, whilst on the surface appear to represent other aspects of change in practice do, in fact, return to the pupils. When asked towards the end of the interview about connections between the three objects CT2 thought momentarily and then stated *“the kids have become...the kids have always been at the centre of my teaching. I went into teaching for the kids and I’ve always tried to make sure that I am doing the very best for them. And I think I’m even more determined now that the pupils that are in my classroom are going to have the best possible chance to achieve the best they can possibly do.”* Here there is a shift from the classroom as a place for organizing teaching and learning to being the place in which teacher / pupil interactions occur and that these must be at the forefront, the focus so to speak. There is



an awareness here of collaboration with the pupils and the possibility that they too share this Thirdspace. Davies (2006) notes that the development of Thirdspace thinking can lead to a place where agency is opened up for both teachers and their pupils. For CT2 the point is not that her practice has changed through the course as such but that the pupils are benefitting “*whereas now I’m much more ‘come and see how well these kids are achieving within my classroom’*”. All of the other discussion and narrative are connected but incidental to that initial intensity and point of change focused on her pupils.

CT1 had a different experience of such a moment of intensity that involved a more political and external battle with authority and power. As with CT2 there is evidence of Firstspace practices in the school being controlled by Secondspace ideals and power. CT1 feels a personal unjustness of this that clearly underpins his reason for changing practice. For CT1 there are, initially at least, two Secondspaces: the school and the university. Indeed, initially, at least, CT1 reacted more negatively to the University space and CT1 removed the early entries from his learning journal. With time, though, the tools of the university space allow a reimagining of the school space: but within the boundaries prescribed by those who control Secondspace:

*“So every policy document that they fire in on us we are actually reading and able to read as an educational, ummm, ideological artifact now because of the work that we did with the Scott stuff which was really, really interesting. And, you know, and to be able to counter that power and it suddenly comes to people that they can’t just slap things down on your desk – that they’re going to get them back.”*

The Secondspace of the university provides the tools with which to collect the evidence to prove that they are making a difference, to counteract and to show that their practice is right. For many,

such as CT1, the process of enquiry is quite a routinized approach that has warrant through the Secondspace of the university: “*certainly the course has given me a lot of research skills which are really, really useful to be able to use in the school*”. However, it is a case of Secondspace being manipulated to create a form of Thirdspace. So, for example CT1 notes that:

*“I’m hoping that as time goes on that people will become more and more used to that type of monitoring and evaluation and reflection on what they are doing. There was a time here when there was no reflection what-so-ever.”*

Not only does CT1 make judgments here about the practice of others (and the manner of reflective practice) but there is a clear link between their ‘reimagining’ of the school space in the shape of a current Secondspace that exists in policy: as monitoring, evaluation and reflection are all key words explicit in current policy texts such as HMIE (2007). This is an interesting observation, especially when CT1 notes that:

*“We’ve just finished with the inspectorate and they’ve just been in here visiting for the second time. Now, last time we got absolutely, umm, taken to the cleaners. This time, ahh, they can see all the improvements that have been made and everything. ...in some ways the course has taught me the skills needed to counteract the HMI.”*

A key element of the concept of Secondspace is the artifacts that define the supposed validity of such a space as conceptualized by those in power. Both the university and school spaces value ‘evidence’ but how it can be engaged with can be considered differently. Here, CT1 plays those owners of Secondspace at their own game by producing the sort of artifacts that they would find hard to argue against. There is also the use of language that reflects the dominant discourse of

the Secondspace, for example, “we’ve got a vision and a direction now”. In the case of CT1 this is a more public shift of practice and one in which speaking out and ‘voice’ becomes more important:

*“We’re in a situation where we are almost being told that everyone else knows better than us. And, actually being able to collect evidence we were actually able to collect the proof that it’s working....as soon as someone else comes into the situation the young person will kick-off and react to that. And so they never really see it as good as it can be. So we need to be able to put all of the evidence together to show that we are really growing as a school – that we are doing this, that and the other thing. And that has been really, really valuable.”*

As part of voice in this context, ‘talkback’ that holds validity within Secondspace becomes an essential part of this contextual Thirdspace:

*“..and just being able to, just being able to...bank the stuff for when someone says that’ll never... and you can say “well actually it has worked in a certain situation”. Ummm, ummm, you know, people tend to be their own worst enemy. Umm, umm and that’s really, really good for answering back to that.”*

This can be seen as a form of a subtle refiguring of the ‘choreography’ of practice’.

*“Every time people were coming and saying “this isn’t good enough, this isn’t good enough, this isn’t good enough, this isn’t good enough, this isn’t good enough” whatever they were seeing. There was never any sort of suggestion that “you could try or you could try or you*

*could try” and there was never any solutions put in place there was just a statement of all the problems that there were. Which is the easy thing to do, it’s easy to look at a situation and say what the problems were. And, you know, whoever it is, the HMI, the council or the parent they can come in and they can see the problems, you know, “why’s she running up and down the corridors?” umm, and they only see that, they don’t see anything else. And so, the course has taught me to stand up for what I believe in and to do what you’re doing, to do it on good educational, theoretical basis....to really believe in yourself, that you know that what you’re doing is right...”*

Once again, in this context, the course and the focus of professional enquiry is evident in the data but it is not the moment of intensity, that is a far more emotive and personal reaction to the perceived unjust nature of power: a reason to fight a system. In part this is about removing the power, often associated with Secondspace: *“really it’s taking this power that they had of saying “well you’re not good enough” away”*. The metaphors associated with this are powerful:

*“But everyone, certainly in my group, had some sort of behind bars, in a cage, umm, they felt that they were just being squiggled and compressed into their little hole, stay in your box – ok? And at the end everyone had some sort of freedom or release...I think that the bars are just a paper cage now and I’ll just remove it and..anyone putting a brick in my way and I’ll step round it – I will do whatever I have to do.”*

*“It’s a giant slayer thing. It’s these folk who put themselves into power of “I am me and I am here to tell you this” and you’re instead of saying “ok!” you’re going “well, actually, how do you know that? How’s it true?””*

Moments of intensities appear not to be dependent on the length of experience in the classroom that the teachers have. The process is clearly not related to the number of years of teaching and therefore experience, indeed it is something far deeper than that. CT6 experiences a moment of shock – a jolt from the notion of teaching-as-usual (Davies, 2006: 432). That they are:

*“Moving from one who simply conducts the practices of teaching-as-usual, to one who also turns her reflexive gaze on her practice, to ask not only how those usual practices reiterate and sustain the relations of power in which her readings are not questioned, but also to search for a form of agency in which the possibility of resignification of herself, and of her students, is opened up.”*

So, it is not simply the *moments* of intensities but the *movements* that such moment evoke. A movement could therefore be conceptualized as being an important gap that allows the space to think differently about aspects of technologies of practice. It is such movements in practice that become important:

*“I try to be diplomatic but I will speak my mind if I’m asked to do something that I ...don’t feel in my heart is right then I will (pause) go and say to this person “I’m not comfortable with what you’re asking me to do or could I try...” or whatever, whereas before I would have just gone away and muttered under my breath and, done it and thought “why are we doing it that way?””*

Part of this is about *“I’m thinking all the time now. I’m thinking about what I’m doing”*.

Associated with this is a frustration that Secondspace ‘*dumps*’ new initiatives on staff that can

lead to panic over implementation, as there is no attempt to *think* through how to handle the implementation. The increasing focus on accountability in education encourages this. In turn, this can lead to the building of a feeling of being ‘done to’. CT6 acknowledges that whilst you cannot change everything, such as the size of the classroom and the number of pupils within it, there are other aspects of practice that you can engage with. As Soja (1996: 65) would suggest it is about remaining open to the “re-combinations and simultaneities of the ‘real-and-imagined’”. Which, in part, signifies a move from second to Thirdspace, as acknowledged by CT6 herself:

*“Life was easier (pause) pre MEd (pause) because you just, you just did your job. You came in, in the morning, you did your job and then you went away at the end of the night. Now you come in and you’re constantly thinking about (pause) how will I change that? How will I adapt that? ....And I, I can’t feel now I can ever have a lazy day before I could feel like I could just have a (sigh) let’s just get the textbooks out and get through things now. Now I think “oh, you can’t do that! That’s a terrible way to learn!...But there are times you think to yourself “it’s easier” – MEd – cause ignorance was, was definitely bliss and now you know better, you know, you know when you’re not doing it properly.”*

Along with a movement to thinking differently comes a feeling of isolation, of others not understanding the process that has been experienced:

*“I do feel very isolated. Especially within a culture where nobody understands really what I’ve achieved....there’s still this whole understanding that it’s just...a piece of paper, it’s just another...degree, it’s...there’s nobody understands the process*

*you've gone through. There's nobody understands the learning that took place while you were at it."*

In experiencing the process of the Masters course, some students have clearly made choices, often implicitly, about which First/Secondspace practices that they want to, or might be able to interrupt or resist (Ryan, 2011). As part of this they work through how to do this in their own time and space whilst playing with the First/Secondspace realities of life in schools. Ryan (2011: 889) in drawing upon the work of Sheehy (2009) notes that:

*"She argues (Sheehy, 2009) that even if individual teachers attempt to introduce new ideas based upon their 'Thirdspace' ideologies, unless they can play along with the ideologies of the institutional space and point in history they have little chance of take-up or success."*

That is a tough ask for teachers who are very much controlled within a tight policy context.

Davies (2006: 436) argues, however, that teachers have a responsibility on one level or another, in terms of their own subjectification to take such work forward:

*"It is not enough, however, to engage in passive resistance, to engage in good teaching in the privacy of the classroom. We must take responsibility for examining the documents and discursive practices that are taken for granted in our schools and universities, and ask: what conditions of possibility are they creating and maintaining for us and our students? In what ways do these conditions of possibility afford our students a viable life? And in what ways may then be said to fall short of adequate care?"*

Whilst moments of intensities are contextual to each individual teacher it is clear that all have engaged with a critical ‘other-than’ option in practice. As Soja (1996: 61) notes:

*“That is to say, it does not derive simply from an additive combination of its binary antecedents but rather from a disordering, deconstruction, and tentative reconstitution of their presumed totalization producing an open alternative that is both similar and strikingly different.”*

Some teachers do not take up this gauntlet, for one reason or another; yet still engage in practice in a way that allows them to achieve the Masters degree. CT4 notes that *“I don’t feel different, I feel...more knowledgeable, I feel more confident em, and just more motivated and enthusiastic I would say”*. However, following on from such statements is less of an analysis or rationale for why this might be the case. In other words there have not been such moments of intensities about *their* practice but there is an element of engagement in the process of practice at a more superficial level. This, in itself, provokes many questions about standards in professional practice and about how these are achieved and maintained how boxes are ticked around achieving standards of practice. Indeed, as CT6 frustratingly notes towards the end of her interview *“I would have more respect if I became Principal Teacher or if I became a Depute Head. That would be an achievement”*. An important question here, but one that was not explored in the interview, would be why would such an appointment be more of an achievement?

As the teachers have undertaken the Masters course they have simultaneously experienced spaces differently. These spaces, as identified by the objects chosen, have surfaced their



changing positions within these spaces in relation to acceptances, tensions, resistances and refusals in practice. What shifts is how practices are experienced over time.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

This Chapter has considered the data in terms how teachers are located in their practice and schools in terms of spaces: those spatial, temporal and theoretical. This allows the data to engage with two of the research questions of this work: firstly ‘how do teachers locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational space? And, secondly this Chapter starts to engage with the third research question ‘(i) how do teachers account for the effects of formal professional development on themselves and other actors? (ii) How might engaging with theory shed further light on the processes involved in CPD?’

However, in reading the data in this way there is a feeling that something is missing in terms of spatiality as an underpinning theoretical model. So, what is missing? Is it an awareness of, even an acknowledgement, of the ‘affective’ or the personal. The CTs talk of connections “*they’re both on ‘friends and family’ on my ‘phone bill’*” (CT3) and of having more of a voice (CT4). How could theorization using spatial theories take place around statements such as “*what the course does is make you realise, you know, more aware of who you are and what you are*” (CT3)? It is also important to consider how such notions relate to the increased level of ‘thinking’ that the data highlights. Whilst engaging with spatial theory can help with an analysis of the spaces of CPD it cannot always unlock, in enough depth, what happens within such spaces.

It can be problematic to assert the existence of some form of Thirdspace but not, in turn, clearly defining it. Whilst it can be unhelpful, at times, to delineate, to close down, to box and define what something is it can be equally unhelpful to allow it to encompass everything that there is to say about anything (Hubbard *et al.*, 2004). In reading to inform this data analysis the lack of what *l'espace vécu* or Thirdspace was has been hard to define. Soja (1996) argues that Lefebvre was one of the first to theorise difference and otherness explicitly in spatial terms. But what this is, or was, or could be was left open and often unexplored. The closest that Soja (2009: 56) gets to a definition is as follows:

*“In this sense, Thirdspace is (1) a way to understand the spatial dimension of human life; (2) an integral part of the often neglected trialectics of spatiality; (3) an all encompassing spatial perspective, which has the same potential as historical and sociological views; (4) a mutual political strategy against all forms of oppression; and (5) a starting point for many new approaches”.*

On some level this lack of willingness to commit is the weakness of such spatial theories and Foucault is used in the following Chapter to continue an engagement with the data and its analysis. How different is it from the Firstspace if in defining Thirdspace it is asserted that *“Il y a toujours l'autre.”* And yet, as Sørensen (2009) argues, there is no end point. As Ryan (2011: 886) notes, both Lefebvre and Foucault are:

*“Not without hope, then, that individuals can dissent from normalizing categories and spaces to subvert and disrupt the ‘order of things’”*

In other words within First/Secondspace, within the power and authority that develops amongst accepted practices, that there lies the possibility for change and resistance (Soja, 1996). This Chapter has attempted to use spatial theory to consider how teachers locate themselves within educational spaces and how, indeed, they create such spaces. Furthermore it used spatial theory to start to explore the experiences that teachers talked about and, in turn, how they account for shifts in their professional identities. The analysis of data in this Chapter also starts to raise some questions about the effects of formal professional training on the teachers and those around them. However, such an approach has allowed for less discussion of this third research question, and indeed the fourth research question: *(i) To what extent are the relational and ethical foregrounded in accounts given by respondents? (ii) What theoretical sense might be made of this?* As such this work now considers a reading of the data drawing upon the work of Foucault to help engage with these questions.

## Chapter Five: Beyond Thirdspace: Spatial Analysis through the lens of Foucault

### 5.0 Introduction

In reading, and re-reading the data through a Thirdspace lens there are aspects of the data that are comfortable within a theoretical take of Thirdspace, but other elements of the data fit less well. In particular this relates to the fourth research question: *(i) To what extent are the relational and ethical foregrounded in accounts given by respondents? (ii) What theoretical sense might be made of this?* In turn this question relates to an important objective of this work: to understand the value of relational and ethical practices in professional learning. This is an important objective to have, not least because within the data there is a continual return to both the personal and affective elements of the transformation of practice such as *“what the course does it make you realise, you know, more aware of who you are and what you are”* (CT3). Part of this includes a reference to other people: *“they’re both on ‘friends and family’ on my ‘phone bill”* (CT3). Therefore, an important question here is does a Thirdspace approach allow for the individual, the affective element of transformation and connections with others? Does it allow a consideration of the work that the teachers undertake on themselves and the role that others may play in these? All of these are significant shifts and transformations that are talked of in the data. Interestingly Soja (1996) draws upon the work of Foucault and explores his notions of heterotopologies in relation to Thirdspace. It was noted that few links existed between Lefebvre and Foucault and, indeed, Lefebvre argued that Foucault’s focus on the individual failed to consider the importance of the collective subject. It could be argued that Foucault’s later work would not support such a contention. Soja (1996: 146) writes:

*“The many-sidedness of Foucault’s conceptualization of power/knowledge took too little note of “the antagonism between a knowledge (savoir) which serves power and a form of knowing (connaissance) which refuses to acknowledge power”.”*

This is the tension that Soja (1996) and Lefebvre (1974) would argue exists between the second and Thirdspace. However, more recent work on Foucault helps to build on this theoretical aspect of practice, not through the concept of space but through the ideas of power, knowledge and subjectification (McGushin, 2007). It is possible to see links:

*“The work of thought is not to pose answers but to problematize them: it is to respond to a situation not with a solution that might end discussion or action but with a question that might open up new possibilities.”* (McGushin, 2007: xvii)

Therefore this work will now turn to the later work of Foucault (1984a, 1984b), which draws upon the latter two volumes of the history of sexuality and focuses on the problematisation of practice, on the care of the self and the practices associated with this – such as *Askēsis* – to explore the data further. It develops further the idea of ‘thinking’ through the practices of the course that emerged in Chapter 4.

## **5.1 Foucault: The Government of Self and Others**

McGushin (2007: xiii) considers Foucault’s work in relation to the care of oneself as a way of working to transform ourselves and to “regard otherwise the same things”. In other words, this is about being able to consider practices in a new light. Zembylas (2003) touches on this by considering the notion that teaching is experience imbued with normalizing power but with

negotiation of subjectivity and with emotion providing spaces for self-formation and resistance. This is developed from the themes that Foucault discussed throughout his career of power, knowledge and subjectivity, but most significantly his lectures at the Collège de France between 1982 and 1983 (Foucault, 2010). This lecture series focused on the notion of *Parrhēsia* and *Askēsis*. As an approach or idea this may be helpful in reading the data because it allows a more careful consideration of the personal aspect of the teachers' engagement with practice.

McGushin (2007: xiii, Foucault, 1984a: 9) links the idea of care of the self with the notion of *Askēsis* as “an exercise of oneself in the activity of thought”. This notion of exercise, which is derived from Greek literature, is about developing, through a range of practices, to actively become you, to consider what exists and what could exist. Foucault (1997: 239) defines this as a “set of practices by which one can acquire, assimilate, and transform truth into a permanent principle of action. ...it is a process of the intensification of subjectivity”. More complex though, is that this is about practices that allow you to become more than that which you already are, which is a self-shaped by the power of the society and the state: “these power-knowledge relations maintain themselves through leading individuals to become certain kinds of selves: normalized and well-disciplined selves” (McGushin, 2007: xviii). Indeed McGushin argues that in society today those in power create identities for individuals that they are encouraged to adopt through what are often implicit and unexplored processes. For those in professional roles, such as education, some of this fashioning and shaping comes from the policy texts that are created. McGushin (2007) goes on to develop this into the notion of ethno-poetics or self-fashioning whereby poetics from the Greek *phoēsis* refers to those tasks or activities that develop care of the self. These activities include the processes of listening, writing and speaking. Pignatelli (2002) draws upon the work of Foucault to highlight the idea of a shift from the moral obligation to ‘know thyself’ to a practice based on practical questions such as, ‘What are the means or practices already available to me by which I can take care of myself?’ In turn this works towards

the development of an ethos or a character of self with an orientation in the world. For the teachers, it is clear in reading the data, that processes of listening and speaking are an important part of *Askēsis* as they progress through the practices of the course. Thrift (2007) also draws upon some of this thinking, whilst also reflecting the tensions that can arise through such processes. The notion of encounter and the ‘violent training’ that such encounters force and which was termed a materiality of thinking was proposed.

It is, McGushin (2007) argues, care of the self that allows for a resistance to normalization and the power-knowledge relations that shape individuals; it is a mode of resistance to political power. It could be argued that this allows a reading of the data that acknowledges the affective element and the role of others. These are important concepts and ones that emerges from reading the data:

*“It is not a turn inward but rather a turn toward the world as that evolving web of relations, practices, and knowledges in and through which my self manifests itself. It is also a turn towards the self as a material to be shaped and transformed, as a goal to be achieved, and as a practice articulated in the theories, models, guides, techniques, and relationships that the history of philosophy presents to us. And, most important, the conversion of the self is linked to a concern for the truth, for truthfulness: it is linked to Parrhēsia.”* (McGushin, 2007: xxi)

This is a reminder of Butler’s work on Foucault (2002). Butler (2002) who drew upon the work of Raymond Williams makes links between his notion of ‘criticism’ and Foucault’s work on ‘critique’. Both were concerned with the idea that critique is a negative process involving judgement. Instead Butler (2002) develops Foucault’s thinking to highlight the notion of critique

as a ‘patient’ practice and that (*ibid.*: 215) “in the same way that reading, according to Nietzsche, required that we act a bit more like cows than humans and learn the art of slow rumination”. This is in order that “(we) rethink critique as a practice in which we pose the question of the limits of our most sure ways of knowing” (*ibid.*). It is such a notion of taking time that Eraut (1995) uses in his critique of Schön (1983) and his work on reflection-in-action. Butler (*ibid.*) notes Foucault’s returned to Greek and Roman cultures whereby practices were based around “a cultivated relation of the self to itself”: a theme that Foucault returns to in his later work. What Butler (*ibid.*) then goes on to discuss is important here:

*“Certain kinds of practices which are designed to handle certain kinds of problems, produce, over time, a settled domain of ontology as their consequence, and this ontological domain, in turn, constrains our understanding of what is possible. Only with reference to this prevailing ontological horizon, itself instituted through a set of practices, will we be able to understand the kinds of relations to moral precepts that have been formed as well as those that are yet to be formed.”*

She also goes on to state (Butler, 2002: 218) “To be critical of an authority that poses as absolute requires a critical practice that has self-transformation at its core.” But it also involves considering the grounds of validity for such desires to govern.



## 5.2 A Second Reading of the Data: The Ethical Work of the Teacher

The Masters course developed and encouraged a range of practices (*Askēsis*) that allowed individuals to work on themselves. Whilst some of these were initially problematic, such as the ‘confessional’ nature of learning journals<sup>1</sup> others, such as reading key texts and engaging in these critically appear to have impacted upon those undertaking the course. This is an interesting observation in itself and raises questions about the practices used on CPD courses. As Fejes (2011: 807) suggests refusing to engage in such an activity can be about a refusal to engage in such a form of private confession:

*“However, when we confess ourselves to ourselves, there is always a virtual other present, that is, a norm in relation to which we assess and judge ourselves, our thoughts and our actions.”*

Some teachers may have taken part in the initial task of writing in their learning journals, but the interview data highlights that this was a stressful activity for many and some destroyed their written entries shortly after the event. Writing has always been considered an academic practice but as Fejes (2011: 800) notes in comparing the practice of the Stoics with those of Christianity:

*“Here, the person became the administrator of her/himself and looked at what she/he had done correctly with the aim of finding lack of success instead of finding faults. Errors concerned strategy, not moral character. The goal was to find out how*

---

<sup>1</sup> Which, interestingly, McGushin (2007) explores in his Chapter on pastoral power and Christianity, that in turn draws upon Foucault’s later two volumes in his history of sexuality.

*one can be successful in one's intentions, not to excavate guilt as in the Christian confession."*

As Fejes (2011) goes on to explore, for the Stoics the technologies of writing and other practices were used as a way of caring for the self. In this manner rather than the self being something to be renounced and deciphered there was acceptance of a self, which had hidden thoughts and inner impurities. Reading, initially, and other practices then leads to individuals questioning their own practice, *"slowing down my thinking"* (CT4) and their roles within such practices or "to regard otherwise the same things" (McGushin, 2007: xiii). CT4 talks about the processes of the course allowing them to *"look much more closely at every single thing that I do"*. Indeed, it could be argued that they grew to take responsibility and ownership of their practice in relation to others. CT4 goes on to say that *"it represents not just me looking at my practice though but I think at everyone else around me...it represents really everybody within...within school"*. CT4 also relates this to a discussion of the objects that they had chosen. Initially they had considered choosing a mirror to represent looking at their own practice, however, they quickly realized that *"it's kind of looking at myself, but that wasn't enough"*. It was not just about their practice but also about their relationships to others around them.

As McGushin (2007: 106) notes "through care one is able to achieve the truth of oneself, to become who one truly is, by rejecting what one has made oneself into". As part of this process McGushin (2007) argues that you have to unlearn or unbecome. The self that you discover through care of the self is something new but with reflections of past practices. Foucault (McGushin, 2007: 107) talks of this as a 'sortir'; that the practice of care is an exit from the present, from power, from normalizing practices that shape without question. In other words, it encourages a creation of knowledge rather than being defined by knowledge which already

exists and which is created by others. Here, then knowledge is not just accepted but something that is connected to and linked with understanding or looking deeper (CT4). CT6 describes this as being “*better informed*” because of “*thinking more about what I’m doing*” or “*doing things differently*”. It could be argued, therefore that the course can be considered as a set of practices or *poetics* that shape a process whereby the individual can become capable of governing themselves. This is about the use of productive work to help think about our practices and contexts. This is a form of subjectification and is evident within the data:

*“The rise of this “culture of the self” shows that once the self is invested as a domain of truth and freedom, once it is defined as an area of resistance to and differentiation from “general opinion”, it develops into a goal to be achieved independent of politics.” (McGushin, 2007: 98)*

In part this can be considered as a ‘problematization’ (McGushin, 2007) whereby individuals, through their experiences, are able to identify and focus on issues which require attention or a response. In doing so one needs to *care* about such issues and seek to identify, through thought, alternatives and possibilities:

*“It does this by inventing the world anew – creating new kinds of relationships, new practices, assigning new meanings to old practices and relations. Thought reimagines the purposes and possibilities the world offers. It is a response but not a solution. Rather, thinking is the activity that opens up a problem and prepares the conditions for many possible solutions to it. Thought, as the work of problematizing, is what opens up the dimension of the possible.” (McGushin, 2007: 16)*

In other words this is about *thinking* and not *knowing*, ontology versus epistemology, which allows an engagement with the affective element of the data. Fejes (2011) explores Foucault's work in this area to highlight the notion of ascetic practice of self-formation. Fejes (2011) draws upon the work of Rabinow and Rose (2006) in explaining ascetic as being about attaining a way of being and the transformations that you undertake personally to achieve this. This is clearly about ontology as a process of self-formation and requires a deeper engagement with processes and practices. As Fejes (2011) goes on to state it is about 'becomings'. CT6 notes: "*I'm thinking all the time now. I'm thinking about what I'm doing. I'm thinking far too much*". This is part and parcel of Foucault's notion of care of the self. Associated with this, then, is *Parrhēsia* - the notion of free speech, or, as Foucault would argue, to say everything or free-spokenness (*franc-parler*) (Foucault, 2010: 43). That said it is possible to appreciate that in reality it is more complex than this, as explored by Foucault in his lecture programme from 1982-83 (Foucault, 2010). *Parrhēsia* is, in a very positive sense, an ability to speak one's mind and, as the data in the previous Chapter would suggest is the voice that develops and builds in the teachers with increasing confidence. However, there are a number of practices associated with this notion of *Parrhēsia*. Indeed Foucault (2010) suggests that there is an element of risk in telling the truth for those who do so. Gunzenhauser (2008: 2241) suggests that when applied to education "a risk may be as simple as taking a risk to trust a student or a colleague, or to experiment with something new that is not scientifically proven to be a best practice". In other words that there will always be consequences in telling the truth, as you believe it to be. In part this is because there is a personal commitment to such truth: "the truth spoken in *Parrhēsia* is one to which she is personally committed and with which she identifies herself" (McGushin, 2007: 7). And which Foucault (2010: 56) notes as:

*“Parrhēsia, therefore is to be situated in what binds the speaker to the fact that what he says is the truth, and to the consequences, which follow from the fact that he has told the truth.”*

Because of this it requires a certain amount of courage to speak the truth. This is very much about believing in what you say and that what you say is the truth. Such truth is not always knowledge-based, but develops around ontological beliefs and as such has a close link with thoughts about practice. In turn this results in the creation of a personal belief system rather than collecting and storing away that knowledge which is created by others in power. It is about creating a “fortress within which we can take refuge” (McGushin, 2007: 124), but in accepting that there is an undefined eventuality to such approaches. Foucault (2010) refers to this as making a pact with oneself to speak the truth. For the teachers on the course this is a risky business. To challenge not only the policy process, but possibly the senior management within both schools and Local Authorities. For Foucault (2010) there is such a notion of power in *Parrhēsia*. In that the risk of speaking the truth often comes from the fact that you do so to those in power. Again, this is something that can be seen in the teachers’ data. In committing to telling the truth there is also a commitment to justice and highlighting injustice, to being ethically and politically responsible. So, as CT1 states it is important *“to be able to counter that power and it suddenly comes to people that they can’t just slap things down on your desk – that they’re going to get them back”*. Even without any professional fights it is about being about being able to *“stand my ground more on things”* (CT6). McGushin (2007) argues that self-knowledge develops through the confrontations that are had with others, if this is within the process of *Parrhēsia*. It is about moving beyond the status quo of general opinion and asking questions of practice. For Foucault (2010: 161) *“it shows that the function of Parrhēsia is precisely to be able to limit the power of the masters”*, or as CT1 states, *“taking the power away from these people*

(HMIE)”. That said, would such truth speaking be accepted or even tolerated within educational system, and if so, by whom?

CT6 starts to link this with a need to act or speak the truth based on beliefs about practice:

*“If I think I’m right on something then I will...I try to be diplomatic but I will speak my mind if I’m asked to do something that I...don’t feel in my heart is right then I will (pause) go and say to this person “I’m not comfortable with what you’re asking me to do or could I try..” or whatever, where as before I would have just gone away and muttered under my breath...”*

For CT6 there is less of a risk, less of a public fight and yet there is a real desire to negotiate with those in power. There is talk of a new reading scheme that is being ‘dumped’ on staff without discussion. CT6 tries to make suggestions at meetings but finds that what could be a more effective way of working is *“just so foreign to how we do things and it’s not supported through management”*. There is a sense of frustration with being sat together in a group, which constitutes time working together, but in reality it generates no movement forwards in dealing with the new reading scheme. This approach is also reflected by CT7 who feels more strongly now that practitioners should engage with practice and policy processes. They note that:

*“And if there’s a consultation process why aren’t people getting involved in it? And I tend to get a bit, if we’re sitting in the staffroom and we’re being asked something and people just kind of sit with the idea of that we can’t make an impact anyway so why bother. And you want to say well maybe not but maybe we should just try....And things come up in the staffroom here, I’ll be one of the mouthy ones now whereas I*

*normally wouldn't have said anything or might have said something later...I know I'm more vocal and I kind of feel I can back up what I'm saying. I've got some knowledge of what's going on and...views to put forward."*

For some teachers, it is the *Askēsis* of the practices of the course that opens the door to *Parrhēsia*. The practice of collating evidence allows a door to be opened for discussion with those in power. Additionally it allows the discussion to be based on what the teachers consider to be the truth by creating what they believe to be true but in a knowledge form acceptable by those in power. The provision of evidence to others in power such as HMIE (CT1) demonstrates change:

*"This time they can see all the improvements that have been made and everything. There has been real improvement. But a lot of it has been documenting what we've been doing...and being able to show what we've been doing. In some ways the course has taught me the skills needed to counteract the HMI..."*

This evidence is based on theory informing practice (CT1) and is about *"to really believe in yourself, that you know that what you're doing is right"* (CT1)– an important part of *Parrhēsia*. Another aspect of *Parrhēsia* is the way in which those who tell the truth are perceived by others. There is an important relationship that develops around truth-telling that is sometimes associated with power relations. It is clear from some of the CT interviews that others start to view them as knowledgeable as they undertake the course and start to approach them to seek information and advice. Sometimes this is about exploring aspects of *Askēsis* and other times it is simply to look for reassurance. In turn this results in those teachers feeling that they have developed more of a voice. This is an important aspect of *Parrhēsia*. As CT4 notes *"I feel that...people, people are*

*sort of..perceive me differently having done the course I think. More people come and ask me questions and want to talk about things”.*

In developing a care of the self the relationship with oneself “transforms and is transformed by one’s relationships to others” (McGushin, 2007: 115). Foucault (2010: 43) develops this point by stating that:

*“We saw that this art of oneself required a relationship to the other. In other words: one cannot attend to oneself, take care of oneself, without a relationship to another person. And the role of this other is precisely to tell the truth, to tell the whole truth, or at any rate to tell all the truth that is necessary, and to tell it in a certain form which is precisely Parrhēsia, which once again is translated as free-spokenness (franc-parler).”*

Indeed friendships, which are referred to throughout the data, are part of the importance of care of the self, although the self is foregrounded as the key focus of work on the self (Allan, 2012). “To take care of oneself is implicitly to take care of others, not out of selfishness, or out of deliberate decision to do so, but because the good of each thing and each person is linked.” (McGushin, 2007: 120). A line also developed by Deleuze (1999) who suggests that one’s relation to oneself derives from one’s relations with others. The bottom line here is that you cannot care for the self without considering relationships with others, because part of care of the self is behaving appropriately in relationships with others. *Parrhēsia*, is in part, also about relations to others. Foucault (2010) suggests that the freedom of speech associated with *Parrhēsia* will give rise to *Philia* (friendship). McGushin (2007) develops this by stating that *Parrhēsia* is a form of friendship. Such relationships can be community or institution based or



they can be private. Within the data there is evidence of two overlapping, and this is acknowledged by CT 7 who states that *“so there’s two sides to that the friends side and networking and using things for school”*. In the context of the teachers’ friendship within the course this starts off as something that is required to complete the activities and associated tasks but becomes something far deeper as they share experiences and dialogue. Indeed, initially, this level of contact is too much for some of the teachers and they feel threatened. Whilst CT2 by the end of the course acknowledges that the course cohort *“were just such a great, supportive group of people”* at the start of the course, it had been a different story: *“I can remember the second day going home and sitting in a layby at the side of the road and crying because I thought “I don’t want to do this anymore””*. The same point is reflected by CT3 who notes that at the start of the course:

*“I was kind of insecure at that point and I was quite insecure about (pause) I was insecure about who was on the group and how I saw myself in the department and maybe had a chip on my shoulder.”*

CT2 suggests that, in part, their confidence develops, eventually, from the support of the group. As such this is a safe place in which to practice and develop *Parrhēsia*. This is part of care of the self, which, in fact, is partly a social process:

*“One has friends, one is a friend, and one performs the activities of friendship insofar as one strives to save oneself, to establish and maintain the proper relationship to oneself (ataraxie, freedom).”* (McGushin, 2007: 124)

The degree to which the data reflects friendships varies. CT1, amongst others refers to the importance of ‘community’ and working ‘collegially’, CT2 refers to the development of ‘networks’, all of which are considered as important aspects of the process which they are experiencing as a group. Although within this construction is the notion that it is about more than themselves:

*“I’m going to have to step back from that and say ‘well actually....this is more than about me, what do other people want done, how do other people want to be involved in this?’” (CT1)*

For other teachers the relational aspect of the course is more personal and significant. CT3 refers to this throughout their interview. So, the collaborative working with another department within the school resulted in:

*“And in fact a card at the end when I’d actually completed my course from her was a very personal message about how she felt it had really re-energised her teaching. And I think that that’s... you know the kind of spin-off of collaborative working that you know we haven’t really been seeing.”*

As well as the importance of the school supporting their achievement:

*“The Head Teacher presented it (a trophy) to me at a staff meeting on a Friday. I was completely taken aback, a huge bouquet of flowers and the trophy. And whilst I was hugely embarrassed, (pause) I was very flattered..”*

Yet, for some this is less so the case, CT 6 notes that *“I do now feel very isolated. Especially within a culture where nobody understands really what I’ve achieved”*. Not from within the CT group, it should be noted, but from external sources and close colleagues. CT3 also acknowledges the importance of such relationships to their own practice (which they consider to be mutually beneficial) such as discussion to clarify thinking, and the wider the group of people that you can discuss issues with the better. These discussions lead to confidence and consequently *Parrhēsia* in their practice. So, the trophy and flowers were more about *“I hadn’t just worked away in my classroom for my personal gain. I felt it was an endorsement the school could see what a huge benefit it had been to then having a Chartered Teacher”*. Here it is possible to see how *Parrhēsia* starts to develop within the wider community: *“I had put myself out, but I’d actually, in a way, done it to huge benefit of others”*. From the outset CT3 sees the relationship with others as significant to their development. However, initially discussions were around, How far on are you? How many words have you done? However, by the end of the course, whilst such discussions were still important, a stronger friendship group had developed:

*“I suppose it’s been quite fascinating to meet new (people), later in life, quite honestly, that you have something in common with, that you also have, personal things in common with, but in fact, we will go and we will have a lot of discussion about what’s happening in education...and we’ve had a lot of those sort of discussions and wouldn’t have them (pause) without (pause) having meet on the course.”*

One of the key benefits that CT3 identifies here is that it has widened their understanding of educational issues across a range of subjects and sectors. In this respect it can be considered to be something that has acted upon and enhanced their understanding of wider educational issues.

It is also such connections with people that supports the teachers to keep going through the course: “*and it’d be easy at any point to drop it but having people... It’s about ‘thinking out loud’*”, for CT3. Such friendships are important for CT3 who feels that contact after the course would remain important because of the shared experiences that they have had: “*I think the relationships there, are both personal and professional so it’s kind of merged both because of what we’ve been doing*”. The result, at the end of the day for CT3, of all of this was a move from “*the classroom focused teacher to, the sort of, wider network focused teacher*”.

Foucault (1997), as stated earlier, does not see ‘friendship’ on this level as central to work on the self, rather it is part of how one places oneself and one’s practice at the centre. That said Foucault (1997) did see friendship as a reciprocal practice. Maybe, as Rose (1998) suggests this is part and parcel of how the external aspects of practice are enfolded and become internalized. It is just, that, in the data that it is expressed as ‘friendship’. Raaen (2011) further argues that self-construction is social in nature. As such, reading the data around friendship is only one take and one that may be embedded in my own personal values and belief systems. However, the connections that exist between CTs may have a significant role in being a collective:

*“As Foucault insists, the critical project is not one where individual intellectuals judge problems, but a more collective procedure organized around naming and responding to the problems themselves.”* (Nealon, 2008: 110)

As a final thought here it might be useful to draw upon the following statement from Foucault (1984b: 45)

*“It this came to constitute a social practice, giving rise to relationships between individuals, to exchanges and communications, and at times even to institutions.”*

It may simply be that the intensification of the process that individuals experienced as a collective lead to a consideration of the connections developed as ‘friendship’ because it did not have the governmentality feel of the normative practice that they are used to experiencing in schools. Indeed Foucault (1984b: 53) further refers to care of the self as ‘the attention one devotes to the care that others should take of themselves – appears as an intensification of social relations’. It feels less threatening because it has a different power relation and as such the relationships that developed felt more akin to friendship.

### **5.3 Ethics and Agency**

Foucault’s work on ethics (1997) is about relation to ourselves, and in his exploration of this a lot of ground was covered in developing his thinking around care of the self (1984b), subjectification, *Askēsis* and *Parrhēsia*. This is not a self-absorbing egotistical process but one that involves working on practice and being concerned with work on activities (Foucault, 1997), a process that implies knowledge and attention. Freund (2009: 524) links *Parrhēsia* to Foucault’s notion of ‘care of the self’; indeed this was defined as “creating new possibility, a self that can question ruthlessly and without fear of politics”. In other words this is not work on the physical body, but rather the ‘soul’. This is undertaken through what Foucault (1997) refers to as the ‘techniques of the self’ that are those processes that are undertaken in working towards self-mastery or self-knowledge. Rose (1998) considers a genealogy of subjectification that is very much based on Foucault’s later work around the techniques of the self. Subjectification, in this context, is very much about how one relates to oneself and continues to create oneself (Deleuze,

1999: 104) and that it is “recuperated by power relations and relations of knowledge, the relation to oneself is continually reborn, elsewhere and otherwise”. It is about a move away from ‘knowing oneself’ (Foucault, 1997: 87) towards “what should one do with oneself? What work should be carried out on the self? How should one “govern oneself””. Through Foucault’s later work Allan (2012) shapes a notion of agency whereby individuals are able to work on themselves to create new possibilities and existences. Part of this is about how individuals engage with the technologies that are:

*“Hybrid assemblages of knowledges, instruments, persons, systems of judgement, buildings and spaces, underpinned at the programmatic level by certain presuppositions and objectives about human beings”* (Rose, 1998: 26)

Schools, and other educational spaces, are such technologies. As such the organization of technologies such as schools encourages the normative behaviour of individuals based on rules. Foucault, in his later work, explored the idea that care of the self was about engaging with such technologies and the way in which they shaped individuals. This is about individuals being able to understand and experience their own practice and to make decisions based on this about their conduct, which often include resistance to those imposed rules (Rose, 1998). Indeed Foucault (1997) is keen to note that this is not about paying attention to what you do wrong – the guilt and confessional nature of practice that developed with Christianity but rather:

*“If examination is taking stock. Faults are simply good intentions left undone. The rule is a means of doing something correctly, not judging what has happened in the past. Later, Christian confession will look for bad intentions”* (Foucault, 1997: 237)

As such Foucault suggests four dimensions of ethical practice: determination of the ethical substance, the mode of subjectification, self-practice or ethical work and the telos (Allan, 2012; Clarke, 2009; Foucault, 1984a, 1997). The ethical substance is what one decides to work on. These are the questions that require to be asked about practice. This is about the aspects of practice that require development. In many ways it is those parts of practice that ‘bother you’. The second axis is about the rules that are adopted in shaping ourselves and, in part, is about shaping ourselves through such rules (Foucault, 1984a). This is about the reasons and rationales for our practices and behaviours. The third axis is about the practical work that is undertaken, in order to engage with the questions generated in the determination of the ethical substance. As Foucault (1997: 265) words it as “What are we to do?” and then further defines it as ‘self-forming activity’. The final axis is that which individuals aspire to. In some ways it is possible to see this as a continuum of work on the self from being able to identify what aspects of the self to work on, to other ways of working with rules, through to working on the self to transform change. This is about a commitment to a way of being (Foucault, 1984a). This is about more than just awareness; it is about self-formation (Foucault, 1984a). Foucault (1997) argued that whilst these could be seen as independent categories that they tend to be found in specific configurations. In education, as with other aspects of practice, this can be a tall order. Rules defined by those who shape policy develop a concept of normativity, a veil of reality that is created by those at ‘the top’. When considering such policy texts as Standards (GTCS, 2002a, 2002b) it is evident that control lies in the fact that standards cover as much, if not all grounds of the practice of a teacher. Nealon (2008) suggests that this is how norms do their work – through covering all ground and including virtually all aspects of practice. Raaen (2011: 628) notes “professional practice is primarily legitimated by how professionals apply a set of professional and legal norms, not by their personal moral integrity”. It is this personal work that draws upon care of the self.

In the teacher data it is possible to see that some teachers achieve part of this process of work on the self but not others. In other words, that they are able to engage with some aspects of *Askēsis* more so than others and that it is these actions, on whatever level, that are considered as agency. This is an interesting point to develop further, not least because Foucault, in his earlier work, consider autonomy to be an illusion and that:

*“Individuals have made the society’s disciplinary techniques and ruling ways of thinking very much their own and, by doing so, have come to believe and behave as if they were free and autonomous”* (Raaen, 2011: 628 quoting Foucault)

Therefore teachers tend to be allowed to promote one practice over another (in other words demonstrate autonomy) where that practice is considered appropriate by the educational system within which they work. This is normalizing practice based on rules and regulations that are considered to be right and accepted rather than deviant or wrong (Raaen, 2011).

#### **5.4 Four Dimensions of Ethical Practice**

Given that the data collection for this thesis took place after the teachers had completed their Masters course it was more difficult to identify the original determination of the ethical substance. In other words it was difficult, retrospectively, to be able to identify the reasons for the teachers deciding what they wanted to work on in their practice and why. However, it should be noted that they were able to identify those aspects of their practice they had worked on as well as the issues in practice that had ‘bothered them’. As such, it is possible to identify aspects of practice that are more inspirational and therefore could be considered as identifying what *telos*



might be for them. In other words there is something about the links between thinking and doing or being able to action that which you want to do in practice.

Interestingly previous experiences of initial teacher education and CPD meant that some teachers were not expecting to consider the determination of ethical substance. CT6 talked about how they came along to the course expecting to be told how to behave in practice partly through lecturing and some guided reading. However, they experienced a change in this common experience of CPD when *“all of a sudden somebody says to you no this is about your self-development, your self-learning”*. For many, it was this moment and realisation that prompted them to start considering what they might look at in their practice. With this also came a wider realisation that they needed to change, that, as CT3 stated *“we have stayed too much the same for too long”* and that *“maybe what the course does is make you realise, you know, more aware of who you are and what you are”* indeed many of the teachers described the course as a process of undertaking a personal journey. For many of the teachers, this focus on the ethical substance was about *“the fresh approaches that I’ve had to my teaching”* (CT5) or that *“this has really got something out into the classroom and changed practice”* (CT3). Clearly it was about far more than this, the wider implications that came with this and which were often identified in their interview discussions as they delved deeper into what their objects signified. As CT3 stated *“you know, traffic lighting is neither really here nor there in the big scheme of things; it’s getting people engaged, it’s getting pupils and teachers engaged”*. Also, as CT1 explored it was about standing out for what they believed in and to do what you are doing based upon a personal belief in a good educational and theoretical basis. To believe in oneself and to know that what one is doing is right. There is also a desire expressed that they continue to move forwards and to draw upon their growing experiences of knowing what they can and cannot do (CT2).

The mode of subjectification of the teachers seemed less clear in the data, although it appears that there were a number of ways which the teachers adopted in shaping their changing practice and the manner in which they justified such changes or shifts in practice. Part of this subjectification was about tweaking the rules just slightly so that those in power, such as HMIE, were happy with the processes that they were observing but that which also fitted more comfortably with the teachers and their practice. So, for CT1, this was about the fact that they had evidence for people like HMIE; *“one of the things that the inspector really liked was the fact that we had evidence”*, and yet this was evidence that proved that their changing practice was effective but within the rules and regulations that were acceptable by HMIE and other governing bodies. In separating out the data between subjectification and the actual process of ethical work, this seems to be far more about making personal decisions about how the teachers will look at practice. In order to want to *think* more about practice and, in turn, to *look more closely* at practice. So, as CT4 states *“it’s just made me look much more closely at every single thing that I do”*, and that they are *“thinking all the time now, I’m thinking about what I’m doing”* (CT6). There is also evidence that this focus on looking deeper at practice was more than just about the individual but that *“it represents more than just kind of me and looking at what I’m doing...it represents really everybody within..within school”* (CT4).

What seemed clearer within the data was the identification of self-practice or ethical work. Although this did seem to be more clearly linked with *Askēsis*, it appeared that there were key practices that the teachers undertook in relation to their ethical substance that shaped their engagement with their practice. Whilst there was some emphasis on the discussions that teachers had with each other as well as with other colleagues in school it was interesting to note that this seemed less important than other aspects of *Askēsis*. This is interesting because one premise of the construction of the Masters course was that people liked to undertake courses in order to talk

to other like-minded practitioners. This did bear out in the data, but maybe not as significantly as might have been anticipated. Having said that an increased awareness of the pupils and the need to talk to them was identified in the data. In that previously they had tended to teach through personal preferences rather than those of the pupils (CT2) and that as a result this had led to more negotiation with pupils around all aspects of their learning. It could also be considered that discussion was one aspect of practice that shifted for the teachers in that they found that they had more of a 'voice' in discussions, that:

*“Confidence started to build ‘cause I then felt that I could contribute more to the group and then it just built and built and built and now you can’t get me to shut up and you can’t get me to stop” (CT2).*

What is clear is that the reading process had a significant impact on the teachers and their care of the self. CT5 and CT6 both noted the positive impact that reading had had on their practice and that, actually, reading was much easier than had been anticipated. CT6 went on to say that:

*“I think one of the nice things is that I read them but not with the view this is written by a God who knows everything about education, someone who’s so clever they’ve managed to write a book and I’m just a lowly me who needs to read it to find out. I read it and I take from it what I think is useful.”*

CT6 then clearly links this process with being more critical and using 'professional judgement'. Other teachers refer to the fact that more academic books have filled the shelves of their homes, or their overuse of Amazon; they talk about the amount of reading that they undertook as 'phenomenal' and yet are able to see what impact this practice had:

*“Doing that part of the course where you had to start reading between the lines and look at the words and think about where someone was coming from has transformed the way I read.”*

There were also many links between reading and an increase in their confidence to act more publically about changes in their practice through their perceived increase in confidence. Indeed CT2 and CT3 directly link their increased confidence to the practices of the course and the impact that this had, in turn, on pupils’ learning and attainment. CT1 talked about the course as the development of skills, which allowed them to keep looking at their practice. CT2 added that this was also about not being scared to try new things.

Writing was a less popular process of *Askēsis* for the teachers, although there is some differentiation between the processes of formal and informal writing. As CT6 states *“everyone just looks at it as though it’s a lot of essays you have to write”*. Yet, there are some benefits identified in the writing process. CT4 stated that writing (in the learning journal) was a process of slowing thinking down and that, as CT6 identified, writing was difficult but that they *“then discovered at the end of it, it had been necessary for me to process everything”*.

Thinking about *telos* and how this might manifest itself in the data was complex. It was about trying to separate out changes in practice and self-work from what CTs aspired to. This, in itself, was difficult as the interviews took place after the course had been completed. Still, there were hopes and aspirations expressed. CT3 expressed this quite clearly when they said that *“I’m desperate not to lose it ‘cause I think that it would be a shame to, to, to have geared up and then to just say that’s that, walk away. I feel now it’s my duty”*. This duty was then linked to the self-

satisfaction of proving the changes that you can make and the personal nature of such a journey. For some teachers *telos* was about continuing with the self-work, through continuing the processes of *Askēsis* that a course such as the EdD could offer. It seemed a more formal way to be able to continue their personal journeys. Some teachers were able to identify the shift that had taken place in their practice, and, to an extent, there is an implicit expression that this is good and to be desired. This of course could be considered *telos*. CT3 states in relation to this “*it showed a very clear, distinct picture from the classroom focused teacher to, the sort of wider network focused teacher*”. Developing on this CTs 2/3/4 all noted that they were seen a focus of knowledge by other colleagues. This is, in part, seen as being more confident in their jobs because they are better informed and thinking more, as CT6 states “*my life has become harder since doing the MEd but I do think I’m doing a much better teaching job*”. Several teachers highlight the need to move on, but in non-specific ways, for example CT3 asks “*Where am I now? Do I want to move on?*” and CT6 suggests that they are aware that they will need to move on because “*if I stay still too long I’ll stagnate*”.

Foucault (1984b: 61) drawing upon the work of the Roman Stoic Sextius asks, “What bad habit have you cured today? What fault have you resisted? In what respect are you better?” These questions are both useful and helpful when considering the data of the teachers. When they talk about “*not just getting the kids to copy from books*” (CT2). As well as references to practice no longer being as it was before (CT2).

## 5.5 Transgressions and Intensifications

As part of the analysis on Foucault's work Allan (2012) also explores the notion of transgression as a form of resistance, but one that is both practical and playful in crossing boundaries or limits. Ethics, is, as Foucault would argue, a practice of resistance or "to refuse what we are" (Nealon, 2008: 75). This form of resistance is not about a definitive gaining of freedom but rather "moments of freedom or of otherness" (Allan, 2012). Interestingly, CT1 did suggest that the course was a source of freedom for thinking about practice. CT5 developed this sense of 'freeing' by discussing the need that the course instilled of working with people from other sectors and disciplines. As Rose (1998) suggests individuals are constantly in movement across different practices and that these shape the subjectification of the individual. Raaen (2011: 630) links this to the notion of finding spaces in normative practice in which one can work on care of the self:

*"Knowledge of how they relate to the formal limits of their work will reveal whether they actually exploit the space given by the formal structure and to what extent they use their opportunities to investigate critically the obstacles to such exploitations."*

This is significant in that for Foucault it was a move away from a more direct focus on power, which was explored in his earlier work. Nealon (2008) refers to this as 'resistant' subjectivities and defines it as "the ethical art of the self, and resistance to normalized totalization through individual action" (Nealon, 2008: 9). This is a way of subverting normative behaviour, which in turn shapes work on the self. Indeed the "act of crossing the limit does not violate it, but simultaneously affirms and weakens it" (Allan, 2012). In other words, this is not about being against power that exists in a multitude of complex ways but rather:

*“Resistance, then, doesn’t primarily function “against” power, trying to eradicate it altogether; rather, resistance attempts to harness power otherwise, in the production of different effects.”* Nealon, 2008: 24

This idea of transgression is useful in reading the data from the teachers in that part of their *Askēsis* is about these momentary experiences – stepping stones through the process of work on themselves. This happens as they start to engage differently with the rules and normative behaviour that shapes their practice as teachers and which allows them to take ownership of such work on themselves rather than being shaped by those rules and normalizing practices that surround them. Rose (1998: 35) suggests that teachers are not “the unified subjects of some coherent regime of government that produces persons in the form in which it dreams”. These momentary experiences Nealon describes (2008: 42) as “threshold, limits, tipping points, events of emergence, or phase transitions”.

But how might such moments merge to become a stronger self-practice? Nealon (2008) discusses the notion of intensification, which can be considered as:

*“The saturation of a set of practices within a field – the slow expansion of a given practice into a “dominant” mode – is the primary mechanism through which historical change happens. Change, then, is a matter of slow mutations, accretions, and accumulations of social practice, rather than either the dramatic unfolding of a technological story or a deus-ex-machine-style absolute arrival of the new.”*

(Nealon, 2008: 38)

So, as intensification occurs, it consists of more and more transformed practice and, as such, this practice becomes the norm. Nealon (2008) would also argue that this becomes increasingly likely when an aspect of practice has a ‘hook’ in that it is not imposed from above but rather that practitioners can see value in its worth and as such it becomes more embedded and part of everyday practice. What, the data from the teachers would suggest is that this occurs when it is linked to practice in the classrooms and the needs of the young learners. This is about a practice being different, and not as it was before. One question that could be considered is about whether intensification can develop and grow from networks and developing connections. There is much discussion of this by the teachers, such as *“I think it’s really important that we don’t just stick together as social group but that we also sort of stick together as a professional group of CTs”* (CT2). This is not an emotive process but one that is practical and professional based. Interestingly Nealon (2008) describes intensification and the change that it brings as a slow process. This may be why, in a pre-defined course such as the Masters that there is less scope to develop work on the self more fully.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

Considering the work of Foucault allows us to reflect again upon the data collected, this time with a focus on the affective and the role of others. The key foci are those of *Askēsis* and the resulting *Parrhēsia* (including the role of others in work on the self). This is harder than it seems. Teachers are deeply embedded in norms and rules (Zembylas, 2003) and find it difficult to escape these; often it is far easier to accept such norms and rules to avoid marginalisation. In turn this links in with an exploration of epistemology and ontology. This is the difference between the knowledge of standards and thinking about actual practice, which allows and encourages a movement to think and practice differently. As CT6 states:



*“Now had someone said to me “oh, just because you’ve got lots of qualifications after your name doesn’t mean you’re a good teacher”. Yeah, I would agree with that. But at the same time it depends on the nature of the learning that you undertook.”*

For CT6 this is reflected in the fact that when they publically read the TESS in the staffroom others ask if they are looking for jobs because they now have an MEd, the idea that an article in a professional publication might be of interest is alien to others. Furthermore CT6 reflects on the *Askēsis* of the processes undertaken in the course as an engagement with your own practice rather than being a vessel to be filled with professional knowledge:

*“It’s the whole process of ...the, the course..from the very first day when you came in and you were handed your learning journal and said “write down how you’re feeling”. And suddenly someone was interested in your development rather than, I..I’d be the first to hold up my hand up and say I came with my notepad ready to take my notes. Right – teach me and I’ll get good!....and all of a sudden somebody says to you no this is about your self-development, your self-learning.....the journey I was making.”*

For the teachers involved these were all very personal journeys whereby they engaged with normative values, rules and beliefs that governed their practice and to push aside, if only a little bit, what was familiar and comfortable to re-examine rules and regulations (Freund, 2009). On whatever level they engaged with the process of care of the self, they did, at the very least,

challenge assumptions and think transformatively. Clarke (2009: 187) argues, identities are “partly given yet they are also something that has to be achieved, offering a potential site of agency within the inevitably social process of becoming”.

This Chapter has used the later work of Foucault to critically engage with the more personal and affective nature of CPD and the implications for their practice. It has considered the work on the self that teachers undertake and the importance of this for their professional identity. In considering Chapters four and five concurrently the data analysis starts to allow firmer answers to the research questions. Listening to the teachers allows a consideration of how they locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational spaces. The teachers’ voices highlight the relational and ethical importance of their work as they account for the effects of formal professional development upon themselves and other actors. Furthermore, it has been through the theoretical lenses of firstly Soja and then Foucault, that some sense has been drawn from the teachers’ voices and that the implications of ethical work on the self through professional learning is forefronted.

## **Chapter Six: ‘Othering’ CPD: Conclusions, Contributions to Knowledge and Further Research**

### **6.0 Introduction**

In drawing this research together it is helpful to return to the research questions set out in Chapter 1 and to consider how the data, and associated analysis, responds to the questions that were initially outlined. A key focus of this final Chapter will be around the fourth objective set out at the start of this thesis: ‘To make recommendations as to the form that CPD at Masters level might take that takes into account the considerations of practitioners’.

This research has opened up a number of areas for consideration by policy makers, CPD providers and teachers themselves. In particular this Chapter focuses on those lines of enquiry that are most relevant to professional learning, rather than professional development. It will consider how the research undertaken helps to address the gaps and limitations that have been identified for communities of practice, as well as those individuals involved, in educational contexts. In particular, in considering a relational and ethical framing, it is important to consider how such an alternative framing of professional learning may appeal to practitioners, as well as managers and policy makers. In doing so this final Chapter will draw together the findings around all four of the research questions.

Taylor *et al.* (1997) encourage those involved in education to explore the values and assumptions that underlie policy processes as well as the associated power relations. They encourage the use of questions such as ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘why’ in thinking through the complexities of policy development as well as ‘why now’? Such questions are also reflected in the work of others such

as Higgins and Leat (1997). These are some of the questions that will shape the discussion in this final Chapter. Additionally, as a researcher, it is important to acknowledge that the ways in which professionals consider how both epistemology and ontology shape the way in which they think about the policy process as a knowledge creation process. This is an important aspect of thinking about the policy process that is considered more closely in the concluding remarks of this thesis.

### **6.1 Agency and Thinking Practice: CPD as ethical work**

In encouraging teachers to develop the practices associated with *Askēsis* and *Parrhēsia* we need to consider how such practices may allow teachers to exercise a measure of agency in their work whilst accepting that there can exist “possible agential selves with no agency” (Caldwell, 2007: 786). In other words that it is possible to have the skills and experience to instigate agency but without the desire, need or purpose to do so. What the data collected for this thesis shows is that such practices of *Askēsis* and *Parrhēsia* are complex and require a level of agency (see Caldwell 2007 below for a definition) in teachers that may be hard to harness. However, there are some strong arguments developing in the current literature that there is a return to a focus on teacher agency within educational policy (*cf.* Priestley *et al.* 2012). Indeed, Priestley *et al.* (2012) go on to argue that agency is being seen as an important dimension of teacher professionalism and central to the notion of teachers as agents of change. Should this be the case then the complexity of developing spaces and policies that encourage care of the self may be achievable. This thesis has identified what practices might encourage care of the self and considers, later in this chapter, how this might be achieved through providers and the policy process.

However, the argument above requires some engagement with the notion of agency and here it can be helpful to return to the work of Foucault. Caldwell (2007) argues that Foucault moved the notion of agency towards an ontological process-based approach that considered the idea of ‘change’ through a construct of agency that centers on discourse, talk, text or conversation. Caldwell (2007) goes on to argue that Foucault took this further to shape a notion of ‘decentered agency’ that consists of four key components: discourse, power / knowledge, embodiment and self-reflexivity. Such a notion allows for “new possibilities for resistance and the dispersal of agency and change in organizations and societies” (Caldwell, 2007: 771). Indeed this starts to touch on the idea of agency as being not only the ability to resist or act differently *but also* to make a difference. This outcome links to the four axis or dimensions of ethical practice and indeed the fourth element of this – that of *telos* – whereby any individual can identify that which they aspire to in order to act differently in transforming themselves and their practice. As part of this Foucault (Caldwell, 2007) argues for a practice of agency that develops around ‘discursive resistance’. When we return to Foucault’s later work (Foucault, 2010) we see in the CTs’ data such developing practices around *Askēsis* and *Parrhēsia*. Indeed discursive resistance and their rehearsals of such arguments during the Masters course appear significant in their development of an understanding of their CPD as ethical work and the ability to achieve a measure of agency through this. Resistive discourses allow for a number of views to be heard and considered – reflecting the suggestion in the data of the importance of ‘voice’ in the CTs’ developing agency. Caldwell (2007: 781) notes that much of Foucault’s work in this area develops in his later ‘ethical’ writings – upon which this thesis has drawn – as developing a clear shift towards “a positive reading of self-constitution and self-creation through ‘strategic’ (i.e. rational and intentional) modes of self-discipline” and goes on to note (Caldwell, 2007: 782) that:

Foucault wishes to reinstate new possibilities of ‘agential selves’ that can discursively recreate new discourses and dialogues of self-identity and embodied agency. We are not what we are; we are who we can become.

Emirbayer and Mische (1998) discuss the notion of improvisation around agency that can be developed more widely in reading the teachers’ data and their ability to manage their working contexts. In part some of the CTs such as CT1 were able to draw upon their past experiences to manage the present context in a way that best suited them. Emirbayer and Mische also (1998) discuss the idea of resistance, subversion and contention in the development of agency. It was clear from the data that some teachers were able to resist and subvert the logic and practices of the established order whilst other teachers were less able to achieve this. Finally Emirbayer and Mische (1998) discuss the political decision making process, which, in the context of this data, would be relevant to those vertical and horizontal relationships that the teachers had both within the school and the wider LEA. It is the relational aspect of agency that may be central to this work. These ideas, whilst not developed around Foucault’s notion of agency, also reflect the themes that Foucault explored in his later writings.

This consideration of agency is helpful in identifying those aspects of policy and practice that need addressed in this final chapter. Indeed, care of the self can be linked into the notion of agency through the ability to consider current (or past) practices in a new light and to be aware that the way in which we understand our own relationships to the past, present and future shapes our actions. It also highlights the ability to think otherwise about our practices. Additionally care of the self creates a resistance to normalization – again an important element of agency. In order to develop the ability to speak one’s mind, to have a concern for truth and the act of

truthfulness one needs an awareness of agency. As such this chapter now turns to a consideration of those changes that might be required to support higher levels of agency in teachers.

## **6.2 Professional Learning / Professional Development: Implications for Providers of CPD**

It is helpful at this point to return to the following quote from CT6:

*“It’s the whole process of ...the, the course..from the very first day when you came in and you were handed your learning journal and said “write down how you’re feeling”. And suddenly someone was interested in your development rather than, I..I’d be the first to hold up my hand up and say I came with my notepad ready to take my notes. Right – teach me and I’ll get good!....and all of a sudden somebody says to you no this is about your self-development, your self-learning.....the journey I was making.”*

In this quote the implicit beliefs about the processes of CPD are highlighted. As such, this relates to all of the research questions but initially the final Chapter will focus on the second research question: ‘How do formal discourses (such as those shaped by the government and providers of CPD) construct the aims of CPD and professional identities?’ Clearly, how language is used, both implicitly and explicitly, is important. For both policy makers and providers of CPD an awareness of the subtleties of discourse are important in thinking about how professional learning is shaped for future teachers and, indeed, how teachers such as CT6 approach and experience CPD. Professional Development, as the current process for teachers is, in part, shaped through standards and other policy texts. The attempt to provide a fluid and lifelong process of learning for teachers to engage with has, at times, restricted aspects of autonomy or

professional thinking at the classroom level. This may not be the aim of such standards but given the compliant nature of teachers it can be taken as such. However, a relational and ethical reframing of CPD may allow for a balance between practitioners and policy makers and/or providers of CPD. A starting point then, in terms of recommendations from this work, centres around a reframing of the discourse around professional learning. It could be argued that the analysis of the data shows the depth and detail with which teachers have considered their practices. This is a process that has worked for the teachers and one that, the data shows, policy makers, such as HMI, have endorsed.

As Webster-Wright (2009) has noted there is a need to move away from a focus on what is delivered through professional development towards a questioning, and deeper understanding, of how professionals learn. It was proposed that providers must engage more critically with the belief that well-designed professional development programmes will lead to professional learning and improvements in the practice of teachers. Webster-Wright (2009) argues that the profession should engage with a notion of CPL (Continuous Professional Learning) rather than CPD: because, as Webster-Wright (2009) argues, learning comes from a range of experiences, including CPD. Therefore whilst there is room for well-considered CPD there also has to be an acknowledgement that professional learning is not bounded and can take place in a range of contexts and situations. This freeing up of the professional learning process allows teachers more scope to identify and work on the ethical aspects of their practice. This is important in terms of how providers engage with the construction of CPD – an issue that will be considered in the following section. Here it is worth returning to the relationship between epistemology and ontology, and indeed to the work of Foucault. Throughout this thesis it has been considered to what degree standards shape what it is to be a teacher are based upon an explicit ontology. Webster-Wright (2009) argues that professional learning is as much about ontology (who the



professional is) as it is about epistemology (what the professional knows). Professional development, it could be argued, focuses on the reverse. Whilst the epistemological nature of standards can be helpful in focusing on national educational aims and on providing a degree of accountability, they might not be the best focus or driver of professional learning which, the data would suggest, requires a clearer ontological focus. It could be argued, and indeed, recommended, that any Masters level course provides the space for thinking, as well as the need for knowing. Indeed, in reading the data and listening to the voices of the teachers much of their focus is on revisiting their own beliefs, values and attitudes. Embedding the space and processes for such a focus in CPL would appear essential for providers of CPD.

For Foucault (1977) this could be perceived as the standards holding a discipline or power, which shape and define individuals through a process of conformity to the formalised standards (McGushin, 2007). If the aims of such accountability approaches are to guarantee quality and uniformity then, a linked consideration needs to pervade courses of teacher education of how closely professional standards should be defined by the competencies agenda. Coulemans *et al.* (2012: 43) argue that standards are mobile and that, as such, standards can be taken by different stakeholders and used in different ways:

*“However mobile they are though, their form is immutable as it is the basis of compliance, comparison etc, and, hence, standardization.”*

Whilst it was argued that the inclusion of professional actions (from a standard) in some Masters level courses was to encourage a more practical element to CPD, the basis of such professional actions have to be engaged with more critically. Of the nine professional actions that Chartered Teacher was based on, only the last of the nine: *articulating a*

*personal, independent and critical stance in relation to contrasting perspectives on educational issues, policies and developments* allows scope for an individual teacher to engage on a personal level with key issues in their practice. However, it is this professional action that appears most central to the teachers' comments about changes to their practices. Indeed, the data suggests that the notion of work on the self and the associated *Askēsis* reflects a deep engagement with complex aspects of education and learning. A key recommendation arising from this research is to ensure a balance of accountability and standards, with the ontological needs of the teachers. This requires the provision of processes through which teachers and providers can engage with standards in a relational and ethical manner. Here there is a requirement on the part of CPD providers that standards dovetail with, and support, rather than hinder professional learning. As Zembylas (2003: 126) suggests standards "can begin to provide teachers with space for reconstructing themselves and their relations with others".

Fejes (2011) suggests CPD can be a space for a different way of reasoning if Foucault's analysis of the practices of the Stoics is adopted. Which are those of writing, action and good intentions. What is clear from the data is that the teachers who have undertaken a Masters level course appear to have taken most from the process of reading and the manner in which reading as a process is structured as an active and critical process in the development of professionals. Writing, particularly structured assignments, is seen as less useful. In part this is because teachers consider this to be a product that needs completed for university purposes and for certification – rather than a process that is undertaken for their needs and to develop their practice. Given the focus on developing a Masters level profession, this academic hurdle is one that is unlikely to go away. However, flexibility over how formal learning is recognized would benefit from discussion amongst providers of CPD courses. As online provision develops, the

potential for professional portfolios might become more manageable within a Masters level course.

A key issue that arose from the teachers' data was a tension around how those undertaking Masters level work – through a university – were viewed by their friends, families and colleagues. Leat (1999: 400) identifies the need for different approaches to CPD noting that “These are likely to include consortia or networks of teachers and schools to help overcome some of the drag effects of socializing forces.” Leat (1999) goes on to note other factors, such as the need to engage in a sustained manner with evidence in relation to learners and engaging in supportive coaching to support teachers through what is an emotional experience. Whilst this research has highlighted what appears to have been successful professional learning for teachers it also raises some implications for providers and the associated, and often unquestioned, traditional practices of universities. A shared approach to a relational and ethical professional learning framework, one that is shared by practitioners and providers, may allow more support for teachers in their work places as and when tensions may arise. Much of the developing work in recent years around coaching and mentoring in teacher education and professional learning would be worth considering in a relational and ethical light. As such, the issues raised by Leat (1999) required careful consideration by providers.

Any practice in educational spaces including those of universities, are contested practices. As such, it is timely to consider such practices more critically and to consider if there are viable alternatives that might support the learning of teachers more effectively. Beyond this there is also a need to consider what practices, or *Askēsis*, are best for future teachers.

In summary providers of CPD need to consider those individuals undertaking CPD and need to consider a refocusing on CPL - a process that is less controlled by providers but accepts and encourages the wider learning of teachers. As part of this there is a requirement for a safe learning space in which teachers can initially, at least, unlearn or unbecome (McGushin 2007). Higgins and Leat (1997: 308) ask some useful questions connected to the purposes of teacher development of those involved in teacher development, these are:

*“Who is this person? Who are these people? What changes are we seeking? What is the significance of the context? (school culture, socialization, locality, etc.) How might changes be effected? What are the likely consequences of choosing different approaches?”*

These questions allow for the contextual aspects of professional learning for the individual teachers with a focus on the relational and ethical aspects of practice. Additionally such a refocusing would allow the practices that *Askēsis* and the resulting *Parrhēsia* encourage to form a central part to any teacher’s learning.

### **6.3 The Policy Process: *How Good is Our CPD?***

From the data collected for this thesis it is possible to hear what teachers are saying about their experiences of CPD at Masters level. The teachers describe their experiences and account for their changing professional identities. The teachers are also able to account for the effect of such formal professional development. In listening to the teachers it is clear how important the relational and ethical aspects of their work is. This tends to occur when the teachers themselves

are afforded the right to shape their ethical work on the self. This is, to an extent, about the teachers being able to ‘action’ and work on those issues of practice that are important to them. How, then, does this tie in with the policy process and formal CPD processes? At this point it can be helpful to return to the work of Freire (1970, 2005) and his work on *praxis*. In this context *praxis* is a combination of both reflection and action, which results in what Freire (1970) refers to as transforming action. Teachers, as part of this process require having a critical awareness of their role in such activity. Freire (1970: 110) presents a thesis in which such transformation should not be considered an individual activity, but rather that they are all ‘actors in intercommunication’: the relational aspect of professional learning. So, in his thinking there are links with the notions of *Parrhēsia* and *Askēsis*. As such, a recommendation from this work centres around those involved in the policy process. Policy makers, who shape the creation of CPD processes, need to consider the balance of flexibility in standards. Such flexibility may allow teachers to identify their own professional actions and to shape their own *Askēsis* within the knowledge that practices of *Parrhēsia* can lead to an engagement with educational issues. In turn this could result in a practice that is committed to both justice and ethical practices. Creation of such a group of professionals is both supported and encouraged.

Additionally a second recommendation focuses on the use of educational spaces. Educational spaces need to be redefined in terms of where professional learning can take place. Careful consideration needs to be given to what happens in such spaces, and how this is connected to the relational and ethical work of teachers. In recent years there has been a return to the restrictive nature of where teachers have to be located during their contractual hours. This may be an issue that needs revisiting in relation to professional learning.

Associated with the spaces in which professional learning takes place, Freire (2005) notes that you cannot take a resistive stance towards those in authority if you then, in turn, restrict the freedom of learners. In terms of the relational and ethical work of the teachers in this study this connects with the *ethic of care* that the teachers adopt towards their pupils. The data would suggest that the ability to engage in ethics of care for pupils come, in part, from the academic study that the teachers undertook at Masters level. Again, this would suggest that a level of flexibility within any guidance from policy makers on professional learning would be beneficial. In return the data shows that teachers develop a more complex understanding of what it is to be a teacher. This was an outcome that those involved in policy-making processes, such as HMIE and GTCS, have noted as desirable. As a result there is a move away from a simplistic and mechanistic approach to evidencing standards.

Johnson *et al.* (2005) raise the issue of standards – and all that they control within education – as taking the decision-making away from those who are teaching. In turn this means that changes in education have been legislated and not initiated and developed by teachers – or indeed young people. This may be key to the implications of this study for policy. Autonomy does not mean that teachers will run amock rather it is about trusting professionals to make judgements based on their own experiences of young people, and learning and in turn, the learning that they have taken from this. Therefore there is a requirement, in taking professional learning forward, to allow ownership of agendas and policies so that these are not developed at a distance away from places of learning such as schools (Smyth & Shacklock, 1998). Again, the notion of spaces of professional learning, as considered in Chapter four becomes important here. In encouraging a relational and ethical engagement with agendas and policies in a range of educational spaces and with a material / artifact slant allows for a new ‘spatial’ approach to engaging with policy

processes that allows for input and engagement from all stakeholders and encourages ownership and engagement.

Associated with this is a need to review priorities in education in the policy process, as Smyth and Shacklock (1998: 136) noted:

*“In what has to be the most remarkable aspect to the so-called educational reform around the world, there is a uniformly and strikingly consistent emphasis on the restructuring of management, organisation, administration and control of schools – none of it having anything to do with the essence or substance of teaching and learning.”*

They continue to argue that this is a move from those issues close to teachers, such as social justice and improving young people’s lives, towards a focus on limited internal forms of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. Herein lies another question for the policymakers. Can an accountability agenda change teachers by making them more compliant and what does this mean for the underpinning ontology and epistemology of any policy process? One of the research questions of the work was: How do formal discourses (such as those provided by government and providers) construct the aims of CPD and professional identities? Through using theoretical lenses and the analysis of data it is possible to make recommendations around the form that CPD at a Masters level might take that considers the needs of practitioners. The starting point for such recommendations has to be a policy discourse and associated standards that trusts and allows teachers to think about the relational and ethical aspects of their practice. Such processes might be expressed in a more open, and positive discourse.

#### 6.4 Professional Development as Ethical Work: Relational and Ethical Practices

By drawing upon theoretical resources to engage with the data, an ability to understand the value and importance of the relational and ethical practices in professional learning emerges. This in turn, allows engagement with three of the research questions:

- How do teachers locate, experience and account for their changing professional identities as they undergo formal professional development in educational spaces?
- (i) How do teachers account for the effects of formal professional development on themselves and other actors? (ii) How might engaging with theory shed further light on the processes involved in CPD?
- (i) To what extent are the relational and ethical foregrounded in accounts given by respondents? (ii) What theoretical sense might be made of this?

An important focus here is on the implications for the ‘becoming’ of teachers and to ask ‘What kind of professionals do we want?’ The answer lies, in part, in the work of Foucault and a new code of ethics for teaching professionals. This is a form of ethical work that the data from the teachers suggests is required. Foucault’s discussion of ethics has a firm focus on the self. This is in contrast to the more recent construction of ethics that tends to have a focus on governance and control. It can be argued that this is an important construction of ethics in order to consider how standards are read and engaged with by teachers. With this in mind the data from the thesis suggests the proposal of a code of ethics that encourages Foucault’s approach to not being governed ‘like that’ within a context of the rapid expansion of standards and standardization. Rather it might be more productive to develop a code of ethics that fosters an engagement with



the practice of ethics as work on the self. As the data shows, the Masters level course brought the teachers to a space where they refocused on the learners in front of them and the work that they undertook with these learners. The relational and ethical aspects of the course drew teachers back from the epistemological structures of education to a reengagement with their own ontological values and beliefs. As Carr (1999) argues it is the ethical dimension of a teacher's work that makes a professional and goes on to suggest that teachers have a set of values, beliefs and attitudes that promote the needs of others over their own self-interest. This is an important point to highlight as it is one that is clearly highlighted in the data from the teachers. Whilst many policy texts may promote the needs of the government and ergo the perceived needs of the learners it could be argued that CPD that focuses on the ethical work of the teachers may have more productive outputs. If, as Bottery (1998) argues, the ethics of professions includes truth seeking, provisionality and humanistic education then the arguments for professional learning that develop from a direction of 'ethics of the self' becomes much stronger. As such the recommendations made earlier in this Chapter start to allow a refocusing on such a relational and ethical framework.

This work is also about acknowledging the role of standards as actors and to see these as being worthy of interrogation. It is, essentially, about considering a series of different practices that focus on thinking and writing as being critical, but not judgmental. It also allows for an opening up, through the findings of this research, of new ways in which to think about, and ask questions of CPD. Thrift's advice can be comforting here, in what could be a difficult shift for those involved in professional learning. Thrift (2007) argues that instead of closing down routes of enquiry that comfort in a perpetually mobile space should be found (Thrift, 2007: 98) where joint action arising out of several causes brings new things into the world.

What appears to emerge from the data collected for this thesis is that some teachers experience moments of intensities and movements in their practice that are about ‘becoming other’. It is about becoming resistant or becoming (re)activist. It is about thinking differently and imagining new possibilities, and having the space to do this in. However, maybe not in the way in which it was envisaged at the outset of the learning process by policy makers – as Kirk *et al.* (2003: 18) note “chartered teachers are active agents in the transformation of the work of the school”. Not, however, in the manner in which some teachers did become ‘active’ – and this has been part of the tension for those teachers undertaking the course.

Foucault (1997: 273) argues that:

*“No technique, no professional skill can be acquired without exercise; neither can one learn the art of living, the tekhnē tou biou, without an Askēsis which must be taken as a training of oneself by oneself.”*

This raises a number of issues about where, when and how the professional engages with their continuing practice as a teacher. The work on the standards (GTCS, 2002a, 2002b) encourages a seamless engagement with the professional standards throughout one’s teaching career. However, such standards still remain as individual components outlying practice at certain points in an individual’s career and, as such, it encourages a perception of the standards as a product that can be achieved, ticked off and put to one side, rather than as a process which is continually engaged with throughout a teaching career.

Initial analysis of the data (Whewell, 2007:5) lead to the following observation:

*“By actively engaging in questioning practice there are significant benefits to the learners. It is the nature of this active questioning that is central to Professional Enquiry. This results not in the compliant actioning associated with traditional views of professionalism but rather it produces a critical actioning that impacts on practice.”*

Whilst this may be a naive take based on an early reading of the data and without a clear link to any theoretical foundation, it may still be a worthy starting point to consider what professional development is in the life course of a teacher. What is clear, from the data collected, is that the relational and ethical aspects of professional learning and practice are foregrounded in the accounts given by the respondents and that, as such, provide an important focus for how professional learning might be shaped for future generations of teachers.

## **6.5 Contributions of the Research Process**

This thesis has contributed to thinking and practice in two areas. Firstly through a methodology that has focused on objects as accessing aspects of practice and secondly findings in relation to CPD that have implications for both providers of CPD as well as professional communities.

The methodology of this work focused on the use of objects to take account of teachers' views. Much of the research in this area can struggle to access teachers' views. By drawing upon the research techniques of anthropology, that often had to use objects rather than language, to gather data, the data in this thesis has allowed the views of the teachers to be foregrounded. Such a methodological approach with a focus on practice through objects has

allowed the teachers interviewed to take account of the relational and ethical aspects of their practice. Indeed, it has been the adoption of this methodological approach that has opened up the views of the teachers around their professional development experiences. In part this has been through the use of three objects rather than one, in the interviews. By drawing upon three objects and making connections between these the teachers were able to make comparisons with other aspects of professional development and to consider their own experiences of professional learning.

Through a methodological approach based on the use of objects the analysis of the data has highlighted teaching as an ethical practice. Teaching as ethical work relates both to the self of the teacher as well as the ethical relationships that are developed with young people as learners. As a result of engaging with young people ethically in this context means allowing them to engage in shaping the learning process. For providers of CPD this means that a focus on the process that allows such ethical work is important.

The data from the teachers showed that they valued practices that lead to change and, as such, the policy discourse and language requires change to reflect this. The ethical work of teachers is based upon professional learning and not the standards that encourage professional development. Indeed such standards function as a series of full stops rather than opening up practice and allowing teachers to ask questions of their work. Such tensions arose in the data and were made sense of through a Foucauldian reading, which highlighted the tensions that exist.

Further research in this area might focus on the development of socio-material approaches to explore the complex nature of education and the range of actors involved in educational

practices. The use of objects could be developed in a longitudinal study to explore the professional learning of teachers throughout their career. For example it would be interesting to use object to explore professional learning with ITE students and then to follow the teachers as they become early career teachers and beyond. As part of such a study it would be of use to explore the relational and ethical aspects of their professional learning and to consider how this might develop with the experiential nature of their professional journey.

In the same way that a methodological approach that requests the identification of several objects served to open up each discussion with the teachers, The use of two theoretical frameworks has also opened up thinking around the data. As Thrift (2007) would suggest, it has provided a 'jolt'. Working through a couple of theoretical positions encouraged a reading of the data in different ways and this has opened up and challenged thinking, as well as the implicit baggage that comes from being both a provider and receiver in the Scottish education system. Beyond this a reading of the data through several theoretical frameworks allows for strong themes to emerge, which is, as such, a form of post-structuralist triangulation. Within this, though, it is possible to see how such themes may be read or framed differently. It can help, as a process, to problematise the data.

## **6.6 Reflections on Personal Learning**

Without a doubt undertaking this research process has impacted upon my own learning (or *unlearning* and *relearning*) and, in turn, my practice. Caldwell (2007) talks about agency as a way in which we redefine practice through resisting what we have becoming: a form of embodied agency. In the first chapter of this thesis I discussed how my own practice as a

teacher had often developed in a compliant manner without any critical engagement.

Through the process of undertaking this thesis I have been able to engage critically with what my practice had become and to consider how it might be redefined. A process which I feel has impacted positively. In many ways reading Foucault encourages critical questions of practice that can often go unexplored and result in routinized and unquestioning practices.

The analysis of the data has encouraged me to reconsider my own role when working with other teachers and the academic community more generally. This refocusing has centered on a realization that epistemology and the desire to be compliant and 'tick boxes' had moved me away from a more essential need to focus on ontologies of practice and what this means for learning and learners. The challenge, however, that comes with this realization is the need to action such change in practice, and this is where many an academic struggles. Indeed ontology requires a deeper thinking about how and why we engage with practices in the ways that we do, and, as a result, it requires a more critical engagement with day-to-day activities.

As such, in my practice I have endeavored to be more mindful of the rationale for any given CPD input and to be more personally aware of the need to engage with frameworks of practice and within these to create the space and time to encourage the practices in myself and others that develop a more ethical and relational work that fosters care of the self. Beyond this it is also about considering the experiences of others and they engage with processes of CPL. As part of this it has been challenging, but important, to consider how the governance and control of, say, assessment is balanced and managed against wider ontological needs of CPD provision. This, in itself, raises questions about the validity and

value of such practices with HE and the balancing the needs of an HE system with the expectations and needs of those teachers undertaking any given course.

Additionally many practitioners need the space and time and to explore the contexts in which they work and to identify possible ways in which to enhance agency. In my current role this translates into encouraging researchers to ask questions of their research practice and to open up questions around the ethical and relational practices of research. For example, in the current climate of research impact what might the moral and ethical differences be between practices of public participation in research and public engagement? With the impact agenda growing within funding councils, charities and government bodies it is essential that academics are engaged with such questions in both a critical and constructive manner.

## **6.7 Conclusion**

Campbell (2003: 386) suggests that “teachers asking questions should be taken seriously. There are risks. The risks lie in the answers, but perhaps it is time to take a few risks.” It is not enough to pay rhetorical lip service to CPD processes and reduce it to time filling activities. CPD needs to move beyond contractual obligations focused on the latest policy initiative and actively engage teachers in asking pertinent questions of their own practice. This requires a focus on the relational and ethical aspects of practice. It has to be more than professional development and more about professional learning. In this Chapter the implications of the data analysis have been explored in relation to what kind of professionals can exist through an exploration of the research questions and objectives. The practices that any course of professional learning sets out to develop are central to the

ethical work of teachers. Practices that encourage thinking, and, as Foucault (1984b) would argue, ‘truth-telling’ are vital to professional learning because they forefront the ethical dimensions of teaching. Such *thinking* practices, though, often lead teachers to experience new ways of thinking and new combinations of events that can lead to the creation of a ‘Thirdspace’. As such there are implications for all involved in professional learning if a relational and ethical reframing is to be explored. These are identified in the recommendations made in this Chapter. Providers of CPL need to pay careful attention to the relational aspects of practice. As such, providers, and indeed policy makers need to pay attention to their own *Askēsis* and the resulting *Parrhēsia*. Then risks can be taken in a supportive environment, or learning space, that trusts teachers to think about the ethical decisions that they make in relation to their practice.



## References

- Aberton, H. (2012) Material enactments of identities and learning in everyday community practices: implications for pedagogy, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 20(1), pp113-136.
- Allan, J. (2012) Foucault and his acolytes: discourse, power and ethics, in M. Murphy (Ed.) *Social Theory and Education Research: Understanding Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and Derrida*. London, Routledge,
- Allen, R. (1997) AERA paper “what space makes of us”. Thirdspace, Identity Politics, and Multiculturalism presented at AERA Annual Gathering, Chicago, IL, April 2007.
- Atkinson, P., Delamont, S. and Hammersley, M. (1998) Qualitative Research Traditions: A British response to Jacob, *Review of Educational Research*, 58(2), pp231-250.
- Ball, S.J. (2003) The teacher’s soul and the terrors of performativity, *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), pp215-228.
- BERA (2004) Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research. London, BERA.
- Bezzina, M. (2006) The bigger picture and the greater good: Leadership development activities in Catholic systems in NSW, *Journal of Catholic School Studies*, 78 (1), pp10-20.
- Biesta, G. (2007) Why ‘what works’ won’t work: evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research, *Educational Theory*, 51(1), pp1-22.
- Biesta, G. (2009) Good Education in an Age of Measurement: on the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in Education, *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), pp33-46
- Bolton, G. (2005) *Reflective Practice: Writing and Professional Development*. London, Sage.
- Brookfield, S.D. (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Bottery, M. (1996) The challenges to professionals from the new public management: Implications for the teaching profession, *Oxford Review of Education*, 22(2), pp179-197.
- Bottery, M. (1998) *Professionals and Policy*. London, Cassell
- Bottery, M. (2001) *Education, Policy and Ethics*. London, Continuum
- Brown, A.D., Ainsworth, S. and Grant, D. (2012) The Rhetoric of Institutional Change, *Organization Studies*, 33 (3), pp297-321.
- Bruner, J. (1996) *The Culture of Education*. MA, Harvard University Press.
- Bryce, T.G.K and Humes, W.M. (1999) *Perspectives on Policy: no 1: Policy Development in Scottish Education*. Glasgow, UK, Synergy.
- Bubb, S. and Earley, P. (2006) Induction rites and wrongs: The educational vandalism of new teachers, *Journal of In-service Education*, 32 (1), pp5-12.
- Butler, J. (2002) Chapter 8 What is critique? An essay on Foucault's virtue, in D. Ingram (Ed.) *Political: Readings in continental philosophy*. London, Basil Blackwell, pp212-226.
- Caldwell, R. (2007) Agency and Change: Re-evaluating Foucault's Legacy, *Organization*, 14 (6), pp769-791
- Campbell, A. (2003) Teachers' research and professional development in England: Some questions, issues and concerns, *Journal of In-service Education*, 29 (3), pp375-388.
- Campbell, E. (2003) *The Ethical Teacher*. Buckingham, UK, The Open University Press
- Carnell, E. and Lodge, C. (2002) *Supporting Effective Learning*. Edinburgh, UK, Chapman.
- Carr, D. (1999) Professional Education and Professional Ethics, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 16 (1), pp33-46.
- Christie, D. (2003) Competences, benchmarks and standards in teaching in Bryce, T.G.K. & Humes, W.M. (eds.) 2003 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) *Scottish Education: Post-Devolution*. Edinburgh, UK Edinburgh University Press, pp952-963.

- Clarke, M. (2009) The ethics-politics of teacher identity, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 41 (2), pp185-200.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education* (5<sup>th</sup> Edition) London, RoutledgeFalmer
- Colebatch, H.K. (1998) *Concept in the Social Sciences: Policy*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.
- Coulemans, C., Simpsons, M. and Struff, E. (2012) Professional standards for teachers: How do they 'work'? An experiment in tracing standardization in-the-making in teacher education, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 20 (1), pp29-47.
- Davies, B. (2006) Subjectification: the relevance of Butler's analysis for education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27 (4), pp425-438.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Stobart, G., Kington, A. and Gu, Q. (2007) *Teachers Matter*. Maidenhead, UK, McGraw Hill
- Day, C. (1999) *Developing Teachers: the Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. London, Falmer.
- Day, C. and Sachs, J. (2004) *International Handbook on the Continuing Professional Development of teachers*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1999) *Foucault*. London, Continuum.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1998) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Du Gay, P., Evans, J. and Redman, P. (Eds.) (2000) *Identity: A Reader*. London, Sage.
- Dunn, M., Pryor, J. and Yates, P. (2005) *Becoming a Researcher: A research companion for the social science series*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.
- Dwyer, P.J. (1995) Foucault, docile bodies and post-compulsory education in Australia, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16 (4), pp467-477.

- Edwards, R. (1997) *Changing Places? Flexibility, Lifelong Learning and a Learning Society*. London: Routledge.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991) *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice*. New York, Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Elliot, J. (2005) *Using Narrative in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London, Sage.
- Emirbayer, M. and Mische, A. (1998) What Is Agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103 (4), pp962-1023.
- Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. London, Falmer Press.
- Eraut, M. (1995) Schön Shock: A case for refraining Reflection-in-Action? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1 (1), pp9-22.
- Evans, L. (2008) Professionalism, Professionalism and the Development of Education Professionals, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56 (1), pp20-38.
- Fejes, A. (2011) Confession, in-service training and reflective practice, *British Educational Research Journal*, 37 (5), pp797-812
- Fenwick, T., Edwards, R. and Sawchuk, P. (2011) *Emerging Approaches to Educational Research: Tracing the Socio Material*. London: Routledge.
- Fenwick, T. (2000) Expanding Conceptions of Experiential Learning: A review of the five contemporary perspectives on cognition, *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50 (4), pp243-272.
- Forde, C., McMahon, M., McPhee, A and Patrick, F. (2006) *Professional Development, Reflection and Enquiry*. London, Paul Chapman.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish*. London, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1984a) *The Use of Pleasure: the History of Sexuality volume 2*. London, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1984b) *The Care of the Self: the History of Sexuality volume 3*. London, Penguin.

- Foucault, M. (1997) *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. London, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2010) *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France 1982-1983*. London: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London, Penguin.
- Freire, P. (2005) *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Colorado, USA, Westview.
- Freund, M. (2009) 'Me at university doing teacher training – what a big laugh': Narrative and Parrhēsia, *Educational Action Research*, 17 (4), pp523-536.
- Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, Basic Books 2000.
- General Teaching Council of Scotland (2002a) *The Standard for Chartered Teacher*. Edinburgh, UK, GTCS.
- General Teaching Council of Scotland (2002b) *Code of Practice on Teacher Competence*. Edinburgh, UK, GTCS.
- General Teaching Council of Scotland (2006) *The Standard for Full Registration*, Edinburgh, UK, GTCS.
- Gill, R. (2000) Discourse analysis: A Review in M.W. Bauer and G. Gaskell (Eds.) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage, pp172-190
- Goodson, I. (2003) *Professional Knowledge, Professional Lives: Studies in Education and Change*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.
- Grumet, M. (1991) The Politics of Personal Knowledge, in C. Witherell and N. Noddings (Eds.) *Stories Lives Tell: Narrative and Dialogue in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp67-77.
- Gunzenhauser, M.G. (2008) Care of the Self in a context of accountability, *Teachers College Record*, 110 (10), pp2224-2244.

- Hall, S. (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London, Sage.
- Hammersley, M. (2002) *Educational Research, Policymaking and Practice*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London, Cassell.
- Hargreaves, A. (2000) Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning, *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice*, 6(2), pp151-182.
- Higgins, S. and Leat, D. (1997) Horses for courses or courses for Horses: what is effective teacher development? *Journal of In-Service Education*, 23(3), pp303-314.
- HMIE (2007). *How Good is our School?* Edinburgh, UK, Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Holloway, L. and Hubbard, P. (2001) *People and Place: the extraordinary geographies of everyday life*. London, Prentice Hall.
- Honan, E. (2005) (Im)plausibilities: A rhizo-textual analyses of policy text and teachers work, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(3), pp267-281.
- Hoskins, J. (1998) *Bibliographic Objects: How things tell the stories of people's lives*. London, Routledge.
- Hoyle, E. (2008) Changing conceptions of teaching as a profession: Personal reflections in D. Johnson and R. Maclean (eds.) *Teaching: Professionalization, Development and Leadership*. Springer, Amsterdam, pp285-304.
- Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R., Bartley, B. and Fuller, D. (2002) *Thinking Geographically*. London, Continuum.
- Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R. and Valentine, G. (2004) *Key Thinkers on Space and Place*. London, Sage.

- Humes, W.M. (2003) Policy Making in Scottish Education in Bryce, T.G.K. & Humes, W.M. (eds.) 2003 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) *Scottish Education: Post-Devolution*. Edinburgh, UK, Edinburgh University Press, pp74-85.
- Janesick, V. J. (1998) *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers*. London, Sage.
- Johnson, D.D., Johnson, B., Farenga, S.J. and Ness, D. (2005) *Trivalizing Teacher Education: The Accreditation Squeeze*. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Kelchtermans, G. (2004) CPD for Professional Renewal: Moving beyond knowledge for practice, in C. Day and J. Sachs (Eds.) *International Handbook on the Continuing Professional Development of teachers*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.
- Kirk, G., Beveridge, W. and Smith, I. (2003) *The Chartered Teacher: Policy and Practice in education no. 11*. Edinburgh, UK, Dunedin Academic Press.
- Kolb, D. A., (1983) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (2001) Objectual Practice in the Practice Turn, in T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina and E. Von Savigny, E. (Eds.) *Contemporary Theory*. Edited by London, Routledge, pp175-188.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Learning and Teaching Scotland (2006) *The Contribution of Chartered Teachers: Advice and Guidance*. Dundee, UK, Learning and Teaching Scotland.
- Leat, D. (1999) Rolling the Stone Uphill: Teacher development and the implementation of Thinking Skills Programmes, *Oxford Review of Education*, 25(3), pp387-403.
- Lefebvre, H. (1974) *The Production of Space*. Paris, Anthropos.
- Levett, A., Kottler, A., Burman, E. and Parker, I. (1997) *Culture power and difference: psychoanalytic discourse in South Africa*. London, Zed Books.

- MacDonald, A. (2004) Collegiate or Compliant? Primary teachers in post-McCrone Scotland, *British Educational Research Journal*, 30 (3), pp 413-433.
- MacLure, M. (1993) Arguing for your Self: identity as an organizing principle in teachers' jobs and lives, *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(4), pp311-322.
- MacLure, M. (2003) *Discourse in Educational and Social Research* Buckingham, UK, Open University Press
- Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*. London, Sage.
- McGushin, E.F. (2007) *Foucault's Askēsis: An introduction to the philosophical life*, IL, USA, Northwestern University Press.
- Menter, I., Hulme, M., Elliot, D., Lewin, J. (2010) Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Edinburgh, UK, Scottish Government.
- Menter, I., Mahony, P. and Hexall, I. (2004) Ne'er the twain shall meet?: modernizing the teaching profession in Scotland and England, *Journal of Education Policy*, 19 (2), pp195-214.
- Merrifield, A. (2000) Henri Lefebvre: A socialist in space, in M. Crang and N. Thrift (Eds.) *Thinking Space (Critical Geographies)*. London, Routledge. pp167-182
- Mitchell, C., Weber, S. and O'Reilly-Scanlon, K. (2005) *Just who do we think we are? Methodologies for autobiography and self-study in teaching*. London, Routledge.
- Moon, J. (2006) *Learning Journals: A Handbook for Reflective Practice and Professional Development*. London, Routledge.
- Narayan, K. and George, K.M. (2001) Personal and folk narrative as cultural representation, in J. F. Gubrium and J.A Holstein (Eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp815-831.
- Nealon, J.T. (2008) *Foucault beyond Foucault: Power and its intensifications since 1984*. CA, Stanford University Press.



- Nixon, J., Martin, J., McKeown, P. and Ranson, S. (1997) Towards a learning profession: changing codes of occupational practice within the new management of education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18(1), pp5-28.
- Osborn, M. (2008) Teacher professional identity under conditions of constraint, in D. Johnson and R. Maclean (Eds.) *Teaching: Professionalization, Development and Leadership*. Amsterdam, Springer, pp67-81.
- Pagano, J. (1991) Moral Fictions: The dilemma of theory and practice, in C. Witherall and N. Noddings (Eds.) *Stories Lives Tell: Narrative and Dialogue in Education*. New York, Teachers College Press, pp157-170.
- Pignatelli, F. (2002) Mapping the terrain of a Foucauldian ethics: a response to the surveillance of schooling, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, pp157-180.
- Powell, E., Terrell, I., Furey, S. and Scott-Evans, A. (2003) Teachers' perceptions of the impact of CPD: an institutional case study, *Journal of In-Service Education*, 29 (3), pp389-404.
- Priestley, M., Biesta, G.J.J. & Robinson, S. (2012). *The importance of relationships in shaping teacher agency*. A paper presented at the European Conference for Educational Research, 18 September 2012, Cadiz.
- Purdon, A. (2003) The Professional Development of Teachers in Bryce, T.G.K. & Humes, W.M. (eds.) 2003 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) *Scottish Education: Post-Devolution*. Edinburgh, UK, Edinburgh University Press, pp931-941.
- Raaen, F.D. (2011) Autonomy, candour and professional teacher practice: A discussion inspired by the later work of Michel Foucault, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45 (4), pp627-641.
- Rabinow, P. and Rose, N. (2006) Biopower today, *BioSocieties*, 1, pp195-217.
- Randor, H. (2001) *Researching your professional practice: To know is to interpret*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.

- Reeves, J. (2007) Inventing the Chartered Teacher, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(1), pp56-76.
- Reeves, J. and Fox, A. (2008) *Practice-Focused Learning: Developing Excellence in Teaching*. Edinburgh, UK, Dunedin Press.
- Reissman, C.K. (2001) Chapter 33 Analysis of Personal Narratives, in J. F. Gubrium and J.A Holstein (Eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage
- Rose, N. (1998) *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, M. (2011) Spaces of Possibility in Pre-Service Teacher Education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 32(6), pp881-900
- Sachs (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press
- Schön, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass Publishing.
- Schubert (1991) Teacher lore: A basis for understanding praxis, in C. Witherall and N. Noddings (Eds.) *The stories Lives Tell: Narrative and Dialogue in Education*. New York, Teachers College Press, pp207-233.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2000) A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: the McCrone report. Edinburgh, UK, SEED.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2001) A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Agreement Reached following Recommendations made in the McCrone report. Edinburgh, UK, SEED.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2002a) Standard for Chartered Teacher Edinburgh. Edinburgh, UK, SEED.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2002b) Professional Review and Development. Edinburgh, UK, SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2002c) Continuing Professional Development. Edinburgh, UK, SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2002d) Chartered Teacher Status: Frequently Asked Questions. Edinburgh, UK, SEED.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2003) An overview of the CPD Framework and Requirements for Teachers in Scotland, Edinburgh, UK, SEED

Scottish Executive Education Department (2005) Standard for Headship in Scotland, Edinburgh, UK, SEED.

Scottish Government (2000) Standards in Scotland's Schools etc Act 2000, Edinburgh, UK, The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2011a) Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland, Edinburgh, UK, The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2011b) Continuing to Build Excellence in Teaching: The Scottish Government's Response To Teaching Scotland's Future, Edinburgh, UK, The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2011c) Advancing Professionalism in Teaching: The Report of the Review of Teacher Employment in Scotland. Edinburgh, UK, Scottish Government.

Scottish Office Education Department (1994) Higher Still: Opportunity for All. Edinburgh, UK, Scottish Office.

Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1999) Consultation paper on a National Framework for the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers. Edinburgh, UK, SOEID.

Senge, P. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook: Strategies for Building a Learning Organisation*. Boston, MA, Nicolas Brealey Publishing.

Sheehy, M. (2009) Can the literacy practice in an after school program be practiced in school? *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 17(2), pp141-160.

- Smith, C.M.M. and Sutherland, M.J. (2003) Creating a Community of Teacher-Learners, *Journal of In-service Education*, 29(3), pp423-438.
- Smith, I. (2011). Revisiting the Donaldson Review of Teacher Education: Is creative innovation secure? *Scottish Educational Review*, 43(2), pp17-38.
- Smyth, J. and Shacklock, G. (1998) *Re-making Teaching: Ideology, Policy and Practice*. London, Routledge.
- Soja, E. (1996) *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Soja, E. (2009) Thirdspace: Towards a new consciousness of space and spatiality in K. Ika and G. Wagner (Eds.) *Communicating in the Thirdspace*, New York, Routledge, pp99-112.
- Sørensen, E. (2009) *The Materiality of Learning: Technology and Knowledge in Educational Practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London, Heinemann.
- Stronach, I. (1997) *Educational Research Undone: Engagements with the Postmodern*. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.
- Soja, E. (2009) Thirdspace: Towards a new consciousness of space and spatiality in K. Ika and G. Wagner (Eds.) *Communicating in the Thirdspace*, New York, Routledge, pp99-112.
- Taggart, P. (2013) *Reflective Practice and Professional Development*. London, Sage.
- Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B. and Henry, M. (1997) *Educational Policy and the Politics of Change*. London, Routledge
- Thrift, N. (2007) *Non Representational Theory: Space/Politics/Affect*. London, Routledge.
- Thurston, A., Christie, D., Howe, C.J., Tolmie, A. and Topping K.J. (2008) Effects of continuing professional development on group work practices in Scottish primary schools, *Journal of In-service Education*, 34(3), pp263-282.

- Tripp, D. (1993) *Critical Incidents in Teaching: Developing Professional Judgement*. London, Routledge.
- Turner, V. W. (1974) *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. London, Cornell University Press.
- Vadeboncoeur, J.A. (2009) Spaces of Difference: The contradictions of Alternative Education Programs, *Educational Studies: A Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, 45(3), pp280-299.
- Weber, S. (2005) The Pedagogy of Shoes: Clothing and the Body in Self Study, in Mitchell, C., Weber, S. and O'Reilly-Scanlon, K. (2005) *Just who do we think we are? Methodologies for autobiography and self-study in teaching*. London, Routledge, pp13-21.
- Webster-Wright, A. (2009) Reframing Professional Development through understanding Authentic Professional Learning, *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), pp702-739
- Whewell, C. (2005) Translating Policy into Practice: Reflective Practice. Paper presented at the Partnership for Professional Enquiry Seminar, University of Stirling, UK, June 2005.
- Whewell, C. (2006) Learning from the Chalkface. Constructing Collegiality: Changing the Nature of Leadership in Schools? Paper presented at the Partnership for Professional Enquiry Seminar, University of Stirling, UK, June 2006.
- Whewell, C. (2007) Contextualities of Enquiring. Paper presented at the Partnership for Professional Enquiry Seminar, University of Stirling, UK, June 2007.
- Whitty, G. (2002) *Making Sense of Education Policy*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing
- Williams, R. and Grudnoff, L. (2011) Making Sense of Reflection: a comparison of beginning and experienced teachers' perceptions of reflection for practice, *Reflective Practice* 12(3), pp281-291.
- Zembylas, M. (2003) Interrogating "teacher identity": emotion, resistance, and self-formation, *Educational Theory*, 53(1), pp107-127.

## Appendix A: Course Structure and Content

The aim of the M.Ed Professional Enquiry in Education was to address the Standard for Chartered Teacher whilst also allowing participants to gain a Master's degree. The programme (Professional Enquiry into Education Programme PEEP) encouraged teachers to look beyond their professional actions and to explore their underlying assumptions and values, to analyse the context of their work place, to examine and analyse the current educational context in Scotland and to investigate, reflect upon and evaluate their own practice in light of this. As such the course was designed to enable participants to focus on issues of direct interest to them and their schools.

The course was delivered part-time and through double modules with the SCT embedded within these. The use of double modules meant that the degree could be completed within three years. The participants were provided with support materials as well as university-based sessions that took place either through twilight provision or on Saturdays. The first two double modules each consisted of the equivalent of 4 days of directed self-study and the equivalent of 4 days of seminars and workshops. Each double module also required the successful completion of a 6000 word assignment. The work-based module (PEEP02) required participants to undertake an action enquiry in their work place that focused on their own practice. During this module there were two twilight sessions and two individual tutorials that supported the completion of a 6000 word report. PEEP03 focused on collaboration and professional enquiry. This module had a mixed delivery mode, as with previous modules, but also included an assessable web discussion (20% of the final grade). Additionally this module was assessed through a 5000 word assignment which reflected upon the process of preparing for collaborative action enquiry. The final two double modules PEEP04 and PEEP05 made up the dissertation stage of the Masters. The first

module focused on the planning stages of a collaborative enquiry with colleagues. PEEP05 was the completed project demonstrating claims for competence against SCT. At the end of PEEP04 is an interim report of 5000 words with the final 10000 word dissertation being submitted at the end of PEEP05 with a supporting portfolio of evidence.

<b>Year 1</b>	PEEP01 Extending Professionalism	CTS Core Module 1 Self-evaluation CTS Core Module 2 Learning and Teaching
	PEEPA1 Linked Option Developing Contexts for Learning <i>or</i> Developing Cognitive Capability	CTS Core Module 3 Education for All
<b>Year 2</b>	PEEP02 Improving Classroom Practice	
	PEEP03 Collaboration and Professional Enquiry	CTS Core Module 4 Working Together
<b>Year 3</b>	PEEP04 Collaborative Project 1	
	PEEP05 Collaborative Project 2	