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Abstract

Government policy on teacher education, particularly since 2010, has emphasised a perceived divide between sites of learning (universities and schools) and the knowledge base of professional teaching (theory and practice), appearing to value practical knowledge gained in school over theoretical, academic knowledge gained in universities. In a framework of knowledge traditions underpinning teacher education and concepts of teacher professionalism, this study investigates the perceptions of teachers with 3-6 years' teaching experience of what, in their initial teacher education, continues to be of value to them.

A phenomenological approach was chosen for the research. In particular, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis which supports an interpretivist epistemology, within recognised procedures for analysis. Its ideographic approach was appropriate to investigate individuals’ perceptions of their experience, and to give weight to each person’s view (and acknowledge my own). Seven teachers from one school took part in the research. Unstructured interviews, based on a diagram prepared by each participant showing how they view their initial teacher education, was the main method of data collection.

Participants referred to a range of values of academic knowledge, and a number of perceived benefits and limitations of school-based learning. They commented on the relationship between theory and practice, with some seeing clear connections between the two, others less so along a continuum towards little or no connection. They talked about the residual, or lasting, impact of initial teacher education in terms of the significance of professional values in sustaining them as they face the day-to-day demands of teaching.

The findings illuminate ways in which the perceived value of different knowledge may be related to different concepts of professionalism. While some models, which integrate academic and practical knowledge, may be more likely to sustain a teacher in their career in the long term, the attraction of practical knowledge remains strong.
Impact Statement

This study has given a voice to practising teachers to comment on what, in their initial teacher education (ITE), has been valuable to them. Their comments may inform those responsible for teacher education, whether policy-makers or course leaders in universities or Teaching Schools, about the impact of those courses beyond the immediate. The end-of-course student evaluation may be significantly enhanced by a longer-term view of the value of ITE.

The long-standing debate about what sort of knowledge new teachers need to have is illustrated by the findings of the research and linked with models of teacher professionalism to enhance understanding of how student teachers receive and apply their knowledge about teaching. This illustration is helpful in providing some clarification for all those trying to make sense of the many available routes into teaching.

For university tutors, like me, exploring the link between models of professionalism and the knowledge base of teacher education helps to explain the difficulties experienced across the sector of trying to meet a variety of agendas. Greater understanding of the different concepts of the purpose of ITE has the potential to contextualise the dominance of one knowledge base over another and to explain why policy-makers may be wedded to a particular view of teaching and teacher education.

The work on this thesis has already provided a foundation for professional discussion among the tutors and school partners working on the ITE course for which I have been responsible. It has contributed to developing our shared understanding of our purpose in providing ITE that will be valuable in the long as well as short term.

The use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) has been enhanced by diagrams of perception as the basis for unstructured interviews. The device provided a successful way into participants’ perceptions and could be used by future researchers as a helpful addition to IPA.
The findings of this study may provide evidence for those, in the United Kingdom and beyond, arguing their case for an ITE which generates thoughtful, activist professionals who are equipped for a sustained career in teaching.

The findings from this research lead me into a follow-up study, using the same methodology and similarly experienced teachers, to explore ways in which practical and academic knowledge have been integrated successfully during or post-ITE. I would be interested in finding out to what extent ITE courses can successfully make the inter-relationship of knowledge bases overt to new recruits.
Table of Contents

Declaration..................................................................................................................2
Abstract .......................................................................................................................3
Impact Statement.......................................................................................................4
List of Figures ...........................................................................................................9
Acknowledgements....................................................................................................10
Reflective Statement....................................................................................................11
List of Abbreviations...................................................................................................16

Chapter One: Introduction.........................................................................................17
  Professional context .................................................................................................18
  The structure of ITE ..................................................................................................21
  The influence of ITE policy development 2007-2010 ...........................................22
  The influence of ITE policy since 2010 .................................................................23
  The research ............................................................................................................29

Chapter Two: Literature Review ..............................................................................31
  i) The academic knowledge tradition and professionalism ..................................33
  ii) The practical knowledge tradition and competence........................................38
  iii) The integrated knowledge tradition and possible new ways of working .......45
Summary .....................................................................................................................51

Chapter Three: Methodology ..................................................................................55
  Phenomenology ......................................................................................................56
  Hermeneutics ..........................................................................................................57
  Idiography ..............................................................................................................58
  Methods ..................................................................................................................59
  The place of the diagram .......................................................................................64
  Data Analysis .........................................................................................................70
  Ethical considerations .............................................................................................74
  Summary ..................................................................................................................76

Chapter Four: Presentation of findings ...................................................................78
  1 Academic knowledge ............................................................................................78
    i) academic subject knowledge .........................................................................78
    ii) working at master’s level ..............................................................................81
  2 Knowledge from school .......................................................................................83
  3 The relationship between theory and practice ..................................................86
Chapter Five: Discussion of Findings ................................................. 94

Knowledge traditions ................................................................. 94
Ways in which academic subject knowledge may be seen as directly applicable to practice and therefore ‘relevant’ ............................................. 95
Ways in which practice may be seen as the dominant form of learning; as being the overriding purpose of teacher education ........................................ 97
How, although still regarded as the dominant part of teacher education, participants identify limitations of learning from practice ......................... 99
Ways in which academic knowledge or attitudes may be used to make sense of practice .................................................................................. 103
Summary of ways in which findings indicate different understanding of the knowledge underpinning teaching .................................................. 108
Professionalism .............................................................................. 110
Functional development .................................................................. 110
Attitudinal development ................................................................. 114
Collaborative professionalism ......................................................... 114
Activist professionalism ................................................................ 116
Residual impact of attitudinal development versus functional development. 120
Summary ....................................................................................... 123

Chapter Six: Conclusion ................................................................ 124
Relationship between knowledge traditions and concepts of professionalism .................................................................................. 124
Practical knowledge and functional development .......................... 127
Integrated knowledge and attitudinal development ...................... 131
Implications for ITE ........................................................................ 133
Limitations of the research ............................................................ 134
Contribution to knowledge .............................................................. 136
Professional implications ............................................................... 137
Dissemination ................................................................................ 137
Final remarks ................................................................................ 138

References .................................................................................... 139
Appendix 1: Example page – initial noting .............................................. 150
Appendix 2: Example page - emergent themes from each participant...... 151
Appendix 3: Example page - grouping the emergent themes ............... 153
Appendix 4: Example page - identifying common or super-ordinate themes across cases........................................................................................................... 154
Appendix 5: Example page - illustrative comments for each common, super-ordinate theme .......................................................... 155
Appendix 6: Example page of notes from each super-ordinate theme collated into main themes.............................................................. 157
Appendix 7: Revised charts of super-ordinate themes ....................... 158
Appendix 8: Ethics Application Form ..................................................... 159
Appendix 9: Contact emails .................................................................... 171
Appendix 10: Participant information sheet .......................................... 172
Appendix 11: Participant consent form.................................................. 175
List of Figures

Figure 1: Types of CPD and Teacher Professionalism (Sachs, 2016, p421) 32
Figure 2: List of participants ................................................................. 63
Figure 3: Participant diagram, Cindy Circle ........................................ 64
Figure 4: Participant diagram, Stella Stairs ........................................... 65
Figure 5: Participant diagram, Philip Files ............................................ 66
Figure 6: participant diagram, Florence Flower ................................. 66
Figure 7: participant diagram, Linda Lines .......................................... 67
Figure 8: participant diagram, Millie Mindmap ................................. 68
Figure 9: Participant diagram, Wendy Web ........................................ 69
Figure 10: Connections between Sachs’s model of CPD and Teacher Professionalism and Furlong and Whitty’s Knowledge Traditions............. 126
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Jane Perryman and Clare Brooks for their wisdom and encouragement. Their guidance has been invaluable in helping me to clarify my thoughts as my thesis has developed. Their good cheer throughout the process has been highly motivating.

Thank you to the teachers in the school in which I carried out my research; those who agreed and enabled access, as well as the teachers who gave their time and thoughts so generously. Their willingness to take part is greatly appreciated and exemplifies all that is best in the collaborative working that characterises effective teacher education.

Thank you to my friends on the EdD course. It has been a pleasure to share ideas and experiences over the years. Also my colleagues at work; I thank them for their enthusiasm for my project and for asking questions about my research which have often made me re-think my ideas.

Thank you to my family and friends who have listened patiently and enabled me to spend so much time studying and writing. In particular, Simon, Jess, Lily and Robin who have lived with the highs and lows of my EdD years.
Reflective Statement

From the beginning of my EdD studies in 2014 my focus has been on the experience of initial teacher education (ITE) from a range of perspectives. I understood that my own experience as student teacher, teacher, school manager and teacher educator in HE gave me a particular view, and I was interested to examine ways in which other people viewed their experience. As a teacher educator, I had developed a particular understanding of what it is about initial training that most benefits entrants to the profession and was aware that my understanding had changed over time, and that others have a different understanding.

I was aware that the content of ITE, the knowledge required by teachers was the subject of debate. When I first thought I would like to become a teacher I thought that I had a body of knowledge which would be the basis of what I would teach. I would try to emulate the teachers I had learnt from, to make learning interesting, or even inspiring. I soon realised that there was much more to being a teacher than that, that there was another complex body of knowledge about education that was needed if I was to make sense of what I was doing in school. Once I was working as leader of a Secondary PGCE programme I realised, from routine end-of-course student evaluation, that many did not see the point of the time they spent in university, or of the tasks that linked that learning with their practical experience in schools. Many appeared to have started the course believing that they would learn best from teachers in schools and did not appear to have changed that expectation during the year. At the other end of the spectrum there were always those who had understood the point, whose comments included things like, ‘the course made me think in a different way’, or ‘I learnt so much about myself during the year’.

2014 was a significant time to begin my EdD because the debate about the knowledge base of teaching, linked with where that learning takes place had been fuelled by the turn of government policy from the beginning of the Coalition government in May 2010. The negative direction and language of policy against university-led teacher education seemed an obvious area for me to explore in my EdD studies. Where had such antipathy come from, and what might it mean for the quality of teacher education?
Coalition policy had a major impact on the way my university’s partnership with schools operated. Some partner schools understandably embraced the opportunities offered to develop their own programmes for initial teacher education. Of these, many were keen to maintain links with the university, and there appeared to be opportunities to develop new, cooperative ways of working together. For others it appeared to be a signal, or confirmation, that teaching is learnt in schools; the knowledge base of teaching should be acquisition of skills. In other words, the existing theory-practice debate intensified.

In my first EdD assignment (2014) for the module Foundations of Professionalism (FOP) I explored the impact of the coalition government’s policy on initial teacher education in Higher Education (HE). My title was: Government Initial Teacher Education Policy 2007-2014: does it reflect a change in perceptions of teacher professionalism? I considered ways in which the rapid succession of policy directives that came with the new coalition government in 2010 seemed to indicate a different view of teacher professionalism from mine and that of my colleagues. While I understood teaching to be in the mode of a traditional profession whose status is built on significant academic foundations, a sense of moral purpose and thus of value to society, I concluded that this government in particular, was escalating an already established managerial agenda in which teachers were seen as technicians rather than professionals and whose ‘outputs’ needed to be measurable. That first assignment helped me to make sense of the conflicts I was experiencing in my professional life; conflicts between knowledge gained in school and knowledge gained in university.

In 2015, I completed assignments for the modules Methods of Enquiry 1 (MOE1) and Methods of Enquiry 2 (MOE2). MOE1 was a research proposal entitled: Perceptions of the quality of Initial Teacher Education: views from a Teaching School Alliance. In that study I considered the different concepts of knowledge in teacher education as a framework in which to investigate what sort of knowledge student teachers and trainers in a teaching school alliance drew on in their ITE provision. I proposed using semi-structured interviews as my means of data collection, adopting a phenomenological approach. I was interested at this point in gaining perspectives of a particular phenomenon and
understood that the idea of ‘bracketing’ my own perspective might offer a means of accommodating a range of viewpoints. I was aware, on completion of this assignment, that I needed to find out more about phenomenological enquiry, to understand more about its potential for acknowledging the subjectivity of knowledge in order to value the significance of interpretation in the construction of knowledge. I anticipated carrying out thematic analysis but was not sure how that might work, it seemed to me that there was the potential to impose themes on the data rather than pay attention to what the participants were really saying. Before starting MOE2 I investigated Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) and decided to try out its stages of analysis to see if that would be more satisfactory.

For MOE2 I followed the proposal outlined in MOE1 but investigated a different set of views. My title was: Perceptions of the quality of Initial Teacher Education: views from university-based students. I interviewed three PGCE students at the point of completion of their course. My findings suggested that, immediately at the end of their training year, these participants did make connections between learning in university and school, between different types of knowledge. However, I felt that sticking to a list of questions in semi-structured interviews led to a degree of repetition in responses and limited participants, leaving me wondering whether they might have chosen to comment on different aspects of their training if given the freedom to do so. Thinking of MOE2 as a pilot, I decided that I would use unstructured interviews in my next study, with the intention of pursuing responses in depth rather than returning to the next question on the list.

Thus far, assignments had been limited to 5,000 words. The next assignment was the Institution Focused Study (IFS) which, at 20,000 words, provided the scope for greater depth. It also acted as a pilot for my thesis. I was still interested in increasing my understanding of different perceptions of ITE, and the relative value of different types of knowledge drawn from different sites of learning. I was aware that colleagues in school were being required to work with school-led as well as university-led teacher education programmes as a result of the Department for Education (DFE) ITE policy’s emphasis on school-led training. I wanted to find out about their perception of the shift away from the established model of universities taking responsibility for recruitment to ITE, programme content, and school experiences, in a partnership model. Because
I was investigating a different view of the same core issue, my title simply reflected that: *Perspectives of initial teacher education: views from school-based colleagues*. I submitted in February 2017.

In my IFS I built on the work completed so far. I related literature about the knowledge base(s) of teacher education to policy concepts of the knowledge required for teaching and was, by now, able to explore the apparent conflict between the two in more depth. I had been able to spend time since MOE2 reading more about phenomenology and perceptions, and I decided to try to address the issues I had experienced with using semi-structured interviews by asking participants to bring a diagram to the interview. I intended to ask them to tell me about the thoughts they had incorporated in that diagram. I was very uncertain that the pictures would provide a sufficient basis for discussion, that participants might bring such different views to their interview that it would prove impossible to find common elements during analysis, or indeed whether participants would be willing to spend time on this preparation. In the event I was pleased with the outcome, to the extent that I decided to repeat the approach in my thesis.

The findings from my IFS contributed to the focus of my thesis. All three participants (Sarah, Linda and Rachel) noted that school-led and university-led ITE courses were based on different types of knowledge. They all felt that in school the focus is not on academic research but on technique, curriculum content, and pupil attainment. They recognised that the university’s role is to support practical training with academic approaches. In particular, I was struck by the idea expressed by all participants that, as a result, school-led teacher training serves a different purpose from university-led teacher education. Sarah identified the difference by using the term ‘super-coach’ to describe a new teacher emerging from a skills-based school-led programme and ‘thinking teacher’ to describe a new teacher who had completed a master’s level PGCE. She suggested that the ideal, professional teacher is able to contribute to the debates in school, in particular to consider broad issues, for example diversity and inclusion, beyond their school context. On the other hand, her ‘super-coach’ was a competent practitioner able to ensure that pupils work hard, complete the curriculum, and attain well. Both Linda and Rachel identified reasons why the ‘thinking teacher’ is more desirable, such as their capacity, developed through critical enquiry, to know why and how they are teaching as
well as what and how they are teaching. Rachel anticipated that those who lack such reflective abilities would, when confronted by a change of context, be ‘completely flummoxed’ and she speculated that such a lack of ‘mental resources’ was a reason that teachers were leaving the profession ‘in their droves’. I could see that, in these findings, links were being made between the content, or knowledge base of ITE and the type of profession for which student teachers are being prepared. If I pursued that connection in my thesis I would be linking my EdD work on perceptions of training with my first assignment about models of teacher professionalism.

Having considered a range of perspectives on teacher education, I felt that a group whose views about the value of ITE would be significant was practising teachers who were near enough to their training to be able to make some assessment of what had proved to have a lasting impact on them. I thought that this group was significant because it is they who have undergone (and paid for) training that they might reasonably expect would equip them for a long and rewarding career in teaching. As a provider of teacher education, the findings would be important in helping me, and others in the sector, understand how the needs of new teachers can best be met.
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Chapter One: Introduction

This research considers the perspectives that recently qualified teachers have of their preparation for teaching. It examines how, with 3-6 years' teaching experience, they reflect on what they feel was valuable to them in the formal process of becoming a teacher.

The initial preparation of teachers is referred to variously as initial teacher training (ITT) and initial teacher education (ITE). The Department for Education (DfE) uses ITT in all its documentation, while in Higher Education (HE) the preferred term is ITE. It might be considered less confusing to adopt the term ITT throughout this study on the grounds that there will be reference to a large quantity of DfE documentation. However, in many ways the distinction between initial teacher training and initial teacher education lies at the heart of my discussion and for that reason I will adopt the term ITE in this study. The use of ‘training’ suggests a process in which a ‘trainee’ learns to do the things a teacher does while ‘education’ suggests that a person needs to become a student of Education in order to develop into a teacher (Golding, 2015, p116, Furlong, 2013, Hoyle & John, 1998). The thoughts of relatively recently qualified teachers considered in this study will shed light on the different assumptions underlying the choice of terminology.

I drew on my professional context, changes in initial teacher education (ITE) policy, and academic literature about teacher professionalism and different knowledge traditions to identify a gap in knowledge. My professional context led me to consider how teachers use their ITE beyond their first year of teaching. Recent ITE policy has reinforced a perceived divide between the knowledge base of teaching, seen in simple terms as deriving from either theory or practice, and raised questions for me about the concepts of teacher professionalism underlying that perception. ITE policy since 2010 appeared to me to be based on a view that the impact of ITE is short term, to equip teachers for their first year, rather than enduring, to equip teachers for a long-term professional career. While the literature considers arguments about the knowledge base required to develop high quality teachers and models of teacher professionalism, there appears to be little or no specific consideration of the impact of ITE on recently qualified teachers. I considered that this group
of teachers may be in a position to tell us what they continue to value from their ITE. Their perceptions might then be able to add to the understanding of all parties engaged in ITE of what it is that those applying their learning to their practice consider to be beneficial beyond the first years of teaching.

While this study is concerned with long term impact, and an aspiration of ITE providers might reasonably be to provide a foundation for a long rather than short career, it does not specifically consider the current concerns and debates about teacher retention in any depth, neither does it examine theories of motivation. Its focus is on what sort of knowledge the participating teachers identify as valuable to them and how that illuminates our understanding of teacher professionalism.

Professional context


I learnt unexpected lessons from my own ITE which was a PGCE in Secondary History. I started out imagining that I would learn what the school History curriculum consisted of and some techniques about how to make information interesting and lessons enjoyable. In the event I was stunned by the depth of thinking that was required of me, especially about the nature of History. I drew on that foundation for as long as I taught History, I found it motivational, it helped me define what I wanted pupils to learn, and most of all, it enthused me.

As a senior leader in school I had responsibility for ITE and continuing professional development (CPD). I thought I detected, in all phases of teacher development, the impact of reflective practice learnt during initial teacher education. Those who were interested in analysing their practice and how it enabled pupils to learn seemed to me to be more likely to engage in their continuing development, they seemed to continue to be interested in what they did and in doing it well. This observation encouraged me to take the opportunity to move into HE teacher education, I felt that establishing such an attitude in
teaching was powerful; that I could have a significant impact on teachers and therefore on pupils’ experience in school.

One of my observations as a leader of a secondary PGCE course was that many teachers embark on their ITE, as I had done, with a thirst for practical knowledge about teaching. They wanted to get into school quickly, to get on with teaching, to demonstrate their expertise. Those candidates were, understandably, sometimes resistant to the more theoretical elements of the course. I became interested in what struck me as an apparent division, even opposition, between two broad types of knowledge which traditionally contribute to ITE, practical knowledge learnt mainly in schools, and theoretical knowledge learnt mainly in universities. While some student teachers saw a connection between theory and practice from the beginning, and some developed their understanding during the year, others seemed to leave the course without making the connection, concentrating more on achieving Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) than demonstrating their understanding of teaching in an academic framework. Looking back from there to my role in school, I began to think that the reflective practice I had noticed in established teachers as motivating and sustaining had been developed through using academic, theoretical knowledge to make sense of practice. I sensed that perhaps, for some teachers, the value of the connection might be missed during ITE but might become apparent once they were immersed in teaching.

A former student teacher illustrates that hunch in a blog post, expressing as a ‘lightbulb moment’, her understanding of the value of the theoretical, academic elements of her ITE four years after completing her training (Daniels, 2018). She explains that her revelation was ‘connecting education theory with practical classroom pedagogy’ (ibid., p2). She says that during her ITE she concentrated on ‘planning lesson activities’, aware that there was ‘a deeper understanding to be had’ but that during her ITE school experience, she became ‘immersed in the fast-paced, task-driven culture of the schools, and never discussed the ideas that were presented in the university sessions with my school mentors… (who sadly often seem to have some cynical views of university programmes’ (ibid., p3-4). The idea that theory and practice are regarded as oppositional areas of knowledge is clear in Daniels’ experience. However, after a few years’ experience, she has changed her view, now ‘getting it’ (ibid., p2), ‘it’ being the connection between the two. Now she
considers the division between theory and practice to be a ‘false dichotomy’ (Furlong, 2014, p5), suggesting that she uses one to understand the other. If ITE is to equip new teachers well for a sustained career, the perspective of those in a similar position to Daniels, those able to look back on their ITE in the light of their subsequent teaching, would provide valuable new insights.

The purpose and mode of ITE has been the focus of my EdD studies so far, as discussed in my reflective statement. The main findings from my IFS suggested that participants (school-based ITE managers) considered that the type of knowledge underpinning ITE might have an impact on the type of teacher that emerged. All participants referred to the importance of theoretical underpinning of practice. One suggested that a sort of two-tier system was emerging, with practice-based ITE generating ‘super-coaches’, as opposed to university-led PGCE courses generating ‘thinking teachers’. She perceived the ‘super-coach’ as proficient in a classroom, able to implement school policy, and deliver a curriculum. Her preference though was for ‘thinking teachers’ because she perceived those as able to contribute to the intellectual debate about education and understand their school’s particular context within that debate (IFS). Another participant identified theoretical understanding as having a long-term impact. She suggested that it is theoretical underpinning of practice that enables teachers to understand why they do what they do. Without that, she suggested, teachers are not able to cope with change (of context or curriculum) and that is why they are ‘leaving in droves’ (IFS). The connection between the type of ITE, concept of teaching, and elements of course content which might be able to sustain a teacher in her career seemed to me to be worthy of further investigation.

Looking at Sachs’s (2016) model of teacher professionalism (to be discussed in chapter two) and my IFS findings, there seems to be some alignment between the ‘super-coach’ and Sachs’s controlled professional, and between the ‘thinking teacher’ and Sachs’s activist professional. That is not to say that the terms are synonymous, just that the shorthand designation of ‘super-coach’ implies that functional, school-based development may limit potential and autonomy. A ‘super-coach’ may exhibit a number of characteristics of functional development; it is not a specific, academically defined term, more a generic indication of a preference for learning ‘what works’. The term ‘thinking teacher’ is used by Lawes (2010, p156) to describe the purpose of developing
reflective practice in student teachers. I think its use by my IFS participant is more general, in that it is used to suggest both critical reflection and participation in the broad social endeavour of teaching. It may therefore indicate a range of ways in which new teachers use academic dispositions to develop as professionals.

The structure of ITE

The way ITE is structured changed considerably during my time as a PGCE course leader, and has changed the way in which ITE is viewed. When I started in HE, teacher education was funded by the state, and schools were organised in local education authorities. There was a Training and Development Agency (TDA) for teachers responsible for writing and upholding a set of ‘Standards’ for teachers, thus the state had a high degree of control over how ITE was organised. Over the course of my career the structure has changed. The provision of ITE has been moved to the marketplace, a range of routes competing with each other to recruit from a limited pool. Fee income has replaced central funding so that providers need to run financially viable cohorts and, although in some subjects students receive generous bursaries, many students finance their own ITE. In a real sense they have become customers and may reasonably expect to get what they consider to be value for money. It may be that they can only begin to assess that value once they have worked as teachers for a few years. For those embarking on ITE, it might be helpful to have some insight into the value of different elements of ITE perceived by those recently qualified.

Although student teachers have become ‘customers’, the state can be seen to be another ‘customer’. Teacher supply remains the responsibility of the DfE and concern about shortages is reflected, for example, in bursary payments to boost recruitment to some subjects and in the Teacher recruitment and retention strategy (DfE, 2019a). The National Audit Office (NAO) reported in 2016 that the cost to central government of ITE was around £700 million each year and at the same time it understood that of those qualified during the previous 10 years, approximately 12% left state-funded schools within a year of qualifying, and 28% had left within five years (NAO, 2016). The trend has continued, with an estimated reduction of 1.9% in the number of full time secondary teachers during 2017 at a time of rising pupil numbers (DfE, 2018b).
One interpretation of this data seems to me to be that ITE may not be effective in preparing teachers for the long term in teaching. It may be that teaching is increasingly unrewarding and that teachers will continue to leave ‘in their droves’ (IFS), but it may be that there are some features of ITE which sustain newly qualified teachers more effectively than others. The findings in this study might shed some light on what those features might be, so contributing to the debate about what may constitute effective ITE.

**The influence of ITE policy development 2007-2010**

Once I moved into HE, I quickly became aware of the impact of changes in ITE policy. By 2010 it was apparent to me that fundamentally different views about what teaching is have influenced ITE policy. I could also see that changes in ITE policy reflect different underlying assumptions about the professional status of teaching, about whether teachers should be ‘super-coaches’ or ‘thinking teachers’. Those assumptions seemed to me to be rooted in the relationship, or a perceived conflict, between academic, theoretical knowledge and practical, skills-based knowledge.

When I left my job as assistant head, with responsibility for initial and continuing teacher training in a secondary school, for my post in HE in 2005, the PGCE qualification was moving towards the definition in the Bologna Agreement that all courses described as ‘postgraduate’ should be at master’s level. HE providers re-validated their PGCE courses at master’s level; in my institution ready for the academic year 2007-2008. The requirement for a recognised academic grounding for ITE was generally welcomed across the sector, it was seen as enhancing the status of teaching as a profession, as confirming that teaching requires a high level of critical thinking. The New Labour government declared its intention of making teaching an all master’s profession and supported that with the introduction of the master’s in Teaching and Learning in *The Children’s Plan* (Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), 2007). The masters in Teaching and Learning was problematic for me, and many in the HE sector, because it was skills-based, it reflected a utilitarian view of teaching and the micromanagement characteristic of neoliberalism (Brookes, 2015). It required schools to become involved in the ‘delivery’ of courses, sought to assess practice as the knowledge base of an academic award, and allocated funding to schools rather than universities. However,
there was an optimism in the HE sector that there was at least an aspiration to make teaching a master’s profession and the participating teachers saw the award as raising their professional status (Brookes, 2015).

The intention of elevating the professional status of teaching by linking QTS to a high level of academic attainment was reinforced in the recommendation, in January 2010, of the Report of the Select Committee, Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Training of Teachers. The recommendation was that a school must demonstrate involvement with HE teacher education in order to be graded ‘outstanding’ in an inspection. Given the funding and marketing advantages attached to inspection grades, an incentive was thus provided for schools to see ITE as one of their core purposes and to develop genuinely collaborative partnerships with HE. An academic foundation therefore appeared to be seen to be a significant component of teaching and to raise its status to that of other traditional professions. A range of literature supports the value of the academic elements of ITE in developing teachers’ understanding of what they do (see chapter 2).

The influence of ITE policy since 2010

Following the general election of May 2010, a Coalition government was formed which, very quickly, indicated a quite different view of teaching, of teachers as technicians or ‘super-coaches’. A succession of directives about how teachers were to be trained emerged, the focus of which shifted ITE from an academically valid, vocational education to a more technical, skills-based model to be ‘delivered’ by schools. The White Paper, The Importance of Teaching (DfE, 2010) signalled a change from predominantly university-led teacher education to predominantly schools-led teacher training in newly accredited Teaching Schools. An independent review was set up to revise the minimum requirement for teaching resulting in the revised Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011a) which came into force in September 2012.

There followed the consultation document, Training our Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers (DfE, 2011b), followed by the report of the Education Select Committee of the House of Commons, Great Teachers: Attracting, Training and Retaining the Best (DfE, 2012) and the government response to this report in July 2012, all of which reinforced the underlying assumption that
teaching is a craft, best learnt on-the-job from good teachers. Not only that, the language promoted a sense of division between practical knowledge (useful and learnt in school) and academic knowledge (not useful, and learnt in universities). Michael Gove, the then Secretary of State for Education declared:

In the past, the education debate has been dominated by education academics – which is why so much of the research and evidence on how children actually learn has been so poor. Now, thankfully, teachers are taking control of their profession’s intellectual life, taking the lead in pioneering educational research and creating a living evidence base… (Gove, 2013.)

To support the conviction, The Carter Review of initial teacher training (ITT) (DfE, 2015) was commissioned in May 2014, and published in January 2015, with the remit of examining the quality and effectiveness of ITE courses. From this point, there emerged a concept of quality being linked to content, a sort of curriculum for ITE which could ensure that all entrants were prepared by acquiring essential knowledge for teaching across all routes into teaching:

we have identified what appear to be potentially significant gaps in a range of courses in areas such as subject knowledge development, subject-specific pedagogy, behaviour management, assessment and special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). We believe there may be a case for a better shared understanding of what the essential elements of good ITT content look like. (DfE, 2015, para X)

The ‘essential elements of good ITT’ were identified largely as topics to be covered. Although there was reference to the importance of ‘effective delivery and careful structuring’ (DfE, 2015, 2.4.1) and high quality mentoring by ‘experienced and accomplished teachers who provide effective mentoring and structured learning experiences’ (DfE, 2015, 2.4.2), the main emphasis was on practical strategies that new teachers could deploy for, for example, managing behaviour (DfE, 2015, 2.3.47). The conviction that academic knowledge is not an essential part of ITE was reinforced in the statement that the ‘value of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) only programmes should not be underestimated… when QTS qualifies a teacher’ (DfE, 2015, para XXXVIII), although it acknowledged that trainees perceive a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) as providing ‘status’. The preference of school over university, and reinforcement of a divide between the two, as the most effective site of learning was reiterated in the suggestion that:
theoretical content, core knowledge and technical skill can be provided usefully by the universities. It is also important for this content to be delivered in the context of schools and classrooms to ensure that trainees understand its relevance (DfE, 2015, 2.3.36)

Perhaps influenced by arguments put forward by the HE sector (see chapter 2), references to developing research in schools began to appear in DfE documentation. The White Paper Educational Excellence Everywhere (DfE, 2016a) referred to the planned ‘curriculum’ for ITE and, once again, emphasised practical skills as the basis of ITE, but it also included ‘a greater understanding of the most up-to-date research on how pupils learn’ (DfE, 2016a, 1.36). I wondered how that understanding would be fostered, as did the school-based trainers who were interviewed as part of my IFS (see reflective statement), shortly after publication of the White Paper. In those interviews, participants expressed the view that they did not have the capacity to build their knowledge of educational research at the same time as carrying out their primary role of teaching pupils. They associated carrying out educational research with the master’s-level approach of the PGCE courses they worked with which they regarded as fostering the enquiry into and analysis of practice that they considered to be fundamental to developing ‘thinking teachers’. It therefore appeared to my participants that, by transferring the prime site of educational research from HE to schools, the Coalition Government was subordinating an academic framework to school-based training. They did not welcome the divide, they valued the contact they have with HE and the context-free academic approach maintained through that contact. Antipathy between the two sites of learning was not therefore coming from either schools or universities but from policy.

Not only was the value of educational research being subordinated to practical knowledge, the concept of educational research was being re-formed, moving towards a different, utilitarian, concept. An indication of that shift can be detected in a change that was made to the wording of the Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) survey at this time. In 2015 NQTS were asked three questions about educational research. How good was your training in preparing you to: (i) access educational research in your teaching? (ii) assess the robustness of educational research? and (iii) understand and apply the findings from educational research? (National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL),
In 2016, they were asked one question, how well their training prepared them to stay up-to-date with educational research (NCTL, 2016). There is a significant difference between taking responsibility for ‘accessing’, ‘assessing’, ‘understanding and applying’ research, which implies the exercise of individual professional judgement in selection and evaluation of research, and ‘stay up-to-date’ which implies knowing about the findings of new research which will then be put into practice. The change indicates the emergence of a concept of research as a source of how to do teaching, rather than how to understand teaching.

More control from the centre became apparent as the DfE began to define the content of ITE. In July 2016 A Framework of Core Content for Initial Teacher Training (ITT) was published (DfE, 2016b) setting out the ‘basic requirements’ (DfE, 2016, 1.1) for all ITE courses. The ‘content’ consisted largely of a reiteration of the Standards which were seen as setting out the ‘key knowledge, practice and behaviour that providers must ensure trainees are demonstrating in order to satisfy themselves that the Standards are being met’ (DfE, 2016b, 1.3). It sought more to clarify the level at which the Standards should reasonably be met in terms of what a trainee should ‘be able to do’, or ‘should know about’ each Standard. It acknowledged that:

it would be unhelpful to develop an exhaustive list of content that gives little scope for ITT providers to develop their own programme and it simply becomes a mechanical tick list for providers to demonstrate compliance (DfE, 2016b, 2.iii).

Although the framework acknowledged that the ‘moral purpose’ of education should be emphasised in high quality ITE, this was related to providing evidence for achieving Part 2 of the Standards rather than to questioning what that ‘moral purpose’ might be. In other words, Part 2 of the Standards, dealing with personal and professional conduct, was seen to be unproblematic, as providing a list of ‘content’ against which Ofsted would make judgements. Content was thus attached to quality assurance, in turn informing the allocation of ITE places (and thereby funding). It fostered uncritical acceptance of the Standards as content to be checked as delivered, rather than professional interrogation of education and teaching.
The supplementary document Developing Behaviour Management Content for Initial Teacher Training (ITT) (DfE, 2016c) provided further evidence that ITE content could be prescribed. For example, not only is behaviour management accepted as core content to be delivered, but the DfE provides a very clear structure for how behaviour management training could be provided, to the extent of including identification of stages of training and the provision of training activities for ITE providers to use. Such a prescriptive document promotes a utilitarian approach to teaching, and may have been designed to support school-based trainers whose main role is teaching pupils. It does not encourage an attitude of enquiry or structured reflection characteristic of an academic approach.

A utilitarian approach to ITE content had also been exemplified in the Training and Assessment Toolkit: A guide to accuracy in the assessment of trainees published by the National Association of School Based Teacher Trainers (NASBTT, 2015) in July, 2015. Here, not only is each bullet point of each of the Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011a) defined in terms of what a trainee should be able to do or demonstrate, but a structure for ITE is also provided, with details of assessment points; when they should take place and what a trainee might be expected to be able to do at that point. The toolkit includes guidance for mentors, a process for supporting those trainees who are not achieving expectations and so on. Not only does this appear to be a real attempt to establish a common curriculum, it also suggests a common course structure across school-based ITE provision. It might even be seen as an attempt to achieve ‘objectivity’ in assessing trainees. The toolkit is closely framed to align with the 2015 framework for inspection of ITT (now incorporated into the Inspection of Initial Teacher Education Handbook (Ofsted, 2019)). Its aim appears therefore to be to enable ITE providers to demonstrate that they are meeting the criteria for successful inspection outcomes; an approach symptomatic of managerialism and market competition where the pressures from accountability define a good teacher (Ball, 2008). I felt that a checklist approach to ITE content diminished the professionalism of my role. I would no longer be required to make autonomous decisions about the course I led, rather to follow a dictated set of content. In the inspection process my role would be to provide evidence of compliance rather than to enter into discussion about value or purpose. I was perhaps being required to train ‘super-coaches’
controlled by quality assurance outcomes, rather than educate ‘thinking teachers’ active in determining their own professional practice.

While the *Framework of Core Content for ITT* (DfE, 2016b) concentrated on training course content, it recommended that the initial nature of ITE should be acknowledged; that more direction was needed to clarify ‘expectations and entitlement’ to effective CPD in the early years of a teacher’s career (DfE, 2016b, 3) and this was clarified in the *Early Career Framework (ECF)* (DfE, 2019b). There has long been a distinction between initial and continuing teacher development, and the concept of ITE as finite may be a reason that research has not focused specifically on the views of established teachers about their ITE. There may be a view that the influence of CPD rapidly overrides the influence of ITE, and I needed to be open to the possibility that participants in this research would indicate that that was the case for them; that they might consider their ITE to be definitely in the past and no longer relevant.

The ECF does provide further insight into what the DfE understands to be required by teachers for their development, and therefore its underlying notion of teaching as a profession. It suggests that teachers should be entitled to continuing structured support in line with other professions, and once again frames new teachers’ CPD as largely technical, as needing ‘to learn about and learn how to do’ and it states that areas covered in ITE will be covered in greater depth as part of induction (DfE, 2019b, p5). The authors of the framework accept a premise that there is a body of knowledge that teachers will have acquired by the end of their ITE, and that more of the same knowledge can be added later. Five core areas, cross-referenced to the Standards are identified: behaviour management, pedagogy, curriculum, assessment and professional behaviours. There is a commitment to funding time for new teachers to pursue CPD, funding the creation of training materials and establishing training programmes as well as funding for mentor training. Underlying this suggestion is a belief that it is possible and desirable to construct common training programmes from ITE to leadership. A new *framework for core content in ITT*, aligned to the ECF, is due to be published in Spring 2020, for implementation from September 2020.

The rapid succession of policies considered here promotes the view that teaching can best be learnt from observing the practice of established teachers,
and that an off-the-peg, national training programme based on research about ‘what works’ can be ‘delivered’ to teachers; reflecting a view of teaching as a set of skills, and reducing ITE, as well as teaching itself, to a performative, functional task. Rather than conceptualising teaching as a profession in which teachers are required to exercise ‘discretionary judgement’ (Friedson, 2001, p35) fostered by engagement in critical examination of the complex interrelationship between practice and theory, teaching is presented as simplistic, straightforward, and, above all measurable. In this scenario teachers are judged by the outcomes of their pupils and, if teachers are not judged to be ‘good’, then ITE must be at fault, its content flawed (Mayer et al, 2017).

I sensed that the re-framed concept of ITE might require training courses to deliver a set of topic content from which teachers could only learn what to do, not to think about why. I considered that, as Ball (2003) suggests, teaching as mastery of a set of skills may be less rewarding to new teachers than a sense of belonging to a values-driven profession. The ‘thinking teacher’, or activist professional, might be better equipped to sustain their commitment to those values, while the ‘super-coach’, or controlled professional, might find it difficult to make sense of change or to remain motivated by meeting targets. I felt that the literature supporting that view (to be discussed in chapter 2) could usefully be supported by evidence from relatively recently qualified teachers about what they identify, in the light of their teaching experience (the application of that training), as continuing to support them as teachers.

The research

My aim was to gather in-depth, perceptual data from a small number of relatively newly qualified teachers to explore where lasting impact has been experienced in practice. Teachers with 3–6 years’ teaching experience do not form an identifiable group and are therefore not specifically represented in, for example, the broad evidence base of The Carter Review (DfE, 2015), the Framework for Core Content of ITT (DfE, 2016b) or the ECF (DfE, 2019b). It is difficult to identify relatively recently qualified teachers nationally, and it would be difficult to survey their opinions in any meaningful way given the influence of post training CPD and the possible variety of experiences since qualifying. However, it is a group which might be in a position to offer meaningful insights
into what, in their ITE, was, or was not, useful or significant to them in helping them to survive and flourish in their first years in teaching.

I did not seek to impose constraints, to ‘prove’ the value of one source of knowledge over another. I intended, rather, to leave my participants free to identify whatever they perceived to have been significant without imposing any constraints such as might be inherent in a tightly structured interview schedule. To that end, I conducted an Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) study which allowed participants to reflect freely on their lived experience. The data was then used to explore concepts of the knowledge base of ITE, and concepts of teacher professionalism. I considered that the perceptions of teachers still close to their ITE but with sufficient teaching experience to draw on to evaluate their experience would add to our understanding of what makes ITE effective.

To address the gap in knowledge I have identified, my research questions are:

- What perspectives do teachers, in retrospect, present of their initial teacher education (ITE)?
- To what extent does what they say illuminate the way in which knowledge traditions and concepts of teacher professionalism might usefully inform ITE?
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Questions about what student teachers need to learn are not new. There is a long-standing, international, debate about the nature of preparation for teaching. What sort of knowledge and skills new teachers need to have is closely linked with where that knowledge can best be learnt, and the concept of teacher professionalism for which new teachers are being prepared.

From the time that education was first taught as an academic subject in universities in the late nineteenth century, a division between two broad types of knowledge belonging to two sites of learning has characterised the debate (Furlong and Whitty, 2017, Murray, 2013). These have often been described, simply, as theory (mainly learnt in university) and practice (mainly learnt in schools), as conflicting rather than complementary, being associated with different values and aims for education, and as a set of binaries between ‘school and academy, theory and practice, teaching and research, the real world and the ivory tower’ (Davey, 2013, p2). Furlong and Whitty (2017) suggest that the division stems from the low status accorded to education as an academic discipline, that knowledge of education is therefore regarded as having little or no value. Such a division promotes a view, broadly corresponding with the notion of teacher as ‘super-coach’, that it is possible to ‘do’ teaching without any theoretical, academic element; that teaching is relatively easy to do if you have acquired the skills, like managing behaviour, to enable you to disseminate the academic knowledge of your subject (Labaree cited by Davey, 2013, p23). Furlong has argued that this dichotomy is false, that the knowledge acquired from an academic approach is required to understand the knowledge acquired from practice (Furlong, 2014, p5), and the students and school-based trainers I have interviewed so far in my EdD studies have broadly agreed (see reflective statement). I found that student teachers at the end of their PGCE (MOE 2) and school-based trainers (IFS) perceived there to be, in broad terms, an inter-relationship between the two (theory and practice), supporting Shulman’s view that ‘the teacher need not only understand that something is so; the teacher must further understand why it is so’ (Shulman, 1986, p9).
Consideration of teaching as a profession is closely linked with the knowledge required to join that profession. From the extensive literature exploring teacher professionalism, Sachs (2016) presents a model which I use in this study to explore how different knowledge bases may be associated with different models of teacher professionalism. She presents comparative views; of teaching as a craft learnt through apprenticeship which emerges from functional development and trains a competent workforce, characterised as controlled or compliant professionals, as opposed to teaching as a more traditional profession, in which collaborative or activist professionals emerge from attitudinal development. At the same time, she associates controlled and collaborative professionalism with managerialism, and contrasts these with compliant and activist professionalism, associated with occupational or democratic professionalism (figure 1 below). The discussion of literature will explore these concepts with a focus on their underlying knowledge traditions. My research will then explore the relationship between knowledge traditions and these models of professionalism.

**Figure 1: Types of CPD and Teacher Professionalism (Sachs, 2016, p421)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Development</th>
<th>Compliance with Government change agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and control by Government</td>
<td>Modify existing practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of skills</td>
<td>Transmission of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive recipient of knowledge</td>
<td>Teacher as craft worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTROLLED PROFESSIONALISM**

- Organisational or Managerial Professionalism
  - Procedurally driven professional renewal
  - Rethink and renew practices
  - Proscribed collaborative learning networks
  - Teacher as reflective learner
  - Teacher working individually towards their own improvement

**COMPLIANT PROFESSIONALISM**

- Occupational or Democratic Professionalism
  - Transformative practices
  - Production of new knowledge
  - Practitioner enquiry – teacher as researcher
  - Teachers working collectively towards ongoing improvement

**COLLABORATIVE PROFESSIONALISM**

**ACTIVIST PROFESSIONALISM**

**Attitudinal Development**
Furlong and Whitty discuss the knowledge underpinning teaching, and therefore learning to teach, as three ‘knowledge traditions’, academic, practical and integrated (Furlong and Whitty, 2017). I will use their divisions as a framework for my discussion. I consider how (i) the academic knowledge traditions might have the potential to support the development of teachers as recognisably professional in the face of the continuing policy drive towards a skills-based workforce; (ii) the practical knowledge traditions might be associated with training for competence and (iii) the integrated knowledge traditions might be able to prepare teachers to become ‘thinking’ teachers, or extended, autonomous, activist professionals.

i) The academic knowledge tradition and professionalism

Since the early days of teacher training in the late nineteenth century, academic, theoretical knowledge has been contrasted with practical, craft knowledge. The divide has been reinforced by where, how and by whom teacher education has been carried out. First came the pupil apprentice model of training, clearly based on the idea that teaching can be learnt by working with an established teacher, picking up practical techniques for transferring knowledge from the teacher to the pupil. Then came an era (until 1992) in which university PGCE provision co-existed with separate HE provision in teacher training colleges. In the training colleges, school teachers were employed rather than academics, and entry requirements were lower. Thereafter all teacher education took place in university education departments as the HE sector was reformed (Murray, 2013, Furlong & Whitty, 2017). Hence a public perception was fed that teaching is not founded in academic rigour so much as in practice, teaching is seen as technically simple, relying on the teacher’s common sense and her academic knowledge of her subject (Hargreaves, 2000). The return to promoting school-led training over university teacher education evident in policy from 2010 (and discussed in chapter 1) appears to be firmly situated in that view; as a return to a mode of practical training that ‘de-professionalises the knowledge-base of teaching and dulls the profession’s critical edge’ (Hargreaves, 2000, p166).

The academic knowledge tradition is significant in ITE if teaching is to be regarded as a profession at all. According to Freidson (2001), professions are
characterised by academic validity. The academic field of Education, however, is fragile, often regarded as ‘on the margins of academic life’ (Davey, 2013, p1). It has been suggested that it is ‘epistemologically weak’, (Furlong, 2013, p13) and therefore has low academic status (Murray, 2013) because the discipline of education has never been well established. Furlong and Whitty argue that the ‘academic tradition’ must be systematic, principled, and have established ways of working so that the academic community is able to validate the knowledge it produces (Furlong and Whitty 2017). They suggest that Education has borrowed from other academic disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, sociology and history rather than developed its own rigorous and agreed academic identity. The current preference for scientific research methods is, they say, evidence of the continuing search for acceptance of educational research as sufficiently rigorous to give Education an academic status.

A rigorous academic tradition is a key feature of a profession; it is from its own identifiable academic knowledge that a profession derives its status, its recognition, its value (Freidson, 2001). The ‘discretionary judgement’ (Freidson, 2001, p35) and moral value (Furlong and Whitty, 2017) characteristic of professionalism is established through its academic tradition and the place of that knowledge in a hierarchy. If knowledge is non-specialised, it is seen as of lower worth than specialised or ‘powerful’ knowledge (Young and Muller, 2013 p231). Winch adds that it is through the theoretical knowledge associated with the academic tradition that an individual can develop higher levels of expertise because this is ‘a culturally and politically valued body of knowledge and not just a body of knowledge with instrumental value’ (Winch, 2010 p114). By its nature, academic knowledge provides a structured, developmental framework of award and recognition. Rather than standing still, repeating technical skills, there is scope for development (Winch, 2010). This may provide a significant support for teachers in their career, a sense of moving forward, not standing still, and of external recognition of their work and its value. The low regard for, or even dismissal of, the academic or theoretical aspects of knowledge of Education for teaching evident in the ITE policy of the 2010 Coalition Government could be seen as a reflection of those policy makers’ view that Education lacks its own rigorous academic tradition, that teaching is not therefore a traditional profession, or perhaps that academic knowledge no
longer forms the basis of a new ‘regulated’ professionalism (Barnett, 2010, p192).

Without an academic tradition, technique, craft, or skills remain. Bernstein explains the relationship between the two as vertical and horizontal knowledge and this helps to demonstrate the difficult relationship between practice and theory in ITE. If vertical knowledge is specialised and academic, horizontal knowledge is rooted in experience (Hordern, 2015, Young and Muller, 2013). ‘It is the vertical disciplines that provide the ‘rules’ that guide how disciplinary concepts can be combined with and relate to other disciplinary concepts’ (Hordern, 2015 p193). This concept can be used to explain the links that ITE should make between theory and practice. Vertical knowledge on its own is not able to tell a new teacher what to do in their classrooms but it provides the means by which to analyse their practice. For example, without the vertical, academic knowledge, reflective practice (Schon, 1983) may be reduced to consideration of practical issues of classroom management rather than using a meaningful frame of reference to investigate practice.

Discussion of the importance of the academic knowledge tradition is perhaps most evident in the literature that emerged in the wake of The Importance of Teaching (DfE, 2010). The White Paper’s clear message about a model of training in which teachers learn best on-the-job, by practising teaching in schools, threatened the HE sector and the value it attaches to academic knowledge in teaching. Arguments supporting teaching as a profession rather than a craft, as therefore requiring a recognised academic underpinning, were put forward by the sector in its defence; the academic knowledge tradition was seen to be evident as master’s-level, research-based study, linked overtly to teaching as a profession:

The arguments in favour of teaching as an all-masters profession were linked to the following issues: to raise professional esteem; to raise and improve the quality of teaching and pupil outcomes; to reinforce teaching as a research-based profession; to increase skilled performance from teachers; and to improve teacher education. (Jackson and Eady, 2011, p151)

The Universities Council for the Education of teachers (UCET) unsurprisingly voiced its defence of the importance of academic knowledge, notably in its position paper explaining its belief in the importance of universities in teacher
education (Kirk, 2013) and, more recently, for master’s level preparation for teaching (Nunn, 2016). The British Educational Research Association (BERA) produced a wide-ranging review of the value of academic educational research in the education of teachers, publishing its reports (interim and final) in 2014. The final report concluded that the evidence in their review was clear ‘about the positive impact that a research literate and research engaged profession is likely to have on learner outcomes’ (BERA-RSA, 2014b p6). Links were made between professionalism and a solid academic knowledge base evident in its own research culture, echoing Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) characterisation of the academic knowledge tradition. The report talked of engagement with research ‘empowering teachers’ by ‘developing the capacity of teachers, schools and colleges, and education systems as a whole to self-evaluate and self-improve, through an ongoing process of professional reflection and enquiry’ (BERA-RSA, 2014b, p6). It noted the importance of maintaining the academic quality of educational research, warning of confusing ‘evidence-based’ teaching and promoting ‘what works’ (Whiting et al., 2016) with enabling teachers to engage in and with research. Evidence from Winch et al. emphasised the difference between spotting strategies which are then adopted uncritically by schools, and using research to analyse and understand practice (Winch et al., 2014), the former using research as a source of technical knowledge, but the latter characteristic of a professional approach, of understanding the complexities of teaching.

The report also drew on examples from across the United Kingdom of different levels of importance attached to research in ITE, suggesting that the policy turn in England demonstrates a lower regard for teaching as a profession than, in particular, Scotland and Northern Ireland (Beauchamp et al, 2014). They suggest that in Scotland and Northern Ireland there is ‘a strong emphasis on critical reflection and active engagement in research’ (ibid., p14) while the position and value of research in initial teacher education in England is ‘contested and has arguably diminished over time’ (ibid., p15), thus illustrating the link between policymakers’ concepts of teaching and its professional status. Indeed, Tatto’s (2014) evidence expands the perspective to consider the status of teaching beyond the United Kingdom. She notes that those countries, where according to international measures such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) outcomes for pupils is highest (Finland and Singapore),
develop capacity from the bottom up, and rely heavily on methodologically rigorous research-based knowledge to inform their practice. What is striking about provision in both Finland and Singapore, as compared to the more diverse and fragmented provision in the USA and Chile, is the extent to which teachers’ engagement in and with research and enquiry-oriented practice is embedded throughout the education system (Tatto, 2014, p19).

Moves to change the focus of educational research from systematically questioning assumptions and trying to ‘engage in ongoing conversations about what is valuable and worthwhile in education and society more generally’ to research with ‘a purely functional definition’ (Biesta et al, 2019, p3) threatens the position of research as based on and contributing to academic knowledge. Research which seeks to answer rather than ask questions being useful perhaps for meeting performance targets, such as PISA rankings, rather than for developing new knowledge and understanding. It is a contrast to the aims of BERA to promote educational research that is systematic, logical, authoritative, empirically strong, ‘critical but with scholarly detachment’ (McCulloch, 2018, p187). It supports controlled professionalism, where teachers become passive recipients of knowledge rather than activist professionalism (Sachs, 2016, p421), in which teachers draw on ‘scholarly principles of reflection, detachment’ (Hoyle & John, 1998, p81) to interrogate practice.

The academic knowledge tradition is a foundation of teaching as a profession because, say Orchard and Winch (2015, p9), professionals need to exercise ‘good sense’ and ethical principles to inform their professional judgement. In this view, teaching is not ‘a protocol-driven technique’ (ibid.) in which information is ‘delivered’ but a profession in which decisions are constantly required. It is those professional decisions which reveal the values and ethical codes underpinning practice, and which are made from the foundation of ‘traditional academic capabilities’ (Brown et al., 2015 p7). Similar points are made by Grace (2014) and Campbell (2008). Grace (2014, p50) considers a moral foundation to be a requirement of traditional professionalism, ‘historically, professionalism involved the demonstration of esoteric knowledge and expertise but it also involved commitment to codes of moral, ethical and social conduct’. Campbell (2008) suggests that a commitment to collective and individual ethical responsibility defines teacher professionalism. Referring to
Fenstermacher’s manner of teaching, she stresses the extent to which teaching relies on the quality of interaction with pupils and yet how often the ethical professional practice of teachers remains implicit, rather than becoming the focus of theoretical or empirical inquiry.

A grounding in academic knowledge provides the means by which teachers are able to accommodate inevitable changes, for example in curriculum and policy, because they learn, through the academic process, to engage critically with what it means to be a teacher. They acquire the mental internalisation process by which to make sense of or change their understanding of previously held knowledge or understanding (Evans, 2014). Without a ‘thinking’ foundation and sense of the moral value of what she does, a teacher is likely either to be confused by change, perhaps to the extent of feeling unable to continue to teach, or unable to question change, therefore only able to comply. If teaching is regarded as a profession it needs ‘to represent itself to others in ways that are trusted, valued and respected. Its members have a common set of values, are guided by ethical practice and have a knowledge base that is robust and can be defended’ (Sachs, 2016, p422).

This study explores the extent to which teachers value academic knowledge as a significant part of their ITE, one with the residual impact of sustaining them in their career. It considers ways in which they identify academic knowledge, whether as fostering a way of thinking about, or reflecting on, or making sense of practice; working at master’s level, or carrying out structured research. At the same time, it seeks to find out whether they identify ways in which academic knowledge is associated by them with professional status, or a sense of professional value.

ii) The practical knowledge tradition and competence

The practical knowledge tradition in ITE has often been seen as more ‘relevant’ than the academic knowledge tradition. In part this view has been reinforced by teacher educators themselves. The teaching colleges, in which much training of teachers took place from the end of the nineteenth century until the absorption of teacher training colleges into the university sector in 1992, emphasised practising the craft of teaching. Courses were taught by practitioners (school teachers) as opposed to researchers in education. Before
1992 the academic tradition of Education belonged in elite universities, not the training colleges, and was not seen to be necessary for all teachers (Furlong, 2013, Murray, 2013, Davey, 2013). Instead, training relied on the vertical knowledge of the teacher’s own subject discipline plus the foundational disciplines as the basis of its academic validity (Furlong & Whitty, 2017, Hordern, 2015). Teaching colleges existed apart from universities and their existence promoted a model of teaching as a craft, thereby contributing to a binary view of theory versus practice. The preference for practical rather than academic preparation for teaching is particularly associated with the New Right, notably, in 1989, the Hillgate Group\(^1\) which asserted that university-based ITE is not necessary and may, indeed, deter able people from becoming teachers. Such people, with good academic knowledge of their subject, being able to learn the skills of teaching from practitioners without the irrelevance of educational theory (Yandell, 2010, Wilkins, 2011). In this view school-based training is placed in opposition to HE teacher education, its echoes clearly evident in DfE policy since 2010.

From 1992 when training colleges became part of the university system the partnership model of ITE was established, which, to some extent bridged the division between theory and practice (Furlong, 2013). This model acknowledged that university and school, theory and practice, should combine to enable student teachers to use one to understand the other. It involved school colleagues in working with HE tutors by contributing to formal elements of ITE programmes and taking an active part in the assessment of student teachers. The value of such a partnership being acknowledged in the aspiration to make, or elevate teaching to, a master’s profession (DCSF, 2007).

The return, in 2010, to the tradition of prioritising practical, skills-based, craft knowledge is characterised by a preference for concentrating on ‘what works’ (Furlong, 2013). A remit for school-led, practice-based research was included in the new Teaching Schools agenda. It promoted a model of professional development through sharing good practice by means of networks, and thus providing evidence of ‘what works’ (Whiting, 2016). The shift in emphasis to the practical knowledge tradition was confirmed through changes to the funding

\(^1\) The right-wing pressure group which produced a series of pamphlets on British education in the late 1980s.
and allocation of training places, giving more control to Teaching Schools which could now assess trainees for their competence against the Standards without HE involvement (Furlong, 2013, Furlong and Whitty 2017, Davey 2013). The type of research carried out by Teaching Schools is, as a result, often directed toward improved outcomes (Brown et al. 2015) rather than on ‘reviewing the nature and effectiveness of practice to increase understanding of the purposes and content of education, individually and collectively’ (Bousted, 2011, p10). The concept underlying this model is functional development, which relies on acquisition of skills, the transfer and passive receipt of accepted knowledge, and thereby compliance and control (Sachs, 2016), likely to generate ‘super-coaches’ rather than ‘thinking teachers’.

Support for a model of school-led ITE is promoted by, for example Deans for Impact, the Core Practice Consortium and Teacher Education by Design (TEDD) in the United States. That is not to say that they promote the value of practice as the source of knowledge about teaching unequivocally, indeed they acknowledge that typical approaches which rely on teachers simply absorbing practical knowledge are flawed. Rather, they offer ways in which the nature of practice can be investigated through adopting principles of deliberate practice (drawn from medical training) (for example, Deans for Impact, 2016). In particular, core practices can be used to help novice teacher educators understand the complexity of the task in which they are embarking (DeMink-Carthew et al., 2017). Whether there is scope to adopt these principles and how far they can be used to support effective mentoring is beyond the scope of this study. The relevance here is that those who argue that practice should be the starting point of learning to teach, such as Darling-Hammond, Grossman, and Ball and Forzani, also argue that practice in itself is not an adequate source of knowledge for professional teaching. For example, Grossman (1990) stresses the need for the theoretical to be linked to practical realities for it to have meaning to a student teacher, but in so-doing she also stresses the importance of the theoretical.

Learning from experience requires that teachers first interpret classroom events... Without frameworks for understanding teaching and learning, how beginning teachers without professional preparation interpret experience may prove problematic’ (Grossman, 1990, p141).
Darling-Hammond (2016, p509) argues that ‘a system that implies that teaching is predominantly improvisational, impossible to specify, and developed idiosyncratically through individual experience is no system at all and not at all professional’. Ball and Forzani (2009, p499) also support that position in their explanation that while professional practice can be just ‘serendipitous learning’ and largely a matter of luck in where and with whom a student teacher works, it can also constitute professional training. A professional training is one that means ‘unpacking and specifying practice in detail and designing professional education that will offer novices multiple opportunities to practice the work and to fine-tune their skills’ (Ball & Forzani, 2009, p498). The assumption that teaching can simply be absorbed may be based on the ‘ubiquity of teaching activity’ (ibid., p498). The ability to provide informal explanation or demonstration, is, they say, often regarded as evidence of teaching which is therefore seen as a natural attribute. Instead it is a more complex process that needs to be ‘based on professionally justified knowledge and on the moral imperatives of the role. Intuition and everyday experience are poor guides for the specialized work and judgement entailed by teaching’ (ibid., p500).

Furlong and Whitty (2017) explain ways in which the practical tradition is limited, being individualistic, and lacking the test of validity or quality of knowledge that comes from the academic tradition. A danger of relying on practical knowledge gained ‘on the job’ is that the horizontal knowledge of practice is context specific, it may not transfer from one context to another, the training depends on what experience that context can provide at the time of training, school-based trainers may have other, pressing demands on their time, and they may be more or less able to support the trainee in their development (Freidson, 2001 p89). Eraut (2004) identifies knowledge gained in the workplace as necessarily cultural knowledge, or context specific, and not necessarily recognised by those immersed in that environment as such. There is a danger then that that can lead to a tendency to accept workplace knowledge as unproblematic (ibid.). Student teachers need to understand that ‘much within school knowledge is situated and idiosyncratic, rather than broadly based, and typically is not deeply informed by a current, broad, and knowledgeably interrogated research base’ (Golding, 2015, p121). The research base can provide a way of contextualising practical knowledge; if it is missing there is a danger that the knowledge gained in one context cannot be
readily understood, or ‘digested’ in or transferred to another context (Heilbronn, 2010b, p35), that the result will be ‘fragile professionals’ who can only operate in the context in which they have learnt (Hobby, 2011, p12). Evans contrasts this type of functional development, based on learning what and how people do teaching, with attitudinal development which she describes as intellectual and motivational (Evans, 2008, p31), implying that attitudinal development may have a more lasting, or sustaining, impact; the ‘thinking teacher’ may be better equipped for the long term than the ‘super-coach’.

In the practical knowledge tradition, contextualising or analysing practice depends in large part on the quality of the school-based mentor who may be very well equipped for the role or, at the other end of the spectrum, may simply have spare time on her timetable (Golding, 2015, p115). The mentor needs to be more than a model of a good teacher, ‘the most outstanding and inspirational expert can support little by way of learning if they don’t understand the process’ (Davies, 2011, p18). The participants in my IFS provided me with examples. While acknowledging the undoubted value of practice, they were forceful in recognising that school colleagues do not, generally, have the time or current academic knowledge to support student teachers in developing their understanding of practice. For example: ‘we can teach you how to teach in the classroom but we haven’t got the ability to do the pedagogical background and the depth of understanding that our young teachers need; we can’t provide that’ (IFS participant, school-based training manager). Their perspective may be indicative of their own concepts of teachers as reflective learners, working either towards their own improvement (as collaborative professionals) or collectively towards ongoing improvement (activist professionals) (Sachs, 2016). However, mentors may themselves work from a ‘post-performative’ perspective (Wilkins, 2011, p405) as experienced, for example, by Daniels (2018) whose mentors, she says, encouraged her to concentrate on planning activities, without meaningful reflection, evident in the ‘fast-paced, task-driven culture’ (Daniels, 2018, p3) of her placement schools; an approach she now perceives to be superficial. Such teachers are inclined to accept the requirements of the performative culture in which their schooling and ITE has taken place, they accept that meeting Standards, presenting themselves as professional by conforming to dress codes, and accepting measurement of their own ‘productivity’ through observation constitutes professionalism in the twenty-first century (Bourke et al, 2015). Curtis et al (2019, p78) suggest that
the difference in supervision by teachers who are themselves reflective practitioners as oppose to those who are ‘technicians’ necessarily affects the potential for learning from practical experience.

Learning from practice is limited more broadly by the dominance of performance cultures, based on accountability measures and enacted through Standards and inspection judgements (Sachs, 2016). This regime sees teaching as a set of skills required to transfer knowledge of a curriculum subject that can be judged by pupils’ performance data. It positions educational practice as something to be ‘defined by quality assurance structures and indicators’ (Brown et al, 2015, p12). The impact of this in schools has been to alter the concept of the profession of teaching from one in which individuals are required to make ‘discretionary judgements’ (Freidson, 2001 p13) which requires a theoretical framework, to one in which ‘deliberation and judgement are no longer of value’ (Ball, 2008 p67). The external and peer observation associated with meeting externally imposed criteria for judgements of quality:

erodes trust and develops risk-averse dispositions towards practice. Systematic external observation thus becomes part of the taken-for-granted aspect of education practice and creates timidity on behalf of teachers who prefer tried and tested practices because they are safe (Sachs, 2016, p416)

Sachs stresses the role that performance culture plays in leading to controlled or compliant professionalism (Sachs, 2016, p423) in which teachers react to government fiat rather than draw on their own analysis of teaching. They work competitively rather than collaboratively because, ‘when teachers fail to meet targets they are perceived as being individually responsible' (Keddie & Mills, 2019, p7). As teachers who have come through their own schooling and ITE in a performative culture enter the profession, there is an increasing likelihood that they will accept rather than question the ‘improvement agenda’ (Wilkens, 2011, p405), further widening the gap between the perceived relevance of academic knowledge to practice. However, it is possible that some may develop into Sachs’s activist professionals who retain values beyond targets and subvert the managerial, organisational agenda (Wilkens, 2011, Moore & Clarke, 2016).
Sachs argues that managerial professionalism leads to a risk-averse environment because its focus is on meeting performance targets in order to improve inspection outcomes. It is therefore unlikely to be conducive to developing critical, reflective practice (Sachs, 2016) because it fosters an individualistic culture focusing on the individual teacher in her classroom rather than encouraging collaboration and collective responsibility, of ‘debate informed by theory research and evidence’ (Sachs, 2000, p80). Its reliance on judgement through observable technical expertise leads to fear of diverging from accepted, safe practice in which controlled professionals concentrate on ‘the simple business’ of managing behaviour and keeping pupils on task (Moore & Clarke, 2016, p674). In such an environment, it is difficult for school-based mentors to provide support for student teachers to develop their ability to analyse and understand their practice. Indeed, for Schön, this is the basis of critical reflection:

Many practitioners, locked into a view of themselves as technical experts, find nothing in the world of practice to occasion reflection. For them, uncertainty is a threat; its admission is a sign of weakness. Others, more inclined toward and adept at reflection-in-action, nevertheless feel profoundly uneasy because they cannot say what they know how to do, cannot justify its quality or rigor (Schön, 1983, p63).

If the practical knowledge tradition dominates ITE, development remains functional. Teachers are restricted to passing on ‘what works’ to student teachers and therefore to repeating existing practice rather than developing practice through identifying problems and seeking improvement to practice through systematic enquiry. The moral and ethical responsibilities of the profession are reduced to demonstrating Part 2 of the Teachers Standards (DfE, 2011a). Like other codes of professional conduct, this focuses on legal and contractual obligations, leaving little room for developing understanding of the complexity and impact of the teacher’s ethical responsibility (Campbell, 2008), for developing ‘thinking teachers’.

The views of participants in this study will be used to consider whether relatively recently qualified teachers perceive themselves to have benefitted from functional rather than attitudinal development; whether they identify practical knowledge as taking priority in their ITE and if so, whether they perceive that to have lasting value.
iii) The integrated knowledge tradition and possible new ways of working

The integrated knowledge tradition is explained by Furlong and Whitty (2017) as a way of drawing on the strengths of both the academic and practical knowledge traditions. Successful partnership between schools and universities (which already exist and may develop in various ways) should enable a process through which the student teacher can draw on practical knowledge (largely in school) and academic knowledge (largely in university) as and when they need to, rather than dividing the types of knowledge into phases of training or sites of learning.

Since the return in 2010 to the dominance of the practical knowledge tradition in DfE policy, arguments have been put forward to explore the inter-relationship rather than the opposition between academic and practical knowledge. For example, Whitty argues for the development of new ways of working between schools and universities (Whitty, 2014); the BERA-RSA report on the role of research in teacher education examines the inter-relationship between academic knowledge and practical knowledge, arguing that neither on its own is able to educate teachers well (BERA-RSA, 2014a, 2014b); and, more recently, Furlong and Whitty (2017) explore what they call the integrated knowledge tradition. In my EdD research so far, the participants, whether student teachers (MOE2) or school-based ITE colleagues (IFS), seemed to suggest that, for them, integrating academic knowledge and practical knowledge was an important part of their ITE. This study aims to find out whether teachers would identify ways in which they learnt to integrate the academic and practical knowledge traditions during their ITE.

It is difficult to develop an integrated approach if the separate disciplinary bases, with different truth claims (Furlong & Whitty, 2017), are seen to be in opposition. To be successful, the approach needs to avoid dominance of one tradition over the other; to work from the top down, with academic knowledge being applied to practice, and from the bottom up with teachers studying their own practice and drawing on academic knowledge as a resource (Furlong & Whitty, 2017, Winch, 2010). The language of policy since 2010, in which school-led training is preferred to HE-led teacher education, threatens the integrated approach by potentially damaging collaborative partnership and is
further threatened by the funding regime that emerges from policy. Schools, operating in a market, become the ‘customer’ in the partnership (Whiting et al., 2015, p28), their needs being to fill vacancies rather than to contribute to a collaborative approach to preparing teachers to become part of a professional body (Yandell, 2010).

The division of knowledge into practice and theory, ‘knowing how’ and ‘knowing that’ (Ryle, cited by Young & Muller, 2014), ‘abstract’ and ‘pure’, or ‘theoretical and applied’ fails to acknowledge a more complicated relationship. It is not always easy to distinguish between the two because knowledge accumulated from experience can form the basis of specialised knowledge. Although Bernstein suggests a binary distinction between horizontal and vertical knowledge, he also develops a model of a three-way distinction which helps to relate types of knowledge to sites of learning. He presents Singulars as knowledge of structures, the rules and methods that characterise a discipline, Regions which combine disciplines (for example in teaching, knowledge of the teacher’s subject and knowledge of Education) and Fields of practice which are ‘specialised practical contexts’ … [schools, in which professionals]… ‘exercise knowledgeable and reasoned judgements as professionals, by drawing on, often tacitly, their acquired stock of specialised professional knowledge’ (Young & Muller, 2014, p44). This assumes the ability of the professional to make sense of their accumulated knowledge, a view of a professional as autonomous rather than a technician simply passing on ‘how we do’ to student teachers. If ‘skill’ and ‘knowledge’ are to be equally valuable in ITE, it requires the ‘ability to use systematic knowledge to inform practical judgement and action’ (Winch, 2014, p113). It is important therefore for ITE to ‘support professional formation rather than immersion in a discipline’ (Guile, 2014, p170) if they are to be able to relate theory to practice rather than to see these as opposing types of knowledge, particularly where one is seen to be ‘better’ than the other. Through HE and schools working collaboratively, it may be possible to make overt the overlapping relationship between the academic and practical knowledge traditions through a continuous use of one to inform the other.

The partnership model of teacher education introduced in 1992 has, where successful, structured courses to integrate student teachers’ learning. They have sought to ‘facilitate and deepen the interplay between the different kinds of knowledge that are generated and validated within the different context of
school and university’ (Burn and Mutton, 2014, p22) through careful consideration of how students might be able to ‘interrogate their own practice in light of evidence from wider research, as well as drawing on new ideas for inspiration and looking to adapt them to their own settings and contexts’ (Winch et al., 2014, p20). The student teacher draws on theoretical principles to make sense of the practice she experiences so that she can move beyond practical reflection on techniques and strategies; a trial and error approach. She can combine different aspects of reflection on her practice. ‘Post-hoc reflection can happen in school, with the affordances of local knowledge, or in HE, where it can be added to that of peers and related to the theoretical evidence base’ (Golding, 2015, p120). Limiting reflection to the context of practice restricts understanding, access to a wider range of contexts via other student teachers in other schools, and taking a view from a wider perspective promotes a broader view of the profession. For this to happen successfully, partnerships need to be genuinely ‘collaborative’, rather than ‘complementary’ (Burn and Mutton, 2014, p22) such as the Oxford internship model, or examples presented from the USA, the Netherlands and Finland (Burn and Mutton, 2014). Positioning universities against schools, as competitors in the ITE ‘market’, is not conducive to developing such collaboration.

Integrating academic knowledge and practical knowledge can be seen as central in developing ‘thinking teachers’ (Lawes, 2010, p156), that is in developing reflective practice rather than ritualistic reflection (Heilbronn, 2010b). While the latter may tick a procedural box, and serve to confirm that accepted procedures or practices are followed, reflective practice, or critical reflection, requires experience to be ‘digested’, and from ‘digested experiences’ a ‘repertoire of actions’ is built (Heilbronn, 2010b, p35). In this model, academic or theoretical knowledge can inform practice but also practical knowledge can trigger development of theoretical knowledge (Furlong and Whitty, 2017).

There can be no split between elements encountered in reading, research, university and schools, because these elements make no sense, have no meaning, bear no significance to the practitioner, until and unless they are integrated and are able to be applied (Heilbronn, 2010a, p8).

Theoretical knowledge has the capacity to shed light on the contextual nature of practical knowledge by situating self-evaluation in the bigger picture of the
social context in which schooling exists, thus moving reflection away from
countext-specific practice (Yandell, 2010). Student teachers do not always find
it easy to make the connection between knowledge associated with different
sites of learning. Most ITE courses are designed to support student teachers
in making connections between theory and practice; to integrate their
knowledge. They include formal requirements for reflection on teaching and,
in many cases, academic assignments, often at master’s level. For some
students these tasks are seen as intrinsically useful, they ‘get it’ (Daniels, 2018)
from the start, understanding how knowledge is drawn together in the process,
but others take a more performative approach, seeing these as additional
demands, as necessary in order to pass and to achieve QTS rather than as
significant in developing their engagement with teaching (Perryman, 2010). It
is possible that student teachers who may not have seen the connection at the
time, will nevertheless learn the process, understanding later, perhaps only
post-ITE, how to integrate knowledge from different sites of learning.

The integrated approach, with similarities to the partnership model, is, in some
ways, similar to action research, in which teachers engage in research based
on interrogating and developing their practice. It could certainly present
opportunities for schools to become ‘research-rich environments’ (Furlong,
2014). Indeed, the intention of the DfE in Educational Excellence Everywhere
(2016a), with funding promised in the Early Career Framework (DfE, 2019b) is
that schools will engage in educational research. However, there are concerns
that such research should not be reduced to sharing ideas about ‘what works’
which is then reduced to the uncritical adoption of strategies (Brown et al.,
2015). For that reason the BERA-RSA report (2014b) recommends that
‘inspection frameworks explicitly recognise the importance of research literacy
to teachers’ professional identity and practice’ (BERA-RSA, 2014b, p7). While
schools are required to meet performance criteria based on pupil outcomes
data there will be a tendency to avoid risk; developing a research-rich culture
that will enable student teachers to interrogate practice requires a culture
where risk is accepted, and faults admitted (Hobby, 2011); a professional
attitude in which practical knowledge is developed by reviewing the ‘nature and
effectiveness of practice to increase understanding of the purposes and
content of education, individually and collectively’ (Bousted, 2011, p10). HE
partners have, traditionally, contributed the theoretical foundation in which to
question and contextualise practice, integrating the practical and academic
knowledge traditions. It has been suggested that attempts to remove the contribution of HE on the basis that practical knowledge is most useful will starve teachers of any real intellectual content as they prepare for the teaching role…. It deprives teachers of an intellectual basis for their role as educators. It completely undermines their professionalism’ (Hafez, 2011, p21). Enhancing collaboration between HE and schools would seem to enable the integration of practical and academic knowledge, whereas concentrating teacher education in schools would seem to limit the development of professional understanding.

If the integrated knowledge tradition is to provide a foundation for ITE, partnership between schools and HE needs to overcome rather than reinforce the association of knowledge traditions with sites of learning. Collaboration between schools and HE needs to be rooted in reciprocity if professional dialogue which ‘generates analytical insights into and improvements of classroom practices’ (Sachs, 2000, p83) is to develop. Working together might involve joint research and writing projects, thus fostering understanding of each other’s position, challenging long-standing assumptions about the relevance of theory to practice or the association of theory with HE and practice with schools. Such an approach underpins Sachs’s ‘activist professionalism’. Teacher educators and teachers adopt systematic ways of thinking to link teacher inquiry with academic research, enabling teachers to ask critical questions about their practice, working towards a common goal of improving practice. At the same time the status of teachers is enhanced because the knowledge base of the profession is formalised (Sachs, 2000, p91).

While professionalism has been accepted as requiring the demonstration of esoteric knowledge and expertise, it also involves commitment to codes of moral, ethical and social conduct: (Grace, 2014, p50). Professional behaviour involves constant judgement; in the case of teaching, about how to use knowledge (of pupils, data, curriculum demands, for example) for the best outcomes for pupils. These are not just technical judgements about teaching strategies, or resources, they involve ethical and political considerations (Campbell, 2003). A student teacher may be surprised by how much such judgements are affected by her personal values and experiences, particularly when exercising judgements in practice, by the impact that the process of learning through the integrated tradition has on her as a person, but she will also use her ability to reason and justify her decisions (Winch, 2014). These
academic approaches will not be separate from practice. Shalem (2014) suggests that the use of ‘academic’ skills such as assessing the reliability of evidence and diagnosing what is happening in a classroom, in particular how pupils are learning, distinguishes professional judgement from ordinary judgement.

If the purpose of ITE is to prepare teachers to be autonomous professionals, the integrated knowledge tradition offers a promising way forward. If professional knowledge is that which enables a person to make ‘discretionary judgements’ grounded in ‘abstract theory and concepts’ (Freidson, 2001, p.13), ITE needs to provide that grounding lest the newly qualified teacher is only able to apply ‘a limited number of mechanical techniques’ (ibid., p.95) in their practice. Evans (2008) suggests that such functional development does not feed the motivation of teachers. The value of a profession might be evident in its salaries, but an important element is the prestige which sets a professional workforce apart from a skilled workforce; the satisfaction gained from performing well, a belief in the intrinsic value of the work rather than in providing a high level of pay (Freidson, 2001). Absence of public regard for the intrinsic value of the profession of teaching is implicit in the emphasis on practical, functional ITT in DfE policy and it may be that which has led to a high attrition rate among new recruits to teaching (National Audit Office, 2016, DfE, 2018b, Howson, 2019, Roberts and Foster, 2019). The academic and practical tradition might be able to combine to develop a ‘heightened understanding of the broader role that occupational practice plays in the society in which it operates’ (Winch, 2010 p115) supported by a sense of developing professional practice and social value.

I consider how far participants’ perceptions of their ITE suggest that they, in some way, integrate the knowledge acquired during ITE. In particular, to what extent they identify any lasting, or sustaining value from combining academic and theoretical knowledge. For example, how far, where participants have developed a systematic way of thinking about practice, that has helped them to remain engaged with the values that drew them into teaching.
Summary

I have considered some of the ways in which Furlong and Whitty’s knowledge traditions link with different views of teacher professionalism. I acknowledge that teacher professionalism is ‘a somewhat slippery, contested term’ (Moore & Clarke, 2016, p670). Using Hoyle (2008) to summarise, there seems to be a mismatch between professional development for teachers that concentrates on enhancing skills and improving pupil outcomes and the ‘traditional criteria of a profession, particularly those relating to academic knowledge’ (Hoyle, 2008, p290). In his view, and this is significantly before the election of the Coalition Government in 2010, politicians associate professionalism with efficiency while teachers associate the term with autonomy (ibid.). Professionalism can mean outward signs such as dress and punctuality, or the ability to draw on an academic foundation to make a series of autonomous judgements, or, perhaps emerging from either or both those meanings, a status leading to a degree of deference resulting from the social importance of the occupation (Hoyle, 2008, p291). The diagrammatic model presented by Sachs (2016, p421) (fig. 1) seems to me to provide a framework in which to consider the complex and often overlapping concepts of teacher professionalism. I have tentatively seen ‘functional development’ as having some links with Furlong and Whitty’s practical knowledge tradition, to a culture of performativity evident in the direction of ITE policy since 2010, and ‘attitudinal development’ with Furlong and Whitty’s integrated knowledge tradition and concepts of teaching as personal, ethical, and social practice. While functional development is based on procedure and measurable outputs, attitudinal development is based on intellectual engagement and is considered as a result to be motivating (Evans, 2008).

Sachs’s (2016) categories of ‘controlled and ‘compliant’ professionalism both rely on functional development and therefore draw on the practical knowledge tradition, however they also belong to different overall concepts of professionalism. Controlled professionalism belongs to a managerial, organisational concept of professionalism, discussed above, in which teachers are expected to accept the authority of a management charged with meeting government accountability measures, and conform to its diktat. It leads to chronic overload which ‘reduces areas of personal discretion, inhibits involvement in and control over longer-term planning, and fosters dependency
on externally produced materials and expertise' (Sachs, 2003a, p50). I understand controlled professionalism therefore to imply aversion to the academic knowledge tradition, and to be promoted by the DfE, accepted by some ‘post-performative’ teachers (or mentors) (Wilkins, 2011) and to be characteristic of the ‘super coach’. According to Sachs (2000), managerial, organisational professionalism is by its nature disempowering. It relies on learning from a small number of teachers in a restricted context rather than a sense of belonging to a collective profession with a social value in which teachers engage in debate informed by theory, research and evidence. As a result, teachers operate in isolation, lose their sense of moral purpose, and morale is reduced.

Compliant professionalism on the other hand is characteristic of occupational or democratic professionalism. Democratic professionalism is characterised by co-operation between teachers and across the profession. It takes a wider view of teaching than a teacher’s performance in a single classroom, one in which a teacher may contribute to the school, or the wider community. It draws on the academic knowledge tradition as well as the practical knowledge tradition, ‘to foster understanding and improvement of practice; and to help teachers to come to know the epistemological bases of their practice’ (Sachs, 2000, p79). While compliant professionals do not undermine the dominant agenda, and they approach teaching as a craft, they demonstrate some elements of reflection which enable them to modify their existing practice. They are constrained by a concentration on functional development while retaining aspirations to contribute to a broader social purpose. Although they rely on the practical knowledge tradition, they are not suspicious of or opposed to drawing on knowledge from the academic tradition.

At the other end of the scale from functional development Sachs places attitudinal development including the separate concepts of collaborative and activist professionalism. The difference between those concepts being that collaborative professionalism is linked to organisational, managerial professionalism, while activist professionalism is linked to occupational or democratic professionalism. Collaborative professionals are reflective learners who rethink and renew practice but their focus is on working individually, concentrating on individual improvement. Development of this type of professional has an emphasis on the practical knowledge tradition, reviewing
procedure, and sharing ‘good practice’ in local networks. Although they will therefore draw on both the academic and practical knowledge traditions, they will emphasise the value of practical knowledge, seeing outcomes of research as ‘what works’.

According to Sachs, activist professionalism requires reciprocal collaboration between schools and universities and is therefore based on the integrated knowledge tradition. It is characterised by using systematic research to elaborate practical theories, to think about practice, to ‘enhance professional dialogue, generating analytical insights into and improvements of classroom practices in a variety of settings’ (Sachs, 2000, p83). It is situated in occupational or democratic professionalism because its focus is less on the individual teacher’s practice than on ‘education in all of its contexts and dimensions, and [is] about how people can learn from the experiences and collective wisdom of each other’ (Sachs, 2000, p84). It is likely to contribute to the production of new knowledge rather than to confirm or amend practice, illustrating Furlong and Whitty’s view that the integrated knowledge tradition can enable theory to emerge from practice as well as from a separate academic domain.

Sachs suggests that, although all new teachers need to be competent practitioners, they are likely to be motivated by attitudinal development, by entering into an occupational or democratic profession in which they are able to remember ‘the important role of education and schooling as a broader social endeavour’ (Sachs, 2016, p423). By contrast, functional development, dictated by the demands of organisational or managerial professionalism, deprives teachers of the requirement to act autonomously, it:

- diminishes teachers’ self-confidence, creativity and the moral purpose that sustain them in ambiguous and difficult situations. It also corrodes their ability to act with confidence and authority and weakens trust (Sachs, 2016, p423).

I explore these understandings of knowledge and professionalism in the discussion of my findings. I examine evidence in the perceptions of relatively recently qualified teachers of ways in which they draw on Furlong and Whitty’s three knowledge traditions and illustrate Sachs’s models of teacher professionalism. I consider whether my findings indicate that, in retrospect,
some aspects of ITE are valued more highly than others and if so, why. From there, I consider whether those high value elements of ITE might inform ITE in order to sustain new teachers beyond the first years of teaching.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Having established that the aim of my research is to explore teachers' perceptions of their ITE, to find out where they perceive the value of their preparation to lie, I determined that my research should be qualitative rather than quantitative (Robson, 2011, Lichtman, 2013); inductive rather than deductive (Trafford & Lesham, 2008).

The qualitative methodology for this study was also chosen to reflect my interpretive, constructivist view of knowledge. I understand knowledge to be constructed by individuals to whom things have meaning in the context of that person’s existing knowledge and experience (Ormston et al, 2014, Robson, 2011, Lichtman, 2013). For example, the focus of this study, as discussed in chapter one, has been determined by my personal and professional experience, and that experience will affect the way in which I interpret the existing literature, and how I selected my research methodology. It follows that I would not be seeking to find out concrete, provable, ‘truths’ but to explore individuals’ experiences of a life experience (ITE) in order to deepen understanding of the ways in which ITE may draw on different knowledge traditions and develop different manifestations of teacher professionalism. I needed to choose a methodology that would enable me to gather data rich in the detail of the individual experience and to allow me to acknowledge the position of each participant in the same way that I acknowledge my own position. To counter suggestions that conclusions drawn from such an interpretive approach can be seen as simply confirming the researcher’s understanding of the issue in question, I sought a methodology with the sort of rigorous framework that would give weight to my findings.

In order to achieve such depth, credibility, and to explore and acknowledge the perspectives of my participants while at the same time allowing me to acknowledge my part in making sense of their reflections on their experiences I have chosen to take a phenomenological approach. ‘Central to phenomenology, and indeed part of its continuing appeal, is its attempt to provide a rigorous defence of the fundamental and inextricable role of subjectivity and consciousness in all knowledge and in descriptions of the world’ (Moran, 2000, p15). It provides a way of thinking and working that allows
interpretation of knowledge to be made overt, ‘researcher subjectivity is prized and intersubjectivity is embraced’ (Finlay, 2008, p3). In particular, I chose to adopt the framework of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) which provides a clear set of procedures to facilitate ordered enquiry into perceptions of lived experience. The process of analysis supports the researcher in staying vigilant ‘both to avoid charges of self-indulgence and solipsism, and to ensure that the focus of the research does not shift away from the phenomenon, and/or participants’ lived worlds, to the researcher’ (Finlay, 2008, p4). In summary:

Thus the truth claims of an IPA analysis are always tentative and analysis is subjective. At the same time that subjectivity is dialogical, systematic and rigorous in its application and the results of it are available for the reader to check subsequently’. (Smith J.A. et al, 2009, p9)

Phenomenology

According to Smith and Shinebourne (2012), IPA is built on three primary theoretical touchstones; phenomenology, hermeneutics and idiography. The relevance of phenomenology to my epistemology lies in Husserl’s aim of attending to the essence of an experience. Its first step involves a process of describing what a person says about their lived experience, that is before offering interpretation of what they say. In this way close attention is paid to the detail the participant reveals in order to ask the question, is this what the participant really says their experience is like? (Van Mannen, 1990). There has to be a conscious effort to minimise the impact of the researcher’s perspective/construction of knowledge to achieve this. Husserl's suggestion is for epoche, that is for the researcher to ‘bracket’ her own understanding (Moustakas, 1994). The process is to acknowledge her own position by, for example, writing notes about her understanding of the experience so that she can put those aside temporarily to adopt a naïve attention to what is being said. This is a reflexive approach allowing for a 'self-consciousness that enables me to target my energy so that I am attending to just what appears and nothing else' (Moustakas, 1994, p88). This is not a suggestion that it is possible for the researcher to become objective by denying her own view, rather it is the recognition of a position that allows her to slow down and 'open up how things are experienced' (Vagle, 2016, p22). It helps to achieve the aim of enabling accurate description ‘by reflectively focussing the attention on experience rather than the things experienced' (Smith, J., 2016, p9). ‘One is not bracketing
interpretations, but is bracketing pre-suppositions as one interprets’ (Vagle, 2016, p59). The purpose of bracketing is therefore to allow the researcher to attend closely to the human experience under investigation, allowing the phenomenon to speak for itself, rather than trying to examine the phenomenon according to predetermined categories or theories (Smith & Shinebourne, 2012). To that end I kept a reflexive journal while carrying out my research and analysis in which I noted my own perspective and acknowledged the assumptions I might be making in the process. I will draw on entries in my journal to illustrate the way in which I used bracketing during my interpretation and analysis of my data.

Hermeneutics

Ideas from hermeneutic and existential philosophy, from Heidegger, Gadamer and Merleau-Ponty extend Husserl’s work by exploring further the role of interpretation in making sense of phenomena. Finlay and Smith, J., both highlight Heidegger’s influence, developing the notion of bracketing, in his explanation that

whenever something is interpreted as something, the interpretation will be founded essentially upon fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception. An interpretation is never a presuppositionless apprehending of something presented to us (Finlay, 2008, p8, Smith, J., 2016, p17).

Gadamer, similarly explains how bracketing is not an attempt at neutrality but an attempt to foreground and appropriate one’s own meanings and prejudices (Finlay, 2008, p9). He suggests that it is not possible to eliminate all presupposition, the researcher can only aim for ‘freedom from undisclosed prejudices’ (Moran & Mooney, 2002, p2) and it is this recognition that fuses phenomenology with hermeneutics. What the phenomenological researcher is trying to do is find a way to break with her ‘familiar acceptance’ (Finlay, 2008, p10) of the world in order to be open to the meanings that others make.

The relationship between the interpretation that the participant makes of the phenomenon and the interpretation that the researcher makes of the participant’s data is described by Smith, J.A. (2012, p10) as a ‘double hermeneutic’ and by Finlay as a dance between bracketing pre-understandings and ‘exploiting them as a source of insight’ (Finlay, 2008, p1). The participant
is trying, in her account, to make sense of the phenomenon, and this will be from her perspective, while the researcher will try to make sense of the participant making sense of what has happened to them (Smith, J.A., 2012 p10). I found that my journal entries enabled me to keep track of my perspective while investigating my participants' views.

**Idiography**

The close attention to the detail in what a participant reveals about their experience required for a phenomenological enquiry leads to an ideographic approach. It necessarily involves a small number of participants, each of whose experience has its own value. To draw out this value, each case is analysed in turn, before the researcher moves to look for patterns across cases. Looking for patterns is secondary to allowing meaning to emerge from an individual case, so while themes or patterns will emerge, the detail and nuance of each case is retained/protected (Smith, J.A., 2012, p74). Research questions therefore need to be exploratory and open so that the researcher can ‘have the patience to wait for the phenomenon to reveal its own complexity rather than imposing an external structure on it, such as the dogmatic use of theories or models’ (Vagle, 2016, p112). The idiographic nature of the enquiry is summed up by Moustakas who suggests that:

> The aim is to determine what an experience means for the persons who have had the experience and are able to provide a comprehensive description of it. From the individual descriptions, general or universal meanings are derived, in other words the essences or structures of the experience’ (Moustakas, 1994, p13).

The structure for data analysis provided by IPA helps to ensure that due regard is given to each case. I will explain how I followed those steps below.

IPA is therefore an appropriate methodology to accommodate my epistemology. It allows me to acknowledge the subjective nature of knowledge and find a way to explain my understanding of the experience of ITE while at the same time finding a way to represent the different constructions that my participants have made of their experience.
Methods

My research questions support the phenomenological approach by acknowledging the significance of participants’ perspectives and allowing them to talk from that perspective before considering the implications for me of what they say:

- What perspectives do teachers, in retrospect, present of their initial teacher education (ITE)?
- To what extent does what they say illuminate the way in which knowledge traditions and concepts of teacher professionalism might usefully inform ITE?

My methods for carrying out my enquiry emerged as part of my methodology. For such an interpretive approach, I needed to find out from participants as much as possible about their lived experience by interviewing them in such a way as to enable them to reveal that experience.

I was also aware that the idea of perception is a key element of phenomenology, and that each person involved in my study will have their own viewpoint from which they construct their perception of their experience of ITE. Indeed, Husserl (1989), Heidegger (1953) and Merleau Ponty (1962) explain perspective as a way of seeing, illustrating the idea with examples of visual perspective, while Smith et al (2009) explains the double hermeneutic by using an image of a circle around a central phenomenon. There are various viewpoints on the circle, and the process of interpretation requires the researcher to move from one to another, to try to understand how the same thing is viewed, or made sense of, from different perspectives. A typical illustration is the view that different people will have of a house when standing in different places around the house or at different distances from it. They see the same house but see different aspects of it. Van Manen (1990) discusses further influences on a person’s view. He suggests that the view is affected by their fore-knowledge and fore-suppositions which will be based on temporal, spatial, relational and corporeal factors (ibid.). Applying Van Manen to my participants, some have a longer length of service post-ITE than others, some have taught in more than one school while others have experience in only one. Some have a team leadership role and some have some experience of working
with student teachers following various routes of training. Some have had positive relationships with their schools since completing ITE and others will have experienced some less positive relationships over the years. Some will be conscious that they seek to conceal or reveal things about themselves, others less aware of that process of selection. Any of these factors are likely to affect what is relevant to them now in their recollection of what was important in their ITE (and indeed the way they view their future). The participants will be looking at who they were when they trained from the perspective of who they are now; what they experienced then and how that has influenced what they experience now (Van Manen, 1990).

I thought that if I could gain some insight into the individual's perspective, or viewpoint, before embarking on an interview, that would help me to understand the things they said. To that end, I asked each participant to draw, before the interview, a diagram or picture to show how they see their ITE now. In IPA ‘we want research participants to bring us to their experience of the phenomenon’ (Vagle, 2016, p58) and my intention was to gain a first indication of each participant's position which I could then use as the basis for further exploration during the interview. I wondered whether people might place their ITE in the distance, indicating that they felt they had left it behind as they had developed as a teacher, they might even put it in a box to indicate that it was no longer relevant. It might be placed in the foreground as still consciously relevant, somehow running alongside the present, it could be underneath the present as a type of foundation, perhaps it could be surrounding/enclosing the present as a constraint/limiting factor. They might reveal a view of ITE as acquisition of a series of identified skills and strategies. Links might be made as a chain of cause and effect and relevance to the particular career progression that person had experienced. The possibilities were huge, but the relevance to me, and to supporting the ambition of IPA to attempt to ‘capture particular experiences as experienced for particular people’ (Smith et al., 2009, p16) was to provide a first impression of how participants see the experience, where they were standing as they looked at their experience of ITE.

Some participants had prepared their diagram in advance, while others completed it in my presence before we began the interview. I did not offer any comment while those interviewees drew their picture, nor did I offer any instructions beyond that sent by email to each teacher in which I made a
conscious effort to give instructions that enabled each teacher to show their own perspective. I tried to avoid making suggestions about how they might present their view or limit them to, for example, a spider diagram. I was pleased that a variety of images were produced; I felt that indicated that the exercise had achieved the object of introducing me to individual perceptions and to ‘distinguish between the appearing form and the form itself’ (Husserl, 1989, p69). Given a completely free field, I felt that what participants chose to include was in itself significant, as well as revealing something about their personal stance. I intended the diagrams to allow the participants to identify and talk about what they saw as important to them about their ITE rather than imposing, through a set of questions, ‘external theories and constructs of the teachers’ ‘personal practical knowledge’ (Fenstermacher, 1994, p11).

When deciding on this strategy for conducting the interviews I reflected that ‘it is not important to the phenomenologist how one interview is the same or different from another…. The goal is to find out as much as you can about the phenomenon from each particular participant’ (Vagle, 2016, p79). To that end I did not structure the interviews beyond an opening question, ‘can you tell me about your experience of ITE?’ and a closing question, ‘if you were advising somebody embarking on ITE now, what would you tell them to make sure was included in the course?’ Between those I simply asked the interviewee to talk through their diagram. I deliberately did not ask the teachers to send their diagram to me before I met them for the interview because I wanted to approach them without drawing any inferences which might lead me to consider possible questions in advance. The diagram worked to allow the participant to talk about what they had already considered to be significant to them and to maintain the focus of the interview. It enabled me to concentrate on understanding what they were trying to say by adopting ‘deliberate naïveté’ (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, p324), using prompts, like ‘could you tell me more about…’ to seek clarification. I found that I needed to maintain a high level of concentration in order to ‘implement IPA’s inductive epistemology to its fullest extent’ (Smith et al, 2009, p70). I needed to listen to what the interviewee said rather than to jump to a conclusion about what I thought they were implying and to be alert to the need to use questions to ‘interrogate [my] own ‘definiteness’; questions like ‘I have an understanding of that phrase you just used, but can you tell me what it means to you?’ (Vagle, 2016, p81). Being able to focus on the picture helped me to return to the things the participant
wanted to talk about and to listen to their clarification of those things, to accept
that people's perspectives are affected by a range of influences illustrating the
way that IPA draws from Heidegger the idea that 'being-in-the-world is always
'in-relation-to' something – and consequently that the interpretation of people’s
meaning-making activities is central to phenomenological enquiry' (Smith et al,
2009, p18).

The ideographic nature of IPA means that the number of participants is small.
Smith et al suggest that a typical number of interviews for this type of study is
between four and ten. There could be separate participants or, for example,
two interviews with each of four participants. They say:

It is important not to see the higher numbers as being indicative of
'better' work… Successful analysis requires time, reflection and
dialogue, and larger datasets tend to inhibit all of these things (Smith et
al, 2009, p52)

I interviewed seven teachers, selected purposively. I chose to limit my choice
of teachers to those with 3-6 years’ experience of teaching because I wanted
participants to be near enough the experience of ITE to remember, but far
enough away to be able to say what they thought had been, or was still,
important to them. I decided to impose a further limit of using a single school
from which to select the teachers. I thought that the particular school could
make a significant difference to teachers’ perceptions; a school might have a
very strong, or minimal, programme of continuing professional development
(CPD) for example, or it might have particular workload pressures, any number
of factors that could influence the way a teacher viewed the value of their ITE.
I hoped that remaining in one common environment might help to avoid the
distraction of such external factors on teachers’ thinking. Of course, some
teachers had had experience in other schools, but at the time of the interview,
all were operating in the same school. I chose a school which worked closely
and actively with my university’s school partnership. It therefore had a strong
commitment to ITE and interest in educational research. I thought it was likely
that there would be some enthusiasm for allowing me access to teachers with
relevant length of service. I approached the professional tutor who not only
agreed to my request for access but offered to approach teachers on my behalf.
She received a positive response from the ten teachers she approached, I
made email contact with them, and seven responded.
I chose to use the diagrams as the basis for pseudonyms for the participants because they were particularly useful in providing an initial key to the view of each person. The pseudonyms reminded me, during all stages of analysis of each person’s viewpoint.

Figure 2: List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ITE route</th>
<th>When trained</th>
<th>Experience since training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Circle</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>This is her third school, she is now a key stage co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Stairs</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>This is her first school, she is acting Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Files</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>This is his first school. He is now Head of Department in a subject different from that in which he trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Flower</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>This is her second school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Lines</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>This is her second school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie Mindmap</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>This is her first school. She is now a key stage co-ordinator and has a whole school responsibility for the Rights Respecting initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Web</td>
<td>School Direct Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PgCE)</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Trained in this school and has taught here since</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I met the teachers at their school, in all but one case after school. After school was a better time to carry out the interviews because quiet, undisturbed spaces were readily available and there were no distractions of bells or teaching commitments to interrupt the flow of the interview. Each interview lasted approximately an hour. I was struck by the enthusiasm with which each teacher took part, the way they were able to talk to their diagram to provide some well-considered reflection about how they see their ITE in relation to their practice of teaching.
The place of the diagram

The participants’ diagrams provided me with a basis for the interviews, with a reminder of each person’s particular view, and with a way of focussing on the particular elements of ITE that each person had chosen as significant. Thus they helped me to explore individual lived experiences rather than to impose a set of pre-determined assumptions and questions on the process. Throughout the process of analysis, they reminded me that the phenomenon ‘can appear in innumerable ways’ (Vagle, 2016, p21).

The diagrams are presented and discussed here. The discussion demonstrates how each was used as the basis for the interview and how it was used in the double hermeneutic approach to analysis of the interview data.

Figure 3: Participant diagram, Cindy Circle

Cindy Circle’s diagram consists only of one circle and the word journey, and I was initially concerned that it would not provide an adequate basis for our interview. In practice, Cindy was able to give a high degree of verbal explanation to clarify the perspective of ITE that she was communicating, in effect to enhance the image. She explained to me that her perspective is that each year is a circular, reflective process of continuing development, and that each year builds on the previous, to form a tower over time. Her explanation suggests that she sees that the first circle, her ITE year, provided the foundation on which the rest of the tower, her career consisting of annual reflection, builds. She can go back to the bottom of the tower at any time. Her
sense of ITE as the foundation of her teaching is apparent in other participants’ images although the perspective from which they view their foundation varies.

Figure 4: Participant diagram, Stella Stairs

Stella Stairs uses a very clear image of her ITE providing a foundation, with free movement up and down. She added, verbally, that I’m observing the stairs but I could stand on the stairs if I wanted to. I understand that to mean that she sees her ITE as present rather than distant, as still relevant in supporting her as a teacher. She made interesting additional comments:

the stairs don’t end, I wanted them to just kind of carry on so they kind of come off the edge of the paper… I think that in terms of the process of learning and taking on board new things, um I don’t feel that there’s an end as such just kind of a blur maybe… and like how it goes through from the training through to becoming a teacher.

Stella’s image thus provided both a quick insight into the way she views her ITE and the basis for her to be able to talk about her individual lived experience.
Philip Files pictures his ITE as the beginning of a journey to the stars. He puts his ITE in the foreground which suggests to me a connection in his mind between it and his success. As the basis for the interview it enabled Philip to talk about how his ITE has helped him manage the hurdles in his career and work towards his vision of success. It communicated Philip’s particular experience to me quickly and helped me to focus on what he had selected as important to him, to slow down and listen, rather than revert to my own pre-suppositions.
Florence Flower’s reference in her diagram to how she has grown from her ITE into a flower, far from the seed she was, is a particularly memorable part of her perspective. She expanded on this image verbally, explaining that she might be cut down to the ground by a particularly bad experience but could re-grow because her roots are strong. I found that that allowed her to talk about her experience and to reveal a connection between ITE and later teaching that I would not have thought about. I would not therefore have asked a direct question that would have drawn out this response, particularly if I had been working to a fixed interview schedule.

Figure 7: participant diagram, Linda Lines

Linda Lines presents a view of ITE as structured, sequential and a logical progression. The factors she includes are connected with content, or phase, more than impact on her personally. Her diagram seems to me to represent a memory of the components of her own ITE and, in some ways to echo DfE attempts to define ITE and CPD in a framework. It enabled her to talk about
how she thinks the process worked for her. As with other diagrams, I understood her perception to be of ITE as a beginning; in this case the beginning of a process with a degree of uniformity.

**Figure 8: participant diagram, Millie Mindmap**

Millie Mindmap presents a different perspective from Linda Lines. Hers is a series of interrelating sections, forming a circular chain of cause and effect. She chose to start, in her interview, with her picture of herself in the bottom left corner:

> so, when I was putting it together I was… it took me narratively round like this and I thought yes, I’m back, so I’m here I’ve got my family, I know where my workplace is and I’ve got a purpose so I’ve come back to me here.

Her diagram enabled her to talk about what it was in her ITE that had had such a personal impact. It therefore introduced me quickly to her individual view and served to remind me both of what she selected as significant and why.
Wendy Web, like Millie Mindmap, pictured her ITE as a series of connected sections. Her perspective is different, in that it is broadly evaluative, linking aspects of her ITE with her current needs. In particular, she was able to explain, using her diagram, how she could now see how the gaps she identifies in her training might be affecting her practice. Once again, the diagram provided an indication of Wendy’s view, enabling me to focus on the aspects that she selected as significant to her.

All the diagrams provided me with the initial clue to each participant’s thoughts about the place of their ITE and their view of it now and provided the basis of the interview. They enabled both the participant and me to concentrate during the interview on those aspects of ITE that the individuals had identified as significant, especially helping me to avoid following my own pre-suppositions but to listen attentively to what was said; to adopt a phenomenological attitude which “involves a preparedness to be open to whatever may emerge rather than prejudging or prestructuring one’s findings” (Finlay, 2008, p4). I could see straight away that individuals looked at their ITE experience from different viewpoints.
The diagrams provided me with a first indication that there might be a complex continuum between the ways ITE might foster controlled or activist professionalism. For example, at one end of the spectrum Stella built her image on a series of questions, suggesting an analytical attitude that might generate a ‘thinking teacher’ or activist professional. At the other end, Linda identified ITE content as a set of topics in a linear progression, suggesting the compliance with an accepted agenda that might lead to controlled professionalism. However, it was apparent that there is no simple process of labelling along a continuum. Philip, for example, identifies academic requirements of his course as beneficial but identifies success in managerial terms. From looking at the diagrams alone, I therefore started to see that a variety of influences and interpretations of ITE was likely to emerge. I was also aware that the diagrams just provided a first indication of the participant’s perspective.

Data Analysis

I followed the stages of data analysis particular to IPA as described by Smith et al (2009).

The first step was to listen to the interview data repeatedly and to transcribe the interviews. It was useful to become familiar with the way interviewees spoke about their experiences (where and when they were hesitant, chuckling, or speaking confidently) before transcription because such nuances are also part of what is ‘going on’ in an interview. ‘The paying attention, immediacy, and presence required to experience and practice never-nothing-going-on is significant’ (Vagle, 2016, p15). I transcribed each interview verbatim which involved further close listening to what each person had said. I was able to retain some echoes of the voice of each participant so that, at later stages, I could use these subtleties to help concentrate on what was going on in the whole interview. I needed to be conscious that the phenomenological approach is likely to result in the emergence of quite different lived experiences, I should not be looking for commonality across cases during transcription but should accept the slowing down required to pay full attention to the individual cases. I noted ‘look at what there is, not what I’m expecting, or what I think I know’ (journal notes,4.10.18). This illustrates my conscious efforts to adopt a
phenomenological attitude which ‘involves a preparedness to be open to whatever may emerge rather than prejudging or prestructuring one’s findings’ (Finlay, 2008, p4).

I was aware that by the time I had transcribed all seven interviews I had some familiarity with each participant’s data and had then begun to make some connections and comparisons. I was using the diagrams directly in this process, both for some tentative interpretation of the data but also to identify each participant to myself and fix their ‘view’ in my mind.

At the point of completing transcription, I noted that I realised that I was:

already sifting and imposing some degree of analysis on the data as a whole. I think I can say though that I understand that on closer scrutiny of each interview one by one I will find much, much more, and some of my initial assumptions may be moved. This process of bracketing/acknowledging where I am, is helping clear my mind before starting to note exploratory comments for the first interview (journal notes 25.9.18).

Moving between deliberate concentration on the individual lived experience emerging from each interview and my own position is an example of the ‘double hermeneutic’ (Smith et al., 2009, p9):

Although the primary concern of IPA is the lived experience of the participant and the meaning which the participant makes of that lived experience, the end result is always an account of how the analyst thinks the participant is thinking (Smith et al, 2009, p9)

Acknowledging my position, and my tentative connections in journal notes clarified the ‘dance’ (Finlay, 2008) between interpretation and data.

Step two was to make exploratory comments in wide margins, having set out my transcripts in the middle of the page. On one side I noted line by line content; what the teacher was saying rather than what that meant to me. The purpose of that was to concentrate slowly on what had been said rather than look for what I thought had been said; an attempt to get to the essence of the interviewee’s perception (Moustakas, 1991). On the other side of the text I noted features of language, key reference to their diagram and conceptual
comments or themes (appendix 1). I completed the process for all seven transcripts.

Next, from the wealth of exploratory comments, I constructed a chart for each interview noting the emergent themes, the relevant extract from the transcript, and my exploratory comments (appendix 2). The process reduced the data and helped me develop my familiarity with each teacher’s perspective. I noted after completing this stage that:

I feel I have a much more detailed view of what each person has said. It is difficult to concentrate on what they say before speculating on what they mean or what that may mean to me. There are transcripts where I think the interviewee has not said much of interest beyond description, but through the process of line-by-line analysis I find that there are some key ideas after all. Also very interesting language (journal notes, 5.11.18).

I could see that I was dancing between ‘striving for reductive focus and reflexive self-awareness; between bracketing pre-understandings and exploiting them as a source of insight’ (Finlay, 2008, p1).

I inevitably started to identify themes particular to individuals and some emerging common themes. I found the diagrams particularly useful at this stage to guide my first interpretations, such as ‘several see ITE as a foundation… growing from that as well as return to foundation for regeneration: Florence, flower, Stella, steps, Cindy, circle and stack’ (journal notes, 5.11.18). Each of these had spoken about going back to their ITE roots at times since qualifying.

To ensure that I concentrated on the data I went through each transcript to group the emergent themes, such as ‘mentoring’, or ‘being professional’ for each case, yielding between nine and eleven themes for each case. I listed these (appendix 3) following the advice from Smith et al (2009, p106) that with larger groups of participants it may be necessary to ‘identify emergent themes at case level but hold off the search for patterns and connections until one is examining all the cases together’. From my list of emergent themes for each case I looked for common or super-ordinate themes across the cases (appendix 4). I identified eleven of these and grouped the illustrative extracts for each super-ordinate theme in separate charts (appendix 5). At the end of
each chart my next step was to write some exploratory comments noting similarities and differences across the cases (appendix 6).

At this stage I attempted to write some analysis by grouping my super-ordinate themes into larger groups. I wanted to give the attention to individual detail and nuance that I felt a phenomenological approach required but had far too much material from seven participants to attempt such a level of detail in my analysis. I noted that:

I'm having to reduce the data into something manageable and I'm rather sorry that that means less depth inevitably. I don't want to lose the subtlety of the individual views by grouping together for convenience and practicality (journal notes, 29.11.18).

I found it helpful to consider that:

if one has a larger corpus, then almost inevitably the analysis of each case cannot be so detailed. In this case, the emphasis may shift more to assessing what were the key emergent themes for the whole group… what makes the analysis IPA is the fact that the group level themes are still illustrated with particular examples taken from individuals (Smith et al, 2009, p106).

Although my first attempt to write a report of all my findings included too much detail to be viable, the process enabled me to sift through my thoughts and impressions of the data to get a view of the whole; another dance between the data and interpretation (Finlay, 2008), or application of the double hermeneutic (Smith, J.A., 2012). At this stage I made further reductions by following Smith et al (2009) to consider recurrence. I re-visited the super-ordinate themes to select only those in which ‘most stringently’ (ibid., p106) examples were found in all the participant interviews. The same theme was not necessarily evidenced in the same way across participants.

Doing IPA with numbers of participants constantly involves negotiating this relationship between convergence and divergence, commonality and individuality… studies with larger samples require considerable skill in retaining an idiographic focus on the individual voice at the same time as making claims for the larger group (Smith et al, 2009, p107)

Bearing this in mind, I constructed revised charts of the super-ordinate themes (appendix 7) which I present in chapter 4 in terms of what the participant said and my understanding of what they said. Those findings are then discussed in
chapter 5 in relation to the literature on knowledge traditions and teacher professionalism.

**Ethical considerations**

I followed the ethical guidelines provided by the British Education Research Association (BERA) for educational research (BERA, 2018) and secured institutional ethical approval (appendix 8). While external guidelines provide a code of practice, according to Sikes and Goodson (2003) they do not necessarily ensure that research is ‘moral’. ‘In fact, this view reduces moral concerns to the procedural: a convenient form of methodological reductionism… we take the view that ‘interior reflexivity’ is a better anchor for moral practice’ (Sikes & Goodson, 2003, p48). The reflexivity inherent in the phenomenological approach would seem to encourage such practice and to lead the individual researcher to question themselves, their motive in carrying out the research, the position of the participants and the potential impact on them as individuals or employees.

In securing the cooperation of my selected school, I was aware that there were a number of potential power relationships that might arise. Although I might assume that partnership with a school is an equal partnership, ‘the social games – the economic game but also the cultural games… are not ‘fair games’' (Bourdieu, 2003, p74), the school itself might have felt under pressure, as a partner school of the university, to allow me access. They might have felt that I was in a position to place student teachers in that school, and might not do so if they did not agree. They might have felt that I was carrying out covert quality assurance, that I might be in a position to encourage or discourage NQTs leaving the university course to apply for posts at the school (or not) if I was engaged in making judgements about the support provided for new teachers. On the other hand, they might have seen taking part as some validation by the university of their ITE practice and there would then be ethical implications for me in potentially giving a message to other partner schools that I valued one school more than another. Indeed ‘many aspects of the relationship between researcher and research are based on trust, not upon formal agreement’ (Pring, 2003, p62).
I therefore took care to pre-empt potential issues in my contacts with the school (Cresswell, 2013, p57). I explained in my initial contact that I was not intending to seek comments about the school itself or the training provided there as either ITE or CPD but that I was only interested in individual teachers’ views of the ITE that they had experienced and what, from that, they continued to use in their recent practice. I felt that I had a long-standing working relationship with the professional tutor resting on a high level of trust developed over several years. In the event, the willingness not only to agree access but to identify teachers who fitted the criteria and to volunteer to make initial approaches to them on my behalf confirmed my sense of mutual trust, that they believed that I would prove to be a ‘virtuous researcher’ (Pring, 2003, p64).

I knew that it was likely that some of the participants would be ex-students of the course I led because several had been employed by this school. They might feel some pressure to say positive things about their ITE experience because they might think they were criticising me personally as course leader if they made critical comments. I made every effort in my contact emails to explain, again, that I was interested in a range of perceptions, that I was definitely not looking for evaluation of the particular course, that I therefore welcomed any views that gave me an insight into what was felt to have lasting, as opposed to immediate value (appendix 9). I also made clear that they were not obliged in any way to take part. I hoped that enough time had elapsed for those teachers to feel that I was no longer their tutor and that we shared a common cause in this investigation. If they did not I imagined that they would not be willing participants. Seven of the ten teachers I contacted by email responded positively. The three who did not respond at all were not ex-students of ‘my’ course. Of the seven who did, four were ex-students, one had followed a different course at the same university, and two had attended different institutions. I drew the conclusion that perhaps recognising my name encouraged those who responded to open their email in the first place, and that they felt comfortable to take part. In some ways my knowledge of the particular course that four participants had experienced was a useful reminder that my focus was on perceptions rather than on accurate remembering of events.

I reiterated before starting each interview that I was seeking a range of views and was not engaged in evaluating the course I led. Cresswell (2013, p60) suggests that an interview can create ‘a power imbalance through a
hierarchical relationship often established between the researcher and participant' and suggests that, for example, establishing trust and avoiding leading questions can help to reduce this imbalance. I think that the form of interview used in this study, being based on the participant's choice, implements that advice. It gives the lead to the participant, as opposed to the more hierarchical situation of working through a schedule of questions.

The aim of gaining a range of perceptions through giving participants the choice about what they wished to highlight was made clear in the information sheets (appendix 10) and consent forms signed by each participant (appendix 11). I sought to reassure them of my sensitivity to what they talked about by explaining that I would email a copy of the transcript of their interview to them asking them to tell me if there was anything that, on reflection, they wished they had not said or would have preferred to have said differently. None of the teachers asked for changes to be made to their transcript.

I offered to send a copy of the abstract of the completed thesis to each teacher, intending that that would provide additional reassurance that I would treat their material with professional sensitivity. Indeed, I have been careful to protect the dignity of the participants when writing (Webster et al, 2014). I have used pseudonyms to protect the identity of participants and have tried at all times to avoid referring to specific detail which might inadvertently identify them (Robson, 2011).

**Summary**

I have explained how a phenomenological approach to my research complements my epistemology and is appropriate for my focus on individual perceptions. In particular, the principles of IPA have given my research and analysis rigour. The addition of participants’ diagrams of perception to the normal use of interviews as the method of data collection was in keeping with IPA, facilitated the interviews and data analysis, and distinguished between participants. The process of analysis and reduction of data has been complicated, and it has been difficult to reconcile accurate representation of individual lived experiences with the identification of common themes.
There were a range of ethical issues connected with the power relationships inherent in working with a partner institution and with participants who have been students of the ITE course I have been responsible for running. These have been addressed through formal procedures and the phenomenological approach which fosters a high level of regard for the individual participant’s perception of their lived experience.
Chapter Four: Presentation of findings

I set out to find out what teachers with 3-6 years’ teaching experience continue to value from their ITE. IPA allowed me to give my participants free rein to choose to talk about any aspect of their experience of ITE and therefore a wide range of topics emerged. Through the process of analysis discussed above, four main themes, common across all participants, emerged: academic knowledge, knowledge gained from practice, the relationship between academic and practical knowledge, and the residual impact of their ITE. In this chapter, following the procedures of IPA, I present my main findings under those headings. Applying the double hermeneutic inherent in IPA I give an account of the data and offer an indication of the way in which I have made sense of their making sense of the experience, by offering some interpretation in order to communicate what meaning I have drawn from them (Smith et al, 2009, p109). Discussion of the links between participants’ comments presented here and the existing literature will take place in chapter 5.

1 Academic knowledge

My participants seemed to think that academic knowledge was important in various ways. Academic subject knowledge seems to be seen as a more obvious knowledge base for teaching than the field of Education. It appears to be identified as a source of confidence about what to teach as well as how to teach. Developing academic approaches through master's level work seems to be associated with professional status, with contextualising practical knowledge, developing habits of enquiry, and career enhancement. While most participants saw academic knowledge as relevant to understanding practice, that was not the case for all. I present references to academic subject knowledge and working at master's level separately. In the discussion chapter I will explore the different values attached to different types of knowledge and how these may contribute to forming ‘super-coaches’, or ‘thinking teachers’; controlled or activist professionals.

i) academic subject knowledge

For some participants subject knowledge seems to me to be linked with confidence and competence, for example Linda Lines says:
I think it’s right in secondary to learn about your subject that you’re going to teach because then that’s what gives you um the real building blocks that help you directly when you walk through that door and teach the subject.

I see a similar identification by Wendy Web who notes specifically that she did not have a subject specific tutor on her course. I understand her to be linking that gap with her current concerns about her teaching when she says:

I’ve had, had quite a challenging year in terms of engagement with the subject, um, and I don’t know, ’cause when I did this [draw the diagram for the interview] I started thinking well maybe it’s because of some of this, the subject study, um, concerns that I had during the training.

It seems to me that she is suggesting that she is still feeling her lack of a secure grounding in subject specific knowledge for teaching, contrasting with Linda’s confidence derived from her subject specific pre-practice training.

Some comments suggest to me that participants think that subject study in ITE is different from the academic knowledge they brought from their degree studies:

You need it [subject knowledge] in a different way, so when you’ve come from a university level… you’re not going to go into a school with that (Stella Stairs)

I had a lot of subject knowledge, but also making me very aware… how to apply my subject knowledge to kids, it’s quite different isn’t it… what to do with it (Millie Mindmap)

While these comments seem to me to concern adapting academic subject knowledge to school subject knowledge, I see Florence Flower’s comment about some of her cohort that:

I mean they had their subject knowledge, their subject knowledge was like, amazing, but the understanding of kids and the running of a classroom, they didn’t have, they didn’t have any idea

as referring to an additional body of knowledge, also gained through studying teaching her subject, about working with young people. Philip Files appears to
me to have a similar view when he talks about moving into teaching a different subject:

all of those sort of transferable, in my opinion, between any subject, so therefore the underpinning was already there, I had the basics to, I could, as long as I had, I could teach, it’s just what to teach, so the knowledge was simply, for me, it started out with using our OCR specimen

The extracts above lead me to think that these participants, in different ways, see learning about subject pedagogy as important, and as relevant to their practice. Cindy Circle’s experience of learning about teaching her subject, on the other hand, seems to her to have been disconnected with the application of that knowledge:

I didn’t learn anything about my subject knowledge, that’s all come from me and what I did in school… He [subject tutor] hadn’t been in a school for a long time, he had written lots of textbooks and they were all on our reading lists

Cindy seems to me to imply that, to her, academic subject knowledge needed to be related specifically to practical application, her tutor appearing to her to belong to the ivory tower rather than the reality of classrooms.

These references to subject knowledge illustrate the different ways in which participants spoke about its importance. While Linda acknowledges that knowing about the subject matter is a pre-requisite for teaching that subject, there seems to be an understanding that it needs to be adapted from degree level to an appropriate school level. Philip sees the source of school-level subject knowledge as an exam specification, but Stella, Millie and Florence seem to suggest that their role is to draw on their degree knowledge but that they need to learn how to do that. Wendy, by contrast, is aware that she was not taught how to apply her knowledge and considers this to be a fundamental gap in her preparation. The different purposes attached to academic subject knowledge will be discussed as indicators of different concepts of professionalism.
ii) working at master’s level

Participants saw different aspects of academic, master’s level work as significant. One participant, Wendy, followed a course of ITE which did not offer master’s credits. She said that this was frustrating because for me I felt that it devalued the Schools Direct course. I understand her to be making a link between the academic level of her course and the status of her training.

She also comments on what seems to be a different value of master’s work when talking about completing a conversion to master’s course during her NQT year. She says:

*I was almost kind of getting a broader outlook on my teaching practice and what type of environment… being reflected back on my students that then came into my classroom.*

This comment seems to imply that the ‘broader outlook’ is valuable as part of a thinking and understanding process. Millie makes a similar point:

*I think engaging with reading, engaging with um that master’s level… not only prepares you for the day-to-day role but prepares you to think in the way that you should be thinking for the students and unpicking because that, that is what I think makes you a good teacher.*

Philip too mentions the value of one of the academic requirements of his course, written reflection, which he says actually really helps because it makes you sit down and think.

These three participants seem to me to recognise the impact that an academic approach or analysis has had on the way they think about their practice and therefore to indicate some features of the ‘thinking teacher’ or activist professional. Linda identifies a different value. She has completed her full MA, with a dissertation about mentoring, which she chose because she felt this was weak for her during her ITE. Her purpose is stated as: *we just began our SCITT training course.* I understand her to be implying that, while completing the study would allow her to investigate aspects of mentoring which interested her because of her own experience, the value of the study would be not just for herself. The level and formality of her enquiry would give her conclusions weight, and so would be taken into account by the team setting up the school’s own training scheme.
Florence also seems to me to make a connection between master’s work and being taken seriously when she says that she would like to complete her MA because *I’d like to go up the ladder, really, I’d like to become a Head*. I think her comment suggests that she considers demonstrable high academic achievement to be something that makes a teacher stand out among her peers, and provides credibility for leadership. The emphasis on self-development and utility of the qualification may indicate controlled professionalism, but the status attached to academic recognition may be rooted in a more traditional concept of professionalism.

These six participants have various but positive views of academic, master’s level work as a valuable part of ITE. Cindy however says *I didn’t feel like they (assignments) played a part in my training, I felt like I was writing something for the sake of passing, I didn’t feel like it helped me at all*. In the light of her comments about perceiving her tutor to be out of touch with practice (above), I understand her to feel that practical and theoretical elements of her ITE were not explicitly connected. She says, about the reading her course required *I don’t think I understood, um, because it was about something I didn’t feel I knew anything about yet and there wasn’t any discussion about it*.

Cindy is the only student who makes overt reference to the irrelevance of academic thinking to learning to practise teaching. Given DfE policy rhetoric that teachers require practical rather than academic learning during their ITE, it might be expected that more participants would have expressed this view. I understand that there might be a number of reasons why Cindy may express this view; it may be to do with her particular course, or her personal conviction, for example. It does seem to be a comment that indicates a performative attitude; to doing what is required and is therefore indicative of controlled professionalism. On the other hand, Philip and Millie’s specific reference to the way in which academic thinking about practice was embedded during their training, and continues to be part of their practice, illustrates ways in which academic attitudes may be used to make sense of practice and thereby to contribute to the development of activist professionalism.
2 Knowledge from school

Participants chose to speak about a range of factors connected with learning from school experience. No participants questioned the central importance of school experience in learning to teach; there were many comments that emphasised how much was gained through the opportunity to measure their own capacity for teaching, to be allowed to test ideas for teaching and managing classrooms and to deal with the issues presented during their experience. On the other hand, specific points to do with limitations of particular school contexts were raised. These contrasting observations about practice-based learning will be discussed further in chapter 5.

Philip seems to me to reflect a view that successful teaching comes from innate characteristics and that his placements enabled him to take the role of teacher, he says:

_The more practical elements of it and the actual teaching came more naturally… I tended to spend more time on the theoretical side than I did on developing as a teacher myself_

He talks about the value of having the chance to try things out:

_I got, gained, the greatest amount of success is in trial and error and having that flexibility on PGCE and NQT year of trying something new and it falling flat on its backside and then working out what went wrong and self-reflecting_

He appears to me to identify his learning in school as self-supported rather than directed or managed by school colleagues, whereas Cindy says that she was not necessarily able to see, herself, what was happening in her lessons:

_But you have to be in that situation when you’re training to go through that, experience it and then have someone saying why did…, so explain to me why you carried on and I think sometimes people don’t realise it’s going on, or they’re so panicked._

My understanding is that, particularly in situations where several things may be happening in a class, she needed another person to guide her analysis. She could be seen to be developing a collegial approach, developing towards activist professionalism, or relying on being told ‘what works’, fostering controlled professionalism.
Other participants talked about the role of the teachers they worked with in school, and mentioned some potential difficulties.

You might have a group of professionals in a school that aren’t very up-to-date with current ways... therefore you’ve got all these great ideas but you feel like you can’t use any of them because they’re so set in their ways. (Linda)

When I came as a PGCE student it was almost like ooh good, somebody fresh and new that’s going to give me ideas, and we do don’t we, we come like, down the line, we don’t have the new ideas, we haven’t got time to come up with the new ideas, that’s one thing, time constraints is massive. (Millie)

I think probably another factor which you can’t control is the mentors… all very different people and I think the way that some mentors work works for some people and the way that some mentors work don’t, um, and it’s not always easy to pair people up right at the very beginning… I think it’s a real minefield. (Stella)

The difficulties noted by these participants seem to me to be (i) that class teachers may sometimes be unwilling to allow student teachers to try out their ideas, (ii) that class teachers sometimes do not have the time for the research and reflection required for innovative practice, and (iii) that a good relationship between mentor and student teacher is central to the success of the learning experience. These issues would all limit the ability of a mentor to provide the effective support to develop the effective understanding of practice experienced by Cindy.

Florence raises a concern about the appropriateness of formal professional development provided in school. She comments that:

I think the CPDs at the schools are already there for teachers who understand that already and that practice, it’s just building on it… SCITT trainees won’t have had the basics that were given to them if they went to the university and I think university breaks it down.

I understand her to mean that student teachers are, in some cases, included in existing general CPD provision rather than provided with an ITE-specific programme of professional themes. Her contrast with university provision suggests to me that she sees the university as providing her with the specialist knowledge that guided her practice.
There are further comments about a ‘luck of the draw’ element of the nature of the school in which practical experience takes place. Wendy says *I had obviously one placement at Xxxx and I got a perspective from those two schools but it wasn’t hugely broad.* She appears to me to be aware of the contextual nature of the knowledge gained through experience, that she would have learnt different things in different schools. Cindy makes a similar point:

> *You know, children were well behaved, um, you know, didn’t have an issue and I always think, actually that’s not how you learn, to teach, you need to be in a school where you can deal with the problem, that’s how I learnt to be a teacher.*

She explains that her first teaching post was a more challenging environment than her placement schools and that she therefore felt unprepared. She also mentions how differences between schools’ practice and policy continues to be relevant:

> *So here I feel like I’m building on previous knowledge but when you get to a new school it’s almost like you drop down to the bottom of this tower again, you’re learning how to be a new teacher all over again.*

She seems to me to emphasise the limitations of transferring practical knowledge from one teaching context to another.

The comments presented here suggest to me that knowledge gained in school is seen by participants as highly significant, but that they also talk about ways in which it can be limited in a number of ways: a student teacher may or may not be able to try out ideas, they may have a mentor who is more, or less, able to develop their understanding of their practice, the relationship with the mentor may or may not be positive, formal professional development provided in school may not be tailored for ITE, and a school can only provide experience of that particular context. The comments illustrate some of the difficulties, to be discussed in the next chapter, of putting practice into a broad context in order to develop activist professionalism; to enable teachers to interrogate rather than accept practice.
3 The relationship between theory and practice

In this theme, participants talked about (i) the application of theory to practice, (ii) the place of reflection, and (iii) the importance of contextualising practice. It is not easy to know what individuals mean when they refer to theory, in some cases comments may reflect links between learning in different sites, connecting theory with HE and practice with school and may be an illustration of a significant role for HE beyond a source of potentially irrelevant theory. It would have been interesting to pursue participants’ understanding of what they mean when they refer to theory further. Several comments reveal ways in which participants see reflection as significant in their learning and their practice; the way in which they carry out that reflection and the purpose of reflection is shown here as sometimes personal, sometimes more to do with analysing practice with reference to some theoretical underpinning. The role of HE as other than a source of irrelevant theory is evident again in comments about ways in which participants were able, during their ITE, to contextualise practice either through a theoretical approach or the more social aspects of returning to the university. Findings presented in this section therefore illustrate how knowledge is used differently, how learning from practice may restrict professional development to learning functions, while academic knowledge may be needed to make sense of practice.

i) application of theory to practice

Participants commented on how they related theory to practice during their ITE, attaching different levels of significance to each strand:

> Once you get to placement you realise just how relevant those things were (Linda)

> It sets you up for it, but the shock is seeing it for real, you know, actually being in the classroom, doing it, seeing how, how it actually happens (Philip)

These comments suggest to me that these teachers see practice as ‘real’, as the testing ground for their theoretical knowledge.

Stella seems to consider theoretical preparation as more fundamental. Rather than putting ideas into practice she talks about applying a thinking process:
you don't, if you're not in a position to explain why you're there, you know, if you're not in a position to kind of research ways and methods to teach and then experiment with them, then you know if you went in and, I don't know, just tried to work with a group of students, I think you'd find it tricky

Linda seems to see theory slightly differently. Talking about students going straight into practice, without any theoretical preparation, she says:

*what you'd end up with is two types of students. Those that would just use their initiative and do really well and those that would just sink because they don't have the theoretical underpinning to uphold what they are trying to implement in practice*

Her comments suggest to me that while she thinks it is possible for some people to be ‘natural’ teachers, with no need of academic knowledge, she also thinks that practice is ‘upheld’ by knowledge. She might envisage a model in which student teachers try out teaching and look to academic knowledge to explain or provide answers to difficulties if or when they arise. She says that all of those things I think could be taught the other way round. I understand from this that she sees that practice could be the source of theory, or that theory could be used to explain practice retrospectively.

ii) reflection

Millie appears to me to connect reflection with the relationship between theory and practice. She says:

*Reflection, that's a biggy for me, is why didn't something go well or why do I feel something about a class... and try to unpick it and I think the PGCE definitely sets you up to do that... I'm still as, ... very evidence based and very theoretical and thinking things through and trying to build the curriculum in a similar way... I still go back to ... why you doing that, and I use it with the children, so why am I analysing... it's really stuck and I get, it's really important to realise why we're doing stuff um with children and what they're doing and I even still write lesson plans (whispered)*

Her comments suggest that the way she thinks about her practice was established in her ITE. Rather than moving into relying on a body of accumulated practice (on ‘what works’), she continues to value a formal,
structured analysis of what she intends pupils to learn. She is then able to use that to evaluate her success.

Florence also refers to planning as part of the reflection process:

*I think the planning part, the planning and the um, um, the feedback, the reflection time I think is a very powerful tool*

She seems to me to connect feedback and reflection with herself, in this case with raising her self-belief: *to make me realise that I'm actually better than what people just say.*

Wendy also makes a connection between reflection and herself: *I'm probably quite hard on myself in terms of the reflection because I reflect, I reflect on every lesson... giving myself a hard time about every single lesson.*

It seems to me that these two comments illustrate how the concept of reflection may be being used differently. In one case, it has been established as a positive process of understanding practice, while in the other it seems to be being interpreted as self-criticism.

Cindy seems to see the purpose of reflection as developing her understanding of the pupils she teaches, to use it to rationalise what has happened by means of an analytical process:

*I think I always do that (reflection), um, well, you know, if a lesson goes badly, I'm not thinking, my students are misbehaving, I'm thinking you know, what didn’t I do, I think that’s the way to reflect on something rather than just complaining about the behaviour, they’re behaving that way because they couldn’t access it or it was too easy or too hard or, so you’ve got to change what you’re doing*

Although she takes personal responsibility for the lesson, she seems to me to be saying that she is able to de-personalise her response and is confident that understanding the issues affecting the lesson will enable her to improve the outcome for pupils. The different types of reflection indicated in these comments reflect different concepts of professionalism, ranging from the controlled professional who blames herself, to the activist professional who
rationalises practice by using her academic disposition. The relationship between the two will be discussed further in chapter 5.

iii) contextualising practice

Participants spoke about days spent in university during their ITE as significant. They talked about how doing so developed their understanding of practice by changing their perspective from immersion in the day-to-day to taking a more distant view. They commented on the value of discussion with peers in other schools and how that enabled them to understand the context-specific nature of their own experience.

Wendy had the least opportunity in her ITE to mix with peers, she says:

*Obviously being Schools Direct there was only four of us and that was four of us every week all together and you didn’t get a range of experiences from other people*

She also comments on the value of the opportunities she did have to spend days in university with the rest of her cohort:

*One to kind of come out of the school for a little bit to enable more reflection but two to have that networking as well*

I am struck by the importance she attaches to being away from school to *enable more reflection*, suggesting that it is difficult to see what is happening while immersed in practice, or perhaps that considering peers’ different experience provides a less personal framework in which to consider practice.

Millie refers to university days as *high value*:

*It was that phew moment, that just let’s just talk about that experience and talking about different schools*

There is a similar implication I think, that positioning experience in relation to other experiences was a valuable way of understanding the particular in a more general context.
There were also comments about the importance of the emotional release of sharing their experience and the depth of relationships forged. Stella identifies a reason for the strength of the bond she developed with her peers:

\[\text{because people sometimes, unless they're in it, don't really understand what you’re going through and what, how much of an effect it has on you as a person.}\]

Cindy indicates the level of importance of peer support:

\[\text{So if I didn’t have those people, I definitely wouldn’t have made it through}\]

Florence explains why she still sees her peer group regularly:

\[\text{You can actually speak to someone that that’s not in a school, this school, or a surrounding school… you talk to the people that you trust… I would say it all goes back to being at university and having those days}\]

While Linda says that:

\[\text{Talking to peers and sharing ideas with people that are going through the same process as you, and that was probably my most valuable um sort of experience to talk to other people.}\]

These comments illustrate various ways in which participants drew on different elements, or sources of knowledge, during (and beyond) their ITE to make sense of their developing professional practice. It seems to me that the references identify the value of HE in ITE as offering a distance from school that enables student teachers to take a longer view of their practice in a broader context, to offload emotion in a safe space, as well as to apply theory to practice in a formal way. They exemplify the value of collective working associated with activist professionals; the ‘thinking teachers’ who contribute to the profession as a whole.

\[4\text{ Residual impact of ITE}\]

All participants made some comment about why they remain in teaching, and some link those comments with suggestions about what ITE could include to fit teachers for a long rather than short career. Linda says:
The subject alone is what drew you to teaching that subject… is something that can always keep me in, keep me going as a teacher.

Some mention belief in the value of what they do as their motivation. Philip says:

You can enjoy the rest of your life knowing that you’ve had a massive impact on loads of other people, but yuh, and again, I do mention how rewarding it is, every day is different, you’re not stuck at a desk with the same job over and over again, you have no idea what’s going to happen when you walk through that door, and that’s the beauty of it.

Stella includes ‘why I teach’ as the first step on her diagram, using phrases about her impact, for example:

allow students to believe they can do it
guide students down the right path

She says:

Most teachers need that little reminder that little something special that makes you feel, you know, that they’re doing something to make a change… more emotional kind of connectivity and I’d hope to think that’s what makes people stay in the profession

Cindy also seems to me to see her impact on pupils as people as her continuing motivation to teach:

Relationships for me are the most important…
That’s how we win around children, that’s how you get them to work, they want the sense of pride in wanting to work for their teacher, so if you don’t have that relationship…
I wish more emphasis was put on that when I was training, I think it would have made the beginning of my NQT year much easier… I don’t think that’s something that you think you need to teach someone

There are comments about why participants need to have a belief in the value of what they do. Stella provides an example:

I think it’s just that you know when the monotonies of kind of being badgered to do this and being badgered to do that or you know meeting this deadline, it’s just when maybe things get on top of you, you think my to-do list is as long as my arm, um, I’ve got to keep a smile on my face for these kids.
To me, the language in this extract conveys a sense of relentless pressure. Millie adds some thoughts about sources of pressure which she says you are sheltered from as a trainee:

*burden of assessment, or you know, the looming visit from Ofsted, they are all things that I think contribute to why people leave the profession, definitely. Actually you get caught up in the job and you get caught up in the moan and groans of the day... and it’s exams, and it’s all pressure, pressure, pressure, and moan, moan, moan, but actually the journey to this point was, was nice, and worth it, and there will be many days where I feel positive.*

A further source of pressure is identified by Florence. She comments on her experience of in-school observation and judgement, and the impact on her of a change of leadership:

*All of a sudden ... I wasn’t good enough for them, in his eyes, because we’d had a new Head, he’d just been put in place, and, because I wasn’t teaching in the way that they want me to... so I went from an outstanding teacher to a (sigh) requires improvement teacher in the space of a month.*

She seems to me to say that her teaching did not change, but the criteria for judgement did. This came as a surprise to her:

*I don’t think, as a teacher, I was prepared for that and I think that’s something that maybe needs to go into like into ITTs is that, this can happen, and we’ve got to realise that, having Ofsted and having observations um with people coming in, it is subjective.*

Wendy also refers to pressure:

*It’s hard to know when to switch off, I think, in my training year well-being would’ve been helpful, at some point, when is the cut-off point and are you allowed to have a weekend without looking at your emails.*

For a provider of ITE these comments are interesting in that participants have made a connection between the importance of being aware of their values, their own belief in the value of teaching, as a counter to the impact of managerialism: meeting targets, achieving pupil outcomes, being seen to work hard, the impact of judgemental observation. There is an implication that ITE could and should establish in teachers a way of understanding the political
context in which they work, the complexity of human interaction involved in every classroom event, almost to give them permission to make autonomous decisions about all that is involved in being a teacher. It seems to me that they are suggesting that these are the elements of ITE which might sustain a teacher and enable them to cope with change; change of professional expectations, as well as changes to the curriculum or legislative frameworks. Examples will be used in my discussion as evidence of the de-motivating effect of functional development, leading to controlled professionalism, as opposed to the motivating, collective working, associated with attitudinal development and activist professionalism.

Summary

I have presented my main findings, following the IPA approach, to demonstrate those themes that emerged in the interview data across all participants by stating what was said, and to illustrate the operation of the double hermeneutic by saying how I have understood that data. It is difficult to retain ‘an idiographic focus on the individual voice at the same time as making claims for the larger group’ (Smith et al, 2009, p107); to present the data in such a way as to represent participants’ perceptions accurately, while acknowledging how I have made sense of them making sense of their experience (Smith et al, 2009, p183). Further exploration of the data, and its implications, follows in my discussion of how different knowledge traditions contribute to the formation of different types of professionalism. How the ‘super-coach’ or controlled professional may emerge from reliance on practical know-how, while the ‘thinking teacher’ or activist professional successfully integrates practical and academic knowledge.
Chapter Five: Discussion of Findings

Having identified four main themes in participants’ perceptions of their ITE experience as emerging from my data, this chapter will consider how those themes relate to existing writing. First to Furlong and Whitty’s knowledge traditions and then to Sachs’s model of CPD and teacher professionalism, to deepen our understanding of effective ITE. In particular, the data will provide examples of ways in which the knowledge traditions underpinning ITE could play a part in generating controlled or activist professionalism.

Knowledge traditions

In my literature review I considered how Furlong and Whitty (2017) discuss three main knowledge traditions in ITE, the academic, practical and integrated traditions. In this chapter the findings presented in chapter 4 are used to illuminate that analysis. The themes of ‘academic knowledge’ and ‘learning from school’ evidently associate features of ITE with those knowledge traditions. Some findings presented under ‘the relationship between theory and practice’ are also related to knowledge traditions in that they demonstrate ways in which participants apply their knowledge, thus shedding light on their understanding and application of that knowledge.

Furlong and Whitty (2017) acknowledge that, for all the policy rhetoric that places types of knowledge and sites of learning in opposition, it is not always easy to identify one separately from another. They also suggest that knowledge from the academic traditions is often seen by student teachers to be less relevant than practical knowledge. Those difficulties are apparent in my findings. I will discuss examples of:

- ways in which academic subject knowledge may be seen as directly applicable to practice and therefore ‘relevant’,
- ways in which practice may be seen as the dominant form of learning; as being the overriding purpose of teacher education,
- how, although still regarded as the dominant part of teacher education, participants identify limitations of learning from practice,
• ways in which academic knowledge or attitudes may be used to make sense of practice

Ways in which academic subject knowledge may be seen as directly applicable to practice and therefore ‘relevant’

In the data, subject knowledge is seen as a foundational source of knowledge for teaching, with some differences in understanding of what that knowledge might be. Linda refers to learning about your subject that you’re going to teach as valuable preparation, seeing it as the building blocks that help you directly. Her comment may imply that other knowledge might help you indirectly. I understand what she says to signify an early focus, during ITE, on what is needed for individual survival, seeing the transmission of subject knowledge as key and therefore directly applicable to practice. It suggests how academic subject knowledge may be more obviously ‘relevant’ and contrasts with, for example, Cindy’s comment that she didn’t learn anything about subject knowledge other than in school. Linda is perhaps seeing the subject knowledge required by secondary school pupils as different, and removed from, degree level academic subject knowledge. Her point seems to me to illustrate a weakness identified by Furlong and Whitty (2017) in the academic knowledge tradition; that it is often seen as different from the knowledge used every day in classrooms, it therefore appears distant and irrelevant, to belong to a different world of knowledge.

Some participants comment on how, during ITE, they needed to learn to adapt their existing subject knowledge to make it ‘relevant’. There are comments which suggest that their ITE taught them that they needed to adapt their degree level subject knowledge. Like Yandell (2010) and Wilkins (2011) (who argue against the principle espoused by the New Right that the academic base of teaching is good degree level subject knowledge to be transferred to pupils through skills acquired by observing practitioners at work) they see that their existing subject knowledge does not simply become the subject matter that they teach. For example, Florence’s statement that amazing degree level knowledge of the subject is not useful if not combined with knowledge about running a classroom, Stella’s observation that subject knowledge in school is different from subject knowledge at degree level, or Millie’s observation that it was necessary to learn what to do with her high level subject knowledge.
These comments illustrate Shulman’s (1986, p8) contention that there is a transition from ‘expert student to novice teacher… [transforming] his or her expertise in the subject matter into a form that high school students can comprehend’.

The nature of subject knowledge, whether as an academic discipline or as part of practical knowledge, can be detected in Philip’s comment about changing his teaching subject, and particularly the source of his new knowledge. He suggests that his ITE provided him with transferable, generic skills, or understanding of teaching, and he identifies the source of his subject knowledge as the exam specification. His comment indicates to me that he sees himself as imparting a body of knowledge thus defined (and by inference accepted), perhaps therefore regarding subject knowledge in terms of its utility, and as unproblematic. It is reminiscent of Furlong and Whitty’s (2017, p18) reference to different ways of using academic knowledge; as either contributing to the vertical knowledge of teaching, because that knowledge is ‘context-independent… taking the thinker beyond their immediate experience’ or, as in the case of Philip’s comment, placing it in the everyday, context-specific realm of horizontal knowledge. His comment about other teachers in his new department as a source of subject knowledge suggests that he sees subject knowledge as more horizontal than vertical, providing an example of the type of networked professional knowledge described by Furlong and Whitty (2017) as created and carried out in the context of its application, and therefore a profane discourse. Such knowledge, being practical and ‘relevant’ in that it may be what is required to meet a specification, may be characteristic of the ‘super-coach’, of concentration on the functions of teaching, and is different from Shulman’s (1986) argument that teachers need high level academic subject knowledge if they are to evaluate their curriculum and resources, know how to identify and address misunderstanding and know not only what they have to teach but why.

These examples illustrate a variety of concepts of subject knowledge. It may be seen during ITE as degree level academic knowledge to be transferred, in which case it needs to be adapted to become ‘relevant’; or it may be seen as something different from academic knowledge learnt in a university, as knowledge learnt in school; or as what to do to teach that subject; perhaps simply as a matter of knowing, and accepting, a prescribed curriculum. In each
of these concepts, it seems to have been relatively easily related by participants to practice.

**Ways in which practice may be seen as the dominant form of learning; as being the overriding purpose of teacher education**

There is evidence of ways in which practice may be seen as the focus, and therefore as the dominant source of knowledge, of ITE. For example, Philip refers to practice as *real*, indeed to *the shock* of seeing how what has been learnt in HE actually happens. Linda too states that learning in HE is understood *once you get to placement*. However, it is difficult to know what it is that Philip and Linda mean by putting learning into practice. They may be drawing on what they learnt in HE about teaching strategies, or techniques, as much as how to think about teaching. It may be that there is a less binary division for them between theory and practice, providing an example of the complicated relationship discussed by Young & Muller (2014, p44) between the two, that knowledge from experience can be regarded as ‘specialised knowledge’ when it is understood, sometimes tacitly, by drawing on professional knowledge. Whether Philip and Linda’s comments illustrate the use of one to understand the other depends on whether the learning from HE before their practice is seen by them as a set of strategies to be implemented or as a way of thinking about practice in its broad context. They might demonstrate how, as Winch (2014) explains, systematic knowledge is being used to understand and inform practice and that using one to determine how to embark on the other is an indication of ‘professional formation rather than immersion in a discipline’ (Guile, 2014, p170). Their comments suggest a concept of the teacher as a craft worker, although they do not dismiss what they learnt in university as irrelevant. They may be examples of what Furlong and Whitty (2017, p30) describe where ‘everyday ‘profane’ knowledge is ‘inflected with elements of academic knowledge’.

What Philip and Linda’s comments are clear about is the significance of something, although difficult to define, which they learnt in HE before starting to practice. It is therefore difficult to determine to what extent a student teacher might draw on knowledge acquired in university, or how they use that knowledge to contextualise practice. The formation of a ‘super-coach’ or ‘thinking teacher’ may depend on the individual’s interpretation of their course content as well as on the content *per se*.
In another comment, Linda appears to reflect the DfE policy preference for practice-based learning in her comment that some teachers could learn successfully from practice alone by using their own initiative without preparation in HE. However, she also suggests, much as argued by Ball and Forzani (2009), that although it might be possible to start with practice rather than theory, a theoretical understanding is needed. She uses an interesting phrase, that student teachers need the theoretical underpinning to uphold their practice. I understand her to use uphold to mean justify, or explain; that she thinks that some academic rationale is required to learn from practice. She therefore attaches most importance to learning how to do, with academic knowledge serving the purpose of justifying that action. She seems to me to be illustrating the argument made by Furlong and Whitty (2017) that academic knowledge provides an externally validated basis for practice. Her reference to starting with teaching seems to reflect the idea that ‘beginning with the work of teaching allows teacher educators to work analytically backward from what teachers have to do, to what they have to know and believe’ (Ball & Forzani, 2009, p503). However, Linda does not say that this is necessary for all, she says that some student teachers would do really well by only practising teaching, while others would just sink without theoretical underpinning. This raises the question of what she sees as theoretical underpinning. It is, again, possible that she is referring to theory as a source of ideas about what works. It may be that her comment illustrates Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) emphasis on the need to integrate disciplinary knowledge with its practical application, to make it ‘relevant’, because, although she seems to be aware of the relationship, she does not articulate it specifically.

These examples indicate a complex relationship between theory and practice, not least because it is difficult to know what sort of knowledge participants are referring to when they talk about pre-practice learning in the university or use the term ‘theory’. They do illustrate ways in which practice is seen, perhaps obviously, as the point of training and that therefore whatever knowledge is drawn from ‘theory’ needs to be understood by student teachers as relevant to that goal. The type of knowledge that is presented as ‘theory’ and the way that that is explained as relevant to practice is, of course, dependent to a large extent on the expertise of university tutors and school mentors, on whether those people are themselves ‘super-coaches’ or ‘thinking teachers’. 
How, although still regarded as the dominant part of teacher education, participants identify limitations of learning from practice

While the comments above illustrate the importance attached by some participants to practical application of knowledge in the field, that does not necessarily mean that learning from practice is seen as the only or best way to learn to teach. There are several references to the limitations of learning from practice experienced by participants. These echo Freidson’s (2001, p89) suggested constraints of workplace learning. For example, that a student teacher can only learn about what is happening at the time that the learning is taking place, those supervising the practice may have other, more pressing demands on their time, supervisors may vary in their proficiency, they may not have the opportunity to develop their own theoretical understanding, and sites of learning may not see student teachers as one of the school’s fundamental responsibilities.

The contextual nature of the practical knowledge tradition is illustrated by some participants’ awareness of the narrow experience that one school can provide. In particular, Wendy mentions that the requirement to practice in two schools does not ensure that the second experience will provide a meaningful contrast, and Cindy says that she could not learn as much as she felt she needed about managing challenging behaviour in her placement schools because her experience was only of largely compliant pupils. Her comment reinforces Freidson’s (2001) observation that if a student teacher is learning from practice, her learning is limited by what is available in that context at that time, and provides an example of the limitation of what Furlong and Whitty (2017) describe as a knowledge created in the context of its application. Without resort to abstract concepts to support learning, a student teacher gains ‘practice in what can only be a selection from among all the concrete practical and working knowledge that particular work-settings may require’ (Freidson, 2001, p95). Cindy emphasises Freidson’s point when she states that starting a new school is always like learning to be a new teacher all over again.

Florence’s comment about programmes of professional studies provided by schools further illustrates the context specific nature of knowledge gained in school. She observes that student teachers join CPD that is for teachers who
understand… already and fails to break it [practice] down as the university does. I understand her comment to exemplify Freidson’s (2001) suggestion that schools may not see student teachers as their priority, it suggests rather that schools may expect student teachers to take advantage, or make something of, a programme already in place, rather than experience what Curtis et al (2009, p78) call an ‘explicit curriculum for the placement’. Florence’s observation emphasises ways in which a student teacher can only take advantage of what is on offer, what is happening in that school at that time. Her point illustrates Evans’ (2014) argument that in-school programmes, being context-specific, result in learning how to behave in order to be accepted in that environment rather than providing development ‘with a degree of permanence that exceeds transitoriness’ (ibid., p17). In other words, it does not include what Florence calls the basics, a way of breaking it down for student teachers, both of which, Florence says, characterise learning in the university.

In prioritising learning from practice, or asserting, like the then Secretary of State for Education, that ‘teaching is a craft best learned by observing a master craftsman or woman’ (Gove, 2010) there is an assumption that such master craftsmen or women are available and able to provide student teachers with the knowledge they need to develop. Observations were made by participants in this study about the limitations of that scenario. For example, by Linda that a student teacher may be working with professionals who aren’t very up-to-date or are set in their ways and so are not willing to accept experimentation or innovation as part of learning to teach. The implication is that those teachers may be inclined to expect the student teacher to replicate the practice they see rather than to question, or seek to understand, that practice. It may be that the teachers to whom Linda refers were constrained by their perception of practice as good, based on the standards agenda and inspection regime. Her observation illustrates Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) claim that the competence agenda, by defining teaching in terms of knowledge, skills, understanding and above all the practical skills that new teachers need to develop encourages teachers to play safe, to replicate what is acknowledged in that environment to be ‘good practice’. (The impact of the neo liberal standards agenda on teacher professionalism will be discussed in the next section). Linda’s comment may illustrate Forzani and Ball’s (2009) argument that mentor teachers need to be prepared for working with student teachers; they need to know and be able to
articulate that ‘teaching is specialised work that is distinct from informal, commonplace showing, telling or helping’ (ibid., p498).

A different aspect of the same issue can be detected in Millie’s observation that during her ITE she was regarded by her host department as a welcome source of new ideas. She remarks that in her current experience as a mentor, she too sees student teachers as a source of current knowledge, or ideas, because teachers do not have the time to investigate new practice. Her comment provides an example of how teachers necessarily become increasingly reliant on their ‘everyday knowledge… often sharply distinct from ‘Educational knowledge’” (Furlong & Whitty, 2017, p25). By referring to new ideas rather than, for example, academic debate she may be indicating a type of institutionalisation into a view of knowledge as sharing strategies, typically as part of networked professional learning (Furlong and Whitty, 2017). Biesta et al (2019) also argue that the re-framing of educational research as a source of ‘what works’ rather than as a process of critical enquiry leads teachers to look for new ideas rather than to engage in critical reflection on practice as a collective endeavour. This neither fits a mentor to support a student teacher in interrogating practice nor encourages openness to experimentation and evaluation (Hobby, 2011, Bousted, 2011). Although the ECF (DfE, 2019b) promotes involvement of teachers in ongoing research, it seems to envisage that research as providing access to online resources, and questions remain about where the funding will come from to give teachers the time they need to engage fully (Spendlove, 2019). Millie’s comment suggests a complicated relationship between types of knowledge, in that while the student teacher might reasonably expect her mentor to be the knowledge expert (such as Cindy above), the mentor might see the student teacher as a source of knowledge. She might, on the other hand, equally be suggesting, as discussed by Young and Muller (2014), that a mentor might regard HE as the source of specialised knowledge which might infuse practical knowledge with practical judgement.

A further constraint of learning from practice can be seen in Stella’s comment about the significance of the relationship between mentor and student teacher. She goes so far as to suggest that the way some mentors work works for some people, if the way of working does not suit the student teacher, it is difficult for that person to learn. She seems to be suggesting that mentoring is therefore a complex match of two people. Her concept is different from that of, for
example, Deans for Impact (2016), in which mentoring is seen as a straightforward process of following a set of steps to learn an apparently straightforward type of practical knowledge. The knowledge Stella identifies as important for successful mentoring is connected with interpersonal skills and the ability to understand and frame practice impersonally. Her point also contrasts with the recommendation of the Carter Review (2015) which, while acknowledging the importance of mentors in school-based training, saw the creation of a set of mentor standards (DfE, 2016d) as the way to enhance their status and practice.

These examples provide an indication of how school-based learning may be limited by the contextual nature of that learning. Student teachers can only learn from what is happening at that time in that school, and such knowledge is not necessarily transferable. Because ITE may not be the primary focus of teachers, the learning that is provided is not always appropriate for student teachers at the beginning of their experience, and teachers who become mentors are not always well equipped or motivated to encourage student teachers to interrogate practice. They illustrate the weaknesses of the practical knowledge tradition identified by Furlong and Whitty (2017) as based on competencies and networks, and therefore context specific, individualistic, and lacking any test of validity. While it may appear to be easy to apply, or ‘relevant’, it is difficult for it to be cumulative. It focuses on what works, so turns teachers into technicians, or ‘super-coaches’. The model of teacher as technician is potentially short term because it does not provide a sound basis for making the judgements that teachers are required to make all the time. To do that they need not just to know what works but why it works, with whom it works and crucially whether what they are doing is worthwhile in the first place; to be ‘thinking teachers’. This, Furlong and Whitty (2017) argue, requires the integration of academic and practical knowledge traditions. However, they acknowledge that successful integration of knowledge about teaching, or the ability of a student teacher to see beyond the immediacy of practical knowledge as essential for survival ‘remains problematic’ (ibid., p23).
Ways in which academic knowledge or attitudes may be used to make sense of practice

While participants’ comments discussed so far seem to illustrate ways in which practical knowledge and learning in schools is seen as highly relevant, although not necessarily sufficient in itself, there are also comments which indicate a variety of attitudes to academic knowledge as the study of Education. Some suggest utility in terms of career advancement or perhaps professional status, others to ways in which the academic knowledge tradition is seen by them to be significant in making sense of practice; to provide them with a way of thinking.

Comments from Cindy show how some student teachers may see academic knowledge, or academic practice, as a performative requirement rather than as applicable or relevant to practice. She refers to assignment writing as *writing something for the sake of passing*; similar to evidence found by Perryman (2010, p139) of ITT students ‘jumping through hoops rather than genuinely engaging’ with master’s level research. Cindy’s comment exemplifies a separation of knowledge, with practical knowledge seen to be most relevant and therefore as the source of her knowledge about teaching (*what I did in school*). She seems to echo Hordern’s (2015) analysis of the use of horizontal rather than vertical knowledge and to define her knowledge of teaching as knowing and understanding practical skills, to the extent that, as Furlong & Whitty (2017) indicate, it is possible to see academic knowledge as irrelevant to learning to teach. Such prioritising of practical knowledge is also emphasised in Cindy’s comment about her academic tutor’s lack of recent school teaching experience rendering him *out of touch*. She does not seem to attach importance to his academic status, rather to see it as further evidence of his distance from practice, demonstrating Furlong & Whitty’s (2017, p16) suggestion that a ‘strong commitment to practical work in schools’ leads to ‘the consequent suppression of more traditional forms of Educational theory’. Cindy seems to align her understanding of educational knowledge with learning from practice, also illustrating the underlying principle of DfE policy that the practical knowledge tradition is crucial, to the extent of dismissing the academic knowledge tradition as detrimental to developing teaching skills.
On the other hand, Philip suggests that he knowingly draws on the way he learnt to think about his teaching during his ITE. He says that the written reflection required on his course makes you sit down and think. He reinforces the way he applies an academic requirement to learning from practice in his observation that trial and error is where he had the greatest amount of success in learning to teach and that the more practical elements... the actual teaching came to him naturally. He could be attaching the main importance in his ITE to practical knowledge, but he links trying things out with the ability to self-reflect in order to modify his existing practice. It seems to me that he is using academic approaches to make sense of practice, illustrating Heilbronn’s argument that ITE needs to develop reflective practice beyond ritualistic reflection in order for teachers to ‘digest’ experience and become ‘thinking teachers’ (Heilbronn, 2010b, Lawes, 2010, p156). So, although Philip appears to see knowledge as drawn from practice, and to see craft knowledge as central to his practice, he is aware that he draws in some way on a learnt academic process to make sense of what he does. To some extent therefore, his comments appear to illustrate a way in which his ITE enabled him to achieve some integration of different sources of knowledge (Furlong & Whitty, 2017). I see a contrast between Philip’s use of a learnt structure to assess or analyse his practice and Cindy’s reference to relying on her observer to ask questions about what went wrong during a lesson because sometimes people don’t know what’s going on. Her comment seems to indicate a stronger reliance on practical, craft knowledge, in which, according to Kuhlee and Winch (2017, p232) ‘learning the occupation takes place through apprenticeship conditions’. Rather than make sense of her practice herself, she seems to see school colleagues as the source of knowledge about her teaching.

Other participants do make a connection between academic knowledge and professional status. For example, Linda talks about completing her master’s degree as something that will lead her school to take her views about ITE seriously; implying that the award has validated her knowledge. Similarly, Florence says that completing a master’s degree will enable her to become a head teacher. Both examples could be seen as evidence of academic knowledge being regarded as a performance indicator, or a qualification with a relevant practical application, rather than as connected with analysing and improving practice. They provide further illustration of Perryman’s (2010) findings in which student teachers see academic elements of ITE as
performative rather than intrinsically useful. However, underlying both comments is a suggestion that Linda and Florence have a concept of formal academic attainment providing professional credibility. Since master’s level qualifications are no longer regarded by government as an aspiration for all teachers, and it is therefore not an overt requirement for leadership, they seem to be aware almost subliminally, of Freidson’s (2001, p103) finding that ‘the prestige that distinguishes the professions from the crafts stems from the connection of their training with higher education’. Similarly, Wendy’s concern that her School Direct course was devalued because it led to an honours rather than master’s level academic qualification. She might be implying that that value is connected with her employability, but she may, as with Linda and Florence, indicate a deep-seated view of academic attainment as an indication of status. Her comment particularly illustrates a finding of the Carter Review (DfE, 2015) that, although the concern of ITE is enabling trainees to meet the standards for QTS, student teachers sometimes see ITE courses which do not lead to an academic award as of less value than those which do.

There are comments which appear to connect academic knowledge with practice; to demonstrate how some participants are aware of the ways in which an academic knowledge base affects their understanding of what they do. Stella says that just trying to work with a class of pupils without being in a position to explain why you’re there, to kind of research ways and methods and then experiment with them would be tricky. Tricky may mean that the teacher would not be confident in what she is doing, that that confidence comes from having a secure and somehow valid rationale, or it may mean that she would not have a source of ideas about what to do. It seems to me that Stella thinks that some knowledge, and thinking, is a pre-requisite for success, that relying on practice as the source of knowledge about teaching would be problematic. In this way I understand her comment to illustrate Young & Muller (2013, p234), drawing on Durkheim, who say that ‘the knowledge that we need as a basis for understanding the world… is separate from and prior to the practical activities of people’s everyday lives’, that theoretical knowledge is powerful because ‘it enables those who have access to it to envisage alternative and new possibilities’ (ibid., p245).

This point is further exemplified by Wendy when she identifies the lack of subject knowledge in her ITE as a possible source of the difficulties she feels
she has had, and continues to have. Her comment does not say that she feels the lack in terms of things to do, or knowledge about her subject, she attaches it to broader educational knowledge, to being able to engage pupils. She does not seem to be reflecting on her own shortcomings but to her felt need for a deeper understanding of her purpose, the value of what she does, and being able to communicate that to pupils. A research base, Sachs (2000, p790) says, consolidates ‘the knowledge base of the teaching profession’ and fosters ‘understanding and improvement of practice’… it helps ‘teachers to come to know the epistemological bases of their practice’. I understand Wendy to imply such a view of academic subject knowledge as research-based because she also identifies the value of working at master’s level as giving her a broader outlook on her teaching and the environment in which she was working. This seems to me to indicate her desire to position herself as a teacher in a wider context than her own teaching environment and to see a structured, academic approach as helping her to do so. Her comments illustrate, in particular, the identification by Lawes of the value of academic, accredited, master’s level work as an initiation into teaching. She suggests that it is potentially more creative and likely to foster a more ‘thinking teacher’ (Lawes, 2010, p156) because it offers student teachers a broader overview of professional practice and gives them confidence in their subject knowledge and expertise. She contrasts, as does Wendy, the subjective nature of learning from experience with the objectivity of a secure academic knowledge base.

Overt reference is made by Millie to the continuing significance to her of the academic knowledge and disposition learnt as part of her ITE. She makes specific reference to the master’s level work in her ITE as preparing you to think in the way that you should be thinking and she describes herself as still very evidence-based and very theoretical and thinking things through. She uses the terms unpick and analyse to describe her evaluation of practice and she states that it is for the students. Her focus is therefore impersonal because it is about applying formal, academic knowledge to understanding practice. I understand Millie to be illustrating overtly Hordern’s (2015) explanation of the way in which vertical knowledge is used to understand horizontal knowledge. She seems to me to be using the approaches of the academic knowledge tradition to make sense of practice, to have a framework in which to assess whether what she is doing is worthwhile in the first place, that is in terms of how students are learning, rather than about her own performance. Her comment therefore
seems to provide an example of an instance in which the long-standing problem of linking academic and practical knowledge has been overcome. She illustrates Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) integrated knowledge tradition in practice in the way that she draws on academic knowledge and an academic disposition as the basis of her reflection, the purpose of which is to consider pupils’ learning rather than her own performance. She even identifies her use of one knowledge tradition to make sense of the other as fundamental, as *what makes you a good teacher*.

A particular example of Millie’s use of what Furlong and Whitty (2017, p41) describe as a deliberate structure and design being used to integrate experiential learning and research-based knowledge is her comment about writing lesson plans. She says that she still goes back, in her planning, to asking herself why; that that is something that *has really stuck and I get it, it’s really important to realise why we’re doing stuff with children and what they’re doing*. In this fundamental approach to making decisions about her practice, she echoes Winch’s (2014) view that judgements arise from our ability to assert, reason and justify. She provides an example of grasping the relationship between theory and practice (Guile, 2014) and demonstrates the application of a characteristic of research disposition, identified by Biesta et al (2019), that is asking questions of practice; quite different from seeking solutions or turning to ‘what works’ as a source of planning.

A range of attitudes to academic knowledge is evident in participants’ comments. At one extreme, academic knowledge is dismissed as a performative requirement, as might be the case for a ‘super-coach’. At the other, there are examples of ways in which student teachers may be aware of ways in which they draw on academic knowledge to understand practice, to become ‘thinking teachers’. Where such integration has taken place, participants seem to have consciously adopted academic ways of thinking, or practices, to make sense of what they do. In some cases, there are more complicated references to academic knowledge of Education. Rather than seeing relevance of academic knowledge in the day-to-day work of improving the quality of teaching, some participants seem to attach professional status to externally validated evidence of academic attainment, which could be interpreted as a utilitarian, performative attitude, or as evidence of a, perhaps unconscious, association of academic expertise with professional behaviour.
Summary of ways in which findings indicate different understanding of the knowledge underpinning teaching

Policy, particularly since 2010, suggests in its language that it is self-evident that there is a clear divide in ITE between knowledge that is practical and that which is theoretical, characterised as relevant and irrelevant, and belonging to different traditions in different sites of learning. In this model, school is seen to be where useful learning takes place, while university confuses rather than clarifies the process of learning to teach. In that context, it might be expected that all participants in this study would identify that clear division. However, my findings suggest that that is not necessarily the case.

There is certainly a strong sense from some participants that there might be a tendency, as they embark on ITE, to concentrate on their goal of being a teacher. They illustrate Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) conclusions that student teachers often regard contextual knowledge as more relevant than academic knowledge alone, that academic knowledge can appear distant and needs to be translated so that its relevance is made overt. For example, some participants’ comments suggest that it was important to them to prove, as quickly as possible, that they have the natural characteristics of a teacher, and to demonstrate that they fit into their school. For some, success is perhaps more to do with natural aptitude than applying or acquiring particular knowledge and for some, the knowledge required for teaching, acquired by practising, is largely seen as practical rather than academic. In these cases, learning procedures and skills from other teachers is dominant because that supports them immediately in being seen to be in charge in a classroom, to be like an established teacher. Replicating the practice around them demonstrates conformity and competence; they may develop into proficient ‘super-coaches’.

In cases where learning from practice dominates, where academic knowledge is applied it is academic subject knowledge; its relevance in this case being seen to be straightforward in that a teacher transmits that knowledge to their pupils. Several participants indicate that that knowledge does need to be amended in order to be ‘relevant’, thereby re-emphasising a view that practical knowledge is the main concern. Similarly, for some, where academic knowledge is made ‘relevant’ it is as a performative requirement, either
something needed to pass their ITE course, or, later on, as evidence for career progression.

The weaknesses of learning through practice that emerge from my findings illustrates Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) explanation that practical knowledge is based on competencies, on managerialism, and is individualistic and context specific, that such knowledge does not help teachers develop the ability to make the judgements required of them all the time in their daily work. Various examples have been discussed here, including observations about:

- needing to learn anew when transferring from one school to another because it is only possible to learn from what is available at that time in that school
- the constraints of learning from teachers whose practice is fixed and from school-based CPD designed for established teachers rather than student teachers
- various weaknesses of mentoring, including restrictions on practice by mentors unwilling to allow experimentation, mentors’ reliance on practical knowledge, and the variability of aptitude and enthusiasm among mentors

However, there is also some recognition that student teachers arriving in school after preparation in their university may be a source of knowledge for mentors, that the learning process is therefore complementary. In this instance, rather than school teachers being seen as the source of all knowledge, learning is collaborative across sites of learning.

Although, for some, the relevance of academic knowledge remains obscure, it does appear that some ITE students do understand why their course includes both, how one relates to the other, and why using one to make sense of the other is important. In those cases, participants explain how they integrate forms of academic knowledge with their developing practical knowledge. Examples have been discussed which illustrate how some participants continue to use the academic dispositions learnt as part of their ITE to analyse practice, to plan in a way which requires the teacher to examine their purpose beyond measurable pupil outcomes, to become ‘thinking teachers’. They illustrate Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) conclusion that professional judgement is developed when student teachers learn to question how practice works,
where it works, why it works and ‘crucially’ whether what they are doing is worthwhile in the first place. Making the relevance clear to all student teachers is, as evident in the literature review, a continuing challenge for ITE providers, but the findings discussed here suggest that it is not impossible.

**Professionalism**

In the literature review I discussed concepts of teacher professionalism related particularly to Sachs’s model (2016) in which she suggests that there are fundamental divisions between managerial, or organisational professionalism at one end of a continuum and occupational/democratic professionalism at the other end. She links that continuum with a contrast between functional and attitudinal development. Both are significant determinants of the model of professional behaviour that emerges from the model of professional development. In this discussion I use the continuum between functional and attitudinal development as the framework for my discussion of ways in which participants’ comments illustrate Sachs’s model. I suggest that the ‘super-coach’ is most closely aligned with functional development and controlled professionalism and the ‘thinking teacher’ with attitudinal development and activist professionalism.

**Functional development**

Sachs (2016) suggests that where the focus of professional development is on the functions of teaching, it can lead to an ethos of compliance and accountability, stifling debate and drawing trainers and trainees to the ‘fallacious notion of ‘professional objectivity’ (ibid., p417). Functions of teaching may include how to follow the policy and practice of a school or how to meet a standards agenda in a simplistic measurement of pupil outcomes, skills, techniques or strategies for ‘delivery’ often based on ideas about ‘what works’. When skills are valued over the development of reflective practice and enquiry, Sachs (2016) argues, professional learning becomes context specific and teachers do not develop the capacity for the judgement and decision-making which sustains them in ambiguous situations. Evans (2014) goes so far as to suggest that learning how to behave in order to be accepted in one environment leads to short term competence and is therefore a problem for morale, job satisfaction and motivation.
A particular example of the limitation of practical, context-specific knowledge, is Florence’s reference to what happened to her when the culture of her first school changed because a new head teacher was appointed. The change of head brought with it a different interpretation of ‘what works’ and what ‘good’ teaching looks like. For Florence the result was that all of a sudden the judgement of her teaching moved from outstanding to requires improvement. The way she spoke, with a sigh before requires improvement, conveys a sense of deep personal disappointment. All of a sudden suggests that she was not prepared for the possibility that judgements of teaching are subjective; instead accepting the assessment criteria underlying the standards passively, as fixed. Her comment suggests that she had acquired an attitude, characterised by Moore & Clarke (2016) as acceptance rather than interrogation.

By prioritising technical expertise that would lead to ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ judgements, it appears that Florence had been seeing teaching in terms described by Moore and Clarke (2016) of right or wrong, and therefore as straightforward. Because she had accepted observation criteria uncritically, when those criteria changed she did not have a way of making sense of that, other than in terms of her personal failing. She perceived that it was she who had gone from an outstanding teacher to a requires improvement teacher, rather than being able to draw on a theoretical approach to make sense of or challenge the judgement of her teaching. She seems to see that judgement as imposed, providing an example of Bourke et al’s (2015, p89) characterisation of observation as ‘hierarchical’. They suggest that ‘teachers’ productivity is made visible, they are seen as ‘describable or analysable objects whose value can be examined, measured and compared with others’. Florence’s comment seems to typify a ‘restricted’ type of professionalism rather than the ‘extended professionalism that entails reflecting on the wider context of an immediate problem’ (Hoyle and Wallace, 2005, p10). It illustrates Sachs’s concept of controlled professionalism in which, as Florence demonstrates, concentration is on how to get a top grade. It provides another illustration of Evans’s (2014) conclusion that functional development is disempowering and thereby demotivating.

The apparent certainty of learning to do ‘what works’ and replicate ‘good practice’ has an obvious appeal in its simplicity, it turns teaching into the
measurable technique underpinning managerial professionalism. It avoids the uncertainty of seeing teaching as ‘unforgivingly complex’ (Cochran-Smith, 2003). However, Florence’s example shows how confidence can be undermined if such a teacher is not able to take a critical approach to practice in order to make sense of what is happening in their classroom. The extreme, in controlled professionalism, of accepting, and striving to meet, the standards agenda, leaves teachers able to succeed in the short term but not able to question practice. Daniels’s (2018) reflection is illuminating here too in providing an example of the desire to ‘get it right’ as a student teacher, to seek out those with a similar focus on practical success and conformity rather than to enter the more threatening area of critical enquiry into that practice. As Sachs (2016) maintains, when teachers are not able to draw on their own analysis of teaching they lack autonomy, they become controlled by external regimes and, as a result, timid and risk-averse practitioners.

One of the constraints of learning from practice discussed in the previous section is that practising teachers become a student teacher’s source of knowledge about teaching, and that that knowledge may be restricted to practical skills. Mentor teachers also provide models of professionalism, and the link between functional development, practical knowledge and a potentially restricted type of professionalism is illustrated by the same comments. If the mentors working with student teachers are themselves not in a position to question practice, unpick it, and give feedback beyond functional advice, they are likely to reinforce the propensity of some student teachers to seek the way to get it right, to get ‘good’ grades. Linda and Millie’s comments about the teachers they worked with being set in their ways or lacking new ideas suggests to me evidence of the risk-averse practice that Sachs (2016) argues results from the managerial agenda in schools. The main focus for teachers, she says, is likely to be pupil outcomes, they are therefore constrained by the judgements that will be made of them based on those outcomes. They are then, understandably, loath to allow student teachers to try out ideas, preferring to stick to their tried and tested safe practice. Because they are performance oriented, they draw on workplace discourses (Furlong & Whitty, 2017) and focus on ‘what works’. These may be the ‘post-performative’, or ‘twenty-first century teachers’ (Wilkins, 2011, Bourke et al, 2015) who accept the improvement agenda rather than question practice. They are threatened by new ideas rather than in a position to encourage student teachers to analyse
practice. Through immersion in and acceptance of safe practice they become controlled or compliant professionals for whom managing classrooms is a ‘simple business’ (Moore & Clarke, 2016, p674). For them ‘uncertainty is a threat; its admission is a sign of weakness’ (Schön, 1983, p63) rather than an underlying principle of investigating practice. If the teachers from whom student teachers learn are themselves controlled or compliant professionals, the model they present is at odds with one in which academic practice or knowledge is valued and complexity acknowledged. The appeal of a simple concept of ‘good’ teaching is reinforced by them and is likely to add to the difficulty that some student teachers may have of seeing the value of academic knowledge.

A mentor may therefore be part of a performative culture, promoting a simple model of learning ‘what works’, and codifying the requirements of the role as a set of standards (DfE, 2016d). Such a model of mentoring presents the role as concerned with functional development. However, when Stella comments on the central role of the mentor she emphasises the importance and difficulty of ensuring that that teacher has the appropriate personal characteristics. She sees that it is a complex relationship, that a mentor might work well with one student teacher but not another, therefore illustrating Heilbronn’s (2010b) conclusion that mentoring is not simply a process of carrying out ritualistic observation and reflection. I think Stella’s comment illustrates a more complex interplay between mentor and student teacher than identifying the functions of the role of mentor. Her comment is more closely aligned with Davies (2011) who explains that mentors need to understand the process of mentoring, to know what they are doing when they observe and provide feedback. Stella seems to stress that the professional relationship between student and mentor affects the giving and receiving of feedback, echoing Evans (2014, p11) who suggests that at the heart of the role, a mentor must be able to develop in student teachers ‘the mental internalisation process’ that leads to analysing practice. To achieve that, mentors need to draw on other forms of knowledge than functions and uncritical adoption of strategies which ‘work’; they need to be interested in the student teacher’s development beyond replicating practice.

The examples discussed here show an obvious connection between functional development and practical knowledge, learning functions being much the same as relying on practice for knowledge. The concept of teaching as simple and
therefore natural, and achievable, deprives student teachers of the opportunity to question practice. Accepting ‘good’ practice discourages questioning and does not require professional judgement. Participants’ comments illustrate the way in which functional development, generating the ‘super-coach’, seems to be short term because, if the certainty of ‘good’ practice is undermined, the teacher has no way of making sense of that change.

Attitudinal development

Sachs (2016) sets attitudinal development in opposition to functional development. She suggests that by nature it is motivational because it promotes confidence, creativity and encompasses moral purpose. Within attitudinal development she places collaborative professionalism, reflecting aspects of managerialism, and activist professionalism, reflecting democratic, occupational professionalism. In this section I discuss findings which illustrate each of those concepts of professionalism.

Collaborative professionalism

Several comments suggest that participants attach importance to reflective learning. Some seem to refer to an enquiring, problematising approach more typical of activist professionalism, while some refer to evaluation of their individual practice in a more managerial context which I interpret as typical of Sachs’s collaborative professionalism. Wendy’s comment that she gives herself a hard time about each lesson suggests to me that reflection can be connected with personal success or failure. Her comment seems to me to be connected with judgement of individual performance and to reflect Ball’s (2003, p217) reference to a context in which ‘teachers are… encouraged to think about themselves as individuals who calculate about themselves, ‘add value’ to themselves, improve their productivity, strive for excellence and live an existence of calculation’. There is the potential for the process to reduce confidence by fostering self-criticism, looking for failing, rather than using a framework in which to gauge success.

On the other hand, Florence talks about how her confidence has been boosted through the procedure of observation and reflection. In this case, she specifically mentions feedback as part of the reflection process and her
comment indicates another version of reflection, as judgement, in this case judgement by other teachers. Reliance on the judgement of others in this reference has been positive, and contrasts sharply with her negative experience in a previous environment. She implies that her recent feedback has been less judgemental, and more developmental but that it has perhaps been a matter of luck, of fitting in better to a new environment. Her comment suggests to me the importance of teachers being able to draw on a critical, academic approach to use to de-personalise judgements of their teaching or to be able to explain, or justify, their practice to others. It illustrates how, according to Hafez (2011, p21), relying on the judgement of others may deprive teachers of their autonomy, of using their own professional judgement, it ‘undermines their professionalism’. It is from the exercise of that professional judgement that they derive their motivation (Evans, 2008).

These examples indicate that, while some participants recognise that reflection on their practice is important and is part of evaluating and improving practice, they see it in a performative context. Rather than using academic dispositions to understand, analyse and stand up for their own practice, they tend to either seek and accept hierarchical judgement or see the process as one of self-criticism. Both seem to reflect the individualistic element of collaborative professionalism identified by Sachs (2016) as limiting. Their emphasis is on the practical application of their knowledge, suggesting to me a post-performative (Wilkins, 2011) application of both. While they identify as reflective learners, their process and purpose is within the constraints of managerial professionalism. It may be that their induction into reflective practice during their ITE remained ritualistic (Heilbronn, 2010b) or that the value of drawing on context-free professional academic knowledge in the process, has not been made overt to them during their ITE, or indeed that student teachers may choose to focus on what appears to them to be relevant at the time. The reflection illustrated here seems to be based on applying and judging practical knowledge, and the collaboration with colleagues is limited to collective acceptance of ‘what works’, or what makes teaching ‘good’.
Activist professionalism

The concept of reflection is presented differently in Sachs’s concept of activist professionalism in which reflective practice is particularly characterised by the use of academic dispositions to interrogate or make sense of practice. An example of this difference can be seen in Cindy’s comment that she reflects on lessons in order to understand rather than complain about pupils’ behaviour. She seems to indicate some de-personalisation of her perceived difficulties in the lesson in that she tries to identify links between the way pupils are in the lesson and the way in which she has considered the needs and interests of the individuals she is teaching. She seems to be exercising professional autonomy, and illustrating Sachs’s (2011, p162) reference to a reimagined set of social relations ‘where teachers and students are cast as learners and working together in a collective endeavour’.

Millie’s comment about unpicking and analysing her teaching for the students seems to typify a ‘thinking teacher’ and to reflect Sachs’s (2000, p79) explanation of activist professionalism as characteristic of occupational or democratic professionalism which is inclined to ‘foster understanding and improvement of practice; and to help teachers to come to know the epistemological bases of their practice’. Millie seems to demonstrate confidence in what she does, in that, as Sachs (2016) suggests, she feels accountable to the students she teaches, she knows what that means to her, rather than seeking to satisfy quality measures imposed by policy and associated with the managerial policy agenda. Millie’s view fits with Freidson’s (2001, p35) discussion of professionalism more generally, the ‘ideal-typical position’ that:

the occupation uses in its work a complex body of formal knowledge and skill that commands abstract concepts or theories and requires the exercise of a considerable amount of discretion (Freidson, 2001, p83)

Millie’s independence of thought is also evident in her comment about writing lesson plans. Writing lesson plans is presented, in managerial policy, as an element of unnecessary workload (DfE, 2018a). The workload report on planning (DfE, 2016e) suggests that teachers write lesson plans because that is what Ofsted inspectors require, that they therefore serve a functional, hoop-jumping, purpose. I understand Millie to be aware that the expectation is now
that teachers will not write plans because she whispers her ‘confession’. She places writing lesson plans in her process of analysis, recalling her ITE tutor’s key question underpinning the process of planning and analysis: so that…? That key question is included in her diagram side-by-side with lesson plans under the section she calls *what was important*. Her disposition to question practice, of planning as part of a process of analysis, shows how she uses an academic way of thinking to provide a framework for her analysis, illustrating Shalem’s (2014) distinction between professional and ordinary judgement. She says that she uses the same reflective question to try to *build the curriculum*, which seems to me to exemplify Sachs’s characteristic of activist, occupational professionalism in which Millie is concerned with the what and how of teaching beyond herself. She sees that she has a developmental role in working with others to agree a curriculum. Rather than sharing her own ‘good practice’ with other teachers, she is working collectively with them.

I understand Millie’s explanation to show a level of confident, autonomous practice because she does not feel that she has to conform to an expectation. She is not undermining accepted practice but is operating autonomously, illustrating Evans’s (2008) explanation of attitudinal development as empowering and motivational as opposed to imposed functional development. Her position contrasts with Wendy’s comment that she needs to be seen to be working all the time. Sachs (2016, p415) identifies such a divide: on the one hand ‘accountabilities identified by teachers themselves,’ contrasted with, on the other, ‘the accountabilities identified by government and employers’. The latter, she suggests, leads to a ‘form of self-surveillance by teachers and their peers… teachers are watching each other as well as watching themselves’ (Sachs, 2016, p416). Accountability and control by government is included by Sachs as a characteristic of controlled professionalism, diametrically opposed to activist professionalism in which teachers are able to make autonomous decisions. Wendy’s comment seems to exemplify Ball’s (2003, p216) observation that in the performative, managerial atmosphere ‘struggles are often internalised and set the care of the self against duty to others’. Wendy’s suggestion that her ITE could have helped her by including *well-being* might echo the recommendation of the *Carter Review* (DfE, 2015) that strategies to manage stress and workload might be included in ITE. However, she may be thinking about the attitudinal development that is evident in Millie’s comment. For Mille, adopting an academically critical attitude to understand and
contextualise practice has almost given her permission to question the expectations she perceives around her; an ability, and confidence, to stand up for her own practice; an attitude which could be applied to a range of practical, contextual difficulties typical of Hoyle and Wallace’s (2005, p10) ‘extended professionalism that entails reflecting on the wider context of an immediate problem’.

There are several comments that provide evidence of the value to individuals, during their ITE, of the collective working that Sachs (2016) associates with activist professionalism. In particular, Wendy and Millie refer to opportunities to get away from school, to go to the university, as enabling them to talk about experience, talk about different schools, have access to a range of experiences, and share ideas. Their comments illustrate what Sachs (2011, p162) refers to as ‘a collective endeavour; where risk taking is promoted and supported’ and what Lawes (2010, p161) calls ‘a sort of haven for student teachers to meet, discuss and explore new ideas and to talk about their practice – a key element in the development of reflective practice’. Wendy says that this opportunity enabled more reflection which I understand to mean raise questions and contextualise knowledge, to develop ways of thinking about practice. Millie, similarly, refers to the high value and that phew moment of days spent out of school in university and both participants’ comments echo Yandell’s (2010, p27) reference to the return to the university from practice as ‘peripheral participation’ which can be a ‘privileged vantage point, a position from which to make sense of the hurly-burly’. He suggests that the distance and environment facilitates reflection which moves towards a consideration of how the immediate activity of self-evaluation might be located in a much bigger picture: a picture that may include the practitioner’s own history, dispositions, prejudices and fears, as well as the wider social historical and cultural contexts in which schooling itself is situated’ (Yandell, 2010, p24).

Wendy and Millie’s comments seem to suggest that distance, discussion with a range of other student teachers, and comparison of a range of contexts, enables them to consider their accountability and purpose in a wider sense than meeting the demands of a particular school. They illustrate Sachs’s (2016, p415) activist professionalism in which they are ‘accountable to the students they teach and the communities in which they work’. By contrast,
Wendy refers to being part of a small ITE cohort as limiting because you don’t get a range of experiences from other people.

The value of a community beyond the school is also identified as highly significant by participants as a means of managing the emotional impact of learning to teach. According to Freidson (2001, P102), a feature of professional training is that it requires a high degree of commitment. It involves becoming socialised into ‘a distinct occupational culture that is shared with fellow-students, reinforced and elaborated first by the faculty and later by colleagues in practice' and is ‘also likely to foster a deep interest in the specialized knowledge and skill upon which it is focused’. Stella exemplifies this view when she talks about the need to discuss with others the effect of ITE on you as a person. Sharing the experience is described by Linda as probably my most valuable... experience, and Cindy definitely wouldn’t have made it through without the opportunity for mutual understanding of the impact on her of learning to teach. Contact with her fellow ITE students, now teaching in various schools, is identified by Florence as being still a highly significant source of support. She refers to the importance of trust among the group, which echoes, on a small scale, Sachs’s (2003b) characteristic of democratic, activist professionalism as adopted by unions and other professional bodies, those with a view of education in a broad context, (and on the side of the teacher) which she explains as contrasting with the way in which managerial professionalism is advocated by systems and employers as a means of control.

These examples seem to indicate ways in which activist professionalism is characterised by the integration of the academic and practical knowledge traditions. Where student teachers have learnt to integrate the two, to use one to understand the other, they are able to see themselves in a broader context than a single school, and to see their purpose as wider than the attainment of individual pupils in a classroom for which the teacher is held accountable. They have developed the ways of thinking that enable them to be autonomous and confident.
Residual impact of attitudinal development versus functional development

If functional development ‘diminishes teachers’ self-confidence, creativity and the moral purpose that sustains them in ambiguous and difficult situations’ (Sachs, 2016, p423) because it is connected with accountability, attitudinal development fosters autonomy, because it is intellectual and motivational (Evans, 2008). It is characterised by integrating academic knowledge with practical knowledge so that student teachers can develop a ‘heightened understanding of the broader role that occupational practice plays in the society in which it operates’ (Winch, 2010, p115).

There are comments from participants which indicate that it is this sense of the value of what they do that encourages them to remain in teaching. Linda, for example, refers to teaching her subject as the thing that will always keep me going as a teacher, suggesting to me a combination of love of the subject and conviction about the value of that subject to pupils. There is an implication that she has learnt how to apply her subject knowledge well enough to foster success and job satisfaction, illustrating Shulman’s (1986) rationale for the central importance of applied subject knowledge. He suggests that this is the case because a teacher needs to be able to evaluate subject specific materials, to understand why a given topic is particularly central to a discipline and to transform their understanding into ‘instruction that their students can comprehend’ (ibid., p8). By contrast Wendy identifies a lack of subject specific elements in her ITE as leading to the difficulties she experiences now in motivating her students. She seems to me to have become aware, as time has passed, that her knowledge of her subject learnt through practical experience in school has not helped her to acquire a depth of understanding on which to draw to analyse her practice.

There is some contrast between the detrimental impact on motivation of a functional, individualistic approach, characterised by a drive or requirement to meet targets, and a fulfilling, moral purpose. Stella in particular illustrates this contrast when she talks of the monotonies of kind of being badgered as a cause of feeling overwhelmed, being countered for her by focussing on what she values in her work. What she values is building pupils self-belief and guiding them down the right path. This illustrates to me that a long term or sustaining
feature of ITE is situating practice in the broad context of education in society. Millie similarly identifies aspects of the performative culture: the *looming visit from Ofsted* and being *caught up in the job, …exams*, as a source of *pressure, pressure, pressure* and *moan, moan, moan*. For her, remembering the positive days of helping pupils *to get to this point* echoes the focus in her diagram on the impact of her ITE on her: *family, work: purpose*. These comments illustrate Freidson’s (2001) characteristics of ideal-typical professionalism as something in which members of a profession work for job satisfaction rather than for a high salary, that job satisfaction comes from knowing that they have performed well. ‘Satisfaction is intrinsic to the performance of work that is interesting and challenging because it is complex and requires the exercise of discretion’ (Freidson, 2001, p108). Stella and Millie’s comments are similar to Te Riele et al’s (2017, p66) findings which they argue suggest that ‘affective labour offers the opportunity for resistance to neoliberal imperatives and allows teachers to focus on the aspects of the work they themselves value’. What keeps them going is not their salary or meeting performance targets, their commitment reflects Ball’s (2003, p218) ‘older ethics of professional judgement and co-operation’. Their purpose appears to be situated in the broad context of academic knowledge rather than confined to the restricted context of practical knowledge.

Philip also talks about the value of having a *massive impact on loads of other people* and he adds that the infinite variety of teaching is the *beauty of it*. He makes a connection with the challenge that comes from having *no idea what’s going to happen when you walk through that door*. He seems to illustrate a fundamental feature of professionalism, according to Freidson (2001), in identifying the requirement to make discretionary judgements rather than to simply apply techniques. His reflection suggests that the challenge that he values comes from adapting ‘to the confusion and impurity of practical affairs where knowledge is incomplete and resources finite’ (Freidson, 2001, p100). To do so requires knowledge beyond technique and strategy; ‘conceptual knowledge is what teachers use to build their professional judgements and develop reflective practice (Tatto & Hordern, 2017, p255).

Particular emphasis is put on the emotional aspect of teaching by Stella and Cindy. Stella comments that the importance of her work is *emotional connectivity* and links that with *doing something to make a change*. Cindy says
that relationships with pupils are key, that’s how you get them to work and that forging those relationships should have been emphasised in her training. She acknowledges that it might be assumed by teacher educators that forging relationships is a natural attribute rather than something that needs to be taught. She seems to illustrate Campbell’s (2008, p361) point that, in the last decades of the twentieth century ‘direct connections to the ethical professional practice of teachers were left implicit rather than being the focus of theoretical or empirical inquiry’. If ITE concentrates on covering a list of topics or the acquisition of skills needed to meet performance criteria, there is a danger that it loses sight of the significance of the less tangible, certainly less testable interpersonal characteristics of professionals. Moore and Clarke (2016, p667) tell us that entrants to teaching are ‘largely driven to their chosen profession by a desire to do their best for young learners and, more broadly, to contribute something positive to society’, and it seems from participants’ comments in this study that that continues to be a key motivation beyond ITE. If new teachers are to be equipped to cope with workplace demands and change (of curriculum, school, the performance agenda) comments from participants suggest that ITE needs somehow to ensure that it continues to enable new entrants to have a strong sense of the broader ethical and moral purpose of what they do.

The examples considered here indicate to me that participants have been helped to make sense of, or cope with, the day to day demands of teaching through attitudinal development during their ITE. They have valued the opportunity to take a view from a distance, in these cases through the return to the university, because that was where they could contextualise their practical knowledge, and become socialised into a wider community than their practice school(s). Both aspects seem to have helped them to understand what they were trying to achieve and to place their practice in the broader moral and ethical dimension through shared experience and reference to purpose beyond the immediate practical need and individual performance. There is evidence that, where participants are knowingly able to apply academic attitudes and modes of critical enquiry to reflection on practice, they are able to stand up for their own practice, to justify it, and thereby to accommodate it within a performative agenda that imposes judgements and expectations on them. Features of ITE that have enabled participants to accommodate their sense of value, requiring conceptual understanding and the academic disposition to
question practice appear to have contributed to sustaining these participants in their careers.

**Summary**

This discussion provides illustrations of the ways in which, as Sachs and Evans suggest, the lasting value of ITE seems to lie in attitudinal rather than functional development. Examples have indicated that attitudinal development, being that which works towards a concept of the ‘thinking teacher’, a professional able to make autonomous decisions, is based on academic approaches, whereas functional development works towards controlled or compliant professionalism, and is based on the practical knowledge traditions. Reliance on the practical knowledge tradition of learning through apprenticeship seems, as argued by Furlong and Whitty (2017) to leave new teachers able to cope in the context in which their knowledge has been acquired but unable to understand that knowledge in a broader context. It leads to uncritical acceptance of the managerial standards agenda and leaves teachers unable to justify their practice; their aim is to comply with an agenda without necessarily understanding the constructed nature of that agenda. When change happens, those teachers flounder because their certainty is undermined. On the other hand, ITE which draws on the academic knowledge traditions enables new teachers to contextualise and question practice (Furlong & Whitty, 2017) and to operate autonomously; they appear to be able to stand up for themselves and to justify their practice because they understand why as well as what they do.

My discussion raises questions for ITE providers about what ITE should aspire to achieve if initial teacher education is to equip teachers for a long term, fulfilling, professional career.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

Having considered how my findings add to our understanding of the existing literature and in particular to Furlong and Whitty’s knowledge traditions and Sachs’s model of teacher professionalism, this chapter will consider the relationship between the two, and the implications for ITE. I have discussed ways in which different knowledge traditions have been drawn on by different participants and how the knowledge they see as significant is linked with different concepts of professionalism. I have not sought to evaluate particular ITE courses or approaches, or to categorise individuals, rather to consider their comments as presented to me. It is evident that the same course of ITE is not perceived in the same way by all its students. Four participants experienced the same course (the course I know inside out) and recalled details differently. I find that helpful in demonstrating that, across all participants, perception of the value of their ITE is necessarily affected by their experience since qualifying, by what has proved to be relevant to them in their particular context, but seems also to be affected by personal inclination or interpretation of course content, procedure, and organisation.

Relationship between knowledge traditions and concepts of professionalism

In the introduction I explained that when I was a CPD manager in school it seemed to me that those teachers who had learnt to think about, and question practice, had as a consequence, retained their sense of purpose. They continued to be interested in what they did because they were continually asking questions about why, rather than what they were teaching. I made a connection, like Grossman (1990), that their questioning disposition had been established during their ITE and that that was why they were open to debate, and willing to contribute to our collective endeavour in CPD. I also referred to the findings of my IFS in which school-based ITE managers expressed the view that ITE should aspire to develop ‘thinking’ teachers rather than ‘super coaches’. Participants suggested that contributing to the debate in schools, and understanding the social and political dimensions of teaching were equally, or more, important than the ability to prepare pupils for exams. In the literature review I examined concepts of teacher professionalism, in particular Sachs’s (2016) model. Sachs (2000) presents activist professionalism as the model
nearest to ideal-typical professionalism (Freidson, 2001), or autonomous, extended professionalism (Hoyle & Wallace, 2005) and therefore as echoing the aspiration of my IFS participants that new teachers should be ‘thinking teachers’. Sachs (2000) suggests that activist professionalism is rooted in a traditional view of professionalism because it is based on expertise (the ‘occupational group’ has exclusive knowledge and practice) altruism (ethical concern by the group for its clients) and autonomy (the professional’s right to exercise some control over their choice of action). She locates it within the concept of democratic professionalism because it emphasises collaboration and cooperation across the ‘occupational group’ (ibid., p77). Thus, the individual teacher is acknowledged to have responsibility beyond their own classroom; they are seen to be, or see themselves as ‘contributing to the school, the system, other students, the wider community and collective responsibilities of teachers themselves as a group and the broader profession’ (ibid., p78).

My findings suggest that some student teachers start out with a conviction that they will learn how to teach by practising teaching in school, and that conviction sometimes remains throughout their ITE. When they concentrate in this way on the practical knowledge traditions, the tendency appears to be towards acceptance of a dominant culture in school, leading them to replicate rather than question practice. Such passive receipt of knowledge and development of skills is typical of restricted professionalism and stems from a managerial agenda in which teachers become controlled by meeting the demands of the quality assurance regime. On the other hand, where participants indicate that they have drawn on academic knowledge to inform their practice they appear to understand their teaching in a broader context than their school and are able to justify their practice with conviction. That capacity is the basis of autonomous, activist professionalism in which teachers work together rather than in competition with each other, thereby demonstrating characteristics of democratic or occupational professionalism.

To summarise those connections, I have adapted Sachs’s (2016) model of CPD and Teacher Professionalism to show how my findings suggest that it might align with Furlong and Whitty’s (2017) knowledge traditions (figure 10). I have indicated in blue how participants’ comments seem to connect particular knowledge traditions with models of professionalism. The green text identifies
the proponents of organisational/managerial professionalism and occupational/democratic professionalism and the knowledge traditions underpinning those concepts. The red text summarises the implications I have drawn from my findings about the impact of functional and attitudinal development. The orange text shows the relationship between the general descriptors ‘super-coach’ and ‘thinking teacher’ and my research.

**Figure 10: Connections between Sachs’s model of CPD and Teacher Professionalism and Furlong and Whitty’s Knowledge Traditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘super-coach’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not equipped for change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and control by Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive recipient of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical knowledge tradition in opposition to academic knowledge tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROLLED PROFESSIONALISM</th>
<th>COMPLIANT PROFESSIONALISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational or Managerial Professionalism</td>
<td>Occupational or Democratic Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE, and practical knowledge tradition</td>
<td>HE and integrated knowledge tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedurally driven professional renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethink and renew practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscribed collaborative learning networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as reflective learner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher working individually towards their own improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated knowledge tradition with more emphasis on practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATIVE PROFESSIONALISM</th>
<th>ACTIVIST PROFESSIONALISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Development</td>
<td>‘thinking teacher’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value understood as values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible to see from the diagram how my findings illustrate the relationship between Furlong and Whitty’s knowledge traditions and Sachs’s models of professionalism. The characteristics of functional development draw on practical knowledge and limit new teachers to controlled or compliant behaviours which fulfil the apparently straightforward demands of managerial professionalism. ITE which draws only on practical knowledge is likely to generate teachers who are ready to ‘deliver’, to meet externally imposed criteria. They become controlled by the quality assurance criteria in operation at the time of their training and have no means of making sense of their practice when those criteria change. At the other extreme, the characteristics of attitudinal development emerge from an ITE that has successfully integrated the academic and practical knowledge traditions. Activist professionals use critical enquiry to think about their practice. As a result, they are able to determine their own purpose in a broad social endeavour rather than operate in a limited context. They have confidence in their moral purpose and commitment to a values-driven profession. It is this which sustains them in the long term.

‘Super-coach’ and ‘thinking teacher’ are at the edge of the diagram because these are general, unspecific terms used casually in an interview conversation. I have worked inwards to explore their possible meaning through my research. The ‘super-coach’ emerges from functional development and may include some or all the characteristics of controlled and compliant professionalism. The ‘thinking teacher’ is one who integrates academic and practical knowledge to develop her understanding of what she, as part of the teaching profession, is trying to achieve. She is likely to exhibit characteristics of activist professionalism.

**Practical knowledge and functional development**

While my discussion concludes that participants’ comments illustrate Sachs’s (2016) arguments that attitudinal development, and activist professionalism in particular, is motivating and sustaining, and is founded in the integrated knowledge tradition, I also found illustration, among some participants’ comments, of a preference for, or inclination towards functional development and managerial professionalism, even among those who had experienced the same ITE course. To me, that implies that whatever the structure and content
of the course, student teachers may themselves focus on particular aspects. (There are of course variations within a course, such as different tutors, different school contexts or mentors, and different subject groups which could affect the way a student teacher attaches relevance to aspects of the course). Illustrative of the way that the same ITE, based in the same knowledge tradition, can be used differently is Daniels’s blog post (2018) referring to the ‘lightbulb moment’ four years after qualifying when she understood the relationship between theory and practice; why the academic knowledge in her ITE was relevant to her practice. Daniels explains how she chose to focus during her ITE on practical knowledge and was influenced to continue to do so by her mentor in school, while being aware that others in her group ‘got it’ from the start. If, as in Daniels’ experience, and my findings illustrate, the integrated knowledge tradition provides the foundation for activist, autonomous professionalism which sustains teachers in their careers, it may seem ‘obvious’ that ITE should promote that foundation, and that student teachers need to understand the inter-relationship between the practical and academic knowledge traditions. Even if the inter-relationship is not understood at the time, its value may be understood later. If such a conclusion is ‘obvious’, that leads me to consider why it is that functional development has such an appeal.

A reason that some student teachers appear to concentrate on functional development at the beginning of their ITE seems to be the immediacy of survival in their classroom, a desire to know ‘what works’ in order to be seen to be a ‘real’ teacher straight away. For those students, school colleagues are the primary source of knowledge, with HE tutors’ value appearing to lie in their relevant and current experience as a school teacher rather than in their academic expertise. I understand the attraction to be in the simplicity of replicating practice that will lead to assured judgement of being a good, or better, teacher. If there appear to be set criteria embedded in the external (and perhaps therefore understood to be objective) judgement of Ofsted, and those can be met, the process is straightforward and achievable. Meeting the standards, and associated observation criteria, allows the student teacher to feel secure and successful. In this model, and at the beginning of training, it is perhaps easier for student teachers to see the relevance of learning through practice, demonstrating that they have the attributes required for success in the classroom. In this conception teaching may be seen as an aptitude, rather than as based on knowledge (however difficult it might be to grasp, or define that
knowledge). It may be more reassuring to view teaching as intuitive and practical than as specialised and complex. Indeed, as Ball & Forzani (2009, p498) suggest ‘the notion that teaching is unnatural is difficult to grasp because of the ubiquity of teaching activity’.

There is evidence that focus on practice may be reinforced during experience in school where it is not only student teachers who may tend to focus on practical knowledge. Some participants identify limitations in school experience when working with teachers who are loath to allow experimentation. Post performative (Wilkins, 2011) or twenty-first century (Bourke et al, 2015) teachers may find that working with a student teacher towards the apparently straightforward achievement of the standards appears to be much less risky than engaging in the critical evaluation that is required for attitudinal development (Sachs, 2016). It is possible for a mentor to follow the standards as a list of content for ITE (as conceived in, for example, the Framework of Core Content for ITT (DfE, 2016b)), to look at ‘evidence’ of attainment, and to apply the same criteria for observation as those applied to all teachers in their performance management. In this model, the mentor is not required to make what Freidson (2001) calls discretionary judgements, rather to check that topics have been covered. The mentor’s role is framed in straightforward and achievable terms, it does not require critical analysis of practice or the exercise of autonomous professional judgement; rather judgement of a trainee’s ‘performance’, and their personal aptitude. ITE becomes part of induction into the performance management process, focussed on inspection outcomes. The relatively straightforward concept which some student teachers may start out with (that teaching can be ‘good’ and that getting it ‘right’ is simple, just a matter of learning techniques and following policy) is thus confirmed. If school-based ITE is expanded, it might be expected that student teachers will rely increasingly on learning from teachers who may not be able to draw on vertical, academic knowledge (Hordern, 2015, Furlong & Whitty, 2017, Shulman, 1986) to understand and justify their practice. Although there is an attraction in the reductive approach of managerialism, the draw of ‘getting it right’, my findings suggest that ITE that reinforces the primacy of practical knowledge is unlikely to be able to prepare teachers for more than the short term.

Focus on practice may, in some cases, also be reinforced by ITE providers who are subject to the same performative measures as schools. The NASBTT
toolkit for ITE (2015) provides an example. It guides school-based trainers in how to ensure that student teachers receive their ‘entitlement’ and Ofsted inspection criteria are met. Providers, like schools, subject to Ofsted inspection, may be tempted to run ITE with the performative aim of being graded outstanding rather than providing ITE that will sustain teachers. There is perhaps safety in being able to demonstrate how the standards have been met, and market pressure to secure the inspection grade of outstanding. There are therefore readily understandable reasons for functional development to be adopted across the school-based ITE sector, in turn reinforcing the desire among some student teachers to demonstrate practical expertise in teaching as quickly as possible.

It is possible that it is not only school-led ITE that may contribute to an emphasis on learning from practice. ITE in HE, traditionally the source of educational research in the academic knowledge tradition, may be expected to continue to promote the value of that tradition. However, it is also drawn into the performance agenda, in many cases adopting the guidance of the NASBITT toolkit (2015). Universities are subject to the same inspection regime, based on delivery of the core content for ITT (DfE, 2016b) and student outcomes as assessed against the Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011). The inspection grade is significant because it has been used to determine funding and the allocation of training places. In addition, educational research, part of the traditional academic knowledge base of teaching, has been reframed in policy since 2010 with schools rather than universities identified as the source of knowledge about ‘what works’. Consequently, funding has been prioritised for research which is utilitarian, ‘relevant’ (Furlong & Whitty, 2017, Biesta et al, 2019) and which adopts the preferred methodology of ‘scientific’ randomised control trials. Both factors put pressure on HE ITE to support a functional approach to ITE; an approach which may be at odds with traditional academic values (Bourke et al, 2015) and may blur the significance of the academic knowledge foundations of ITE. If traditional academic knowledge of education is to continue to be part of ITE, to provide the basis of the critical understanding of practice seen in my findings as significant, it will need to continue to argue its case to policy makers.

What appears to be difficult is for ITE providers to make the longer-term value of a theoretical underpinning explicit to all student teachers; to make its
relevance clear. Moving a student teacher’s focus from practice, towards understanding the relevance of the theory underpinning that practice, is described by Furlong and Whitty (2017) as a perennial problem. The challenge may prove increasingly difficult as ITE becomes more dependent on practical knowledge transmitted by teachers whose focus is necessarily on pupil outcomes, their CPD based on networked professional knowledge (Furlong & Whitty, 2017), and who have become institutionalised into a performative culture (Wilkins, 2011, Bourke et al, 2015). If the inspection regime is based on the reduction of ITE to a set of topics to be covered, and that is accepted as another part of the culture of teaching, students will not learn how to interrogate and take charge of practice. For example, *The Carter Review* (DfE, 2015) recommends the inclusion in ITE of strategies to manage stress. Strategies are likely to be context specific whereas ‘transferability may… arise via the development of personal characteristics’ (Winch, 2014, p119). The post-performative teacher is not in a position to foster such attitudinal development.

**Integrated knowledge and attitudinal development**

I consider that comments from participants about their reflection or evaluation of practice particularly illustrate the effect of student teachers’ (and some schools and HE providers) tendency to seek practical development in ITE that fulfils a performative, managerial agenda. A difference between ‘ritualistic’ (Heilbronn, 2010b), or functional, reflection and reflective practice (Schön, 1983) is indicated. My discussion suggests that the negative impact that fulfilling a requirement to reflect, which relies on evaluation of how well procedures and strategies are implemented, can reduce confidence. On the other hand, recourse to a theoretical framework depersonalises the evaluation; it becomes less about the performance of the individual. Instead the purpose of the teaching is supported by externally validated knowledge, and ‘success’ can be gauged against those external criteria. Using reflective practice to improve teaching may foster a sense of achievement and development, and therefore contribute to job satisfaction, thereby supporting teachers in the long term. Functional reflection on the other hand responds to imposed criteria whose rationale is not explained beyond being a performative requirement. My findings therefore suggest that the type of reflection established during ITE has the potential to be sustaining or undermining. The difficulty is communicating,
to student teachers in particular, the practical value of using academic frameworks in routine evaluation.

Thus far, an apparently straightforward conclusion from my findings is that ITE providers should challenge themselves and student teachers to draw on both practical and academic knowledge traditions. If the certainty that comes from implementing an imposed agenda is undermined by a change in quality assurance criteria, the teacher who has only learnt to implement that agenda does not have a secure rationale for their practice. If they cease to be seen as successful, they can only interpret their failing as personal. When a teacher is able to justify practice that does not comply with the dominant practice, by reference to an externally validated framework, they are able to remain in control of their professional purpose. Confidence appears to stem from a sense of autonomy rather than passive acceptance of practice (Sachs, 2000, p77). Although the use of academic knowledge to question practice may seem confusing, or irrelevant at first to student teachers, it is what appears to provide the basis for making sense of change; the ability to put forward an argument or justification for practice, to support the exercise of discretionary judgement as a professional (Freidson, 2001). While learnt strategies and putting ‘what works’ into practice may lead to ‘good’ judgements and perceived success in the short term, developing critical understanding of practice is more significant in the long term.

The integrated knowledge tradition relies according to Furlong and Whitty (2017, p39) on learning ‘an intellectual and a practical framework at the same time’. Whether in a clinical practice model or action research, the frameworks have been aligned through co-operation between sites of learning and the knowledge associated with each. The ITE managers contributing to my IFS welcomed the presence of HE tutors in their work with student teachers in school. They saw the integrated working as supporting them as well as their student teachers. Successful partnership models have acknowledged and valued the expertise of both practising teachers and HE tutors. The threat to further development of that co-operation, a move to pit one knowledge tradition, and one site of learning, against the other has come from a set of policies based on dismissing, or re-framing the academic knowledge traditions to prioritise practical knowledge. The impact of that is to promote a cultural divide between one concept, of teachers as thinking, autonomous professionals and another
of teachers as craftworkers or ‘super-coaches’. ‘For the craftworker teacher it is a matter of intuition mediated by experience; for the professional it is a matter of theory mediated by experience’ (Kuhlee & Winch, 2017, p233).

Where participants refer to what keeps them going it is the values underpinning what they do, a belief that they are contributing something worthwhile to individual pupils and society. Such altruism Sachs (2000) argues is typical of traditional professionalism which she characterises as activist professionalism, developed through attitudinal development. ITE provides the opportunity for student teachers to consider whether what they do is worthwhile, and what it is about it that makes it so (Furlong & Whitty, 2017); there may be little opportunity once in school, working as a teacher, to consider such fundamental questions. Questioning emerges from academic approaches that require critical enquiry in order to understand what you as a teacher are trying to achieve and why. Because practical development focuses on what is being done it does not provide the opportunity to establish a position, or understanding of values, on which to hang the practical day-to-day demands of teaching. I consider my findings offer some evidence of why it is important to address these questions before and alongside practical experience.

**Implications for ITE**

To summarise, my findings suggest that ITE could conform to the dominant managerial policy context, and thus meet some student teachers’ expectations for practical instruction. It could equip them for the performance culture in which they will work, and then pass them on to the next phase of their training (as defined for example by the ECF (DfE, 2019b)). In this model, ITT concentrates on meeting the performance criteria set by Ofsted, and controlled or compliant professionals emerge. However, participants’ comments in this study suggest that those models of professionalism, resulting from functional development, do not equip teachers to deal with the inevitable change and challenge they will face. The lasting impact of ITE emerging from my findings comes from the characteristics of traditional, ideal-typical (Freidson, 2001), extended (Hoyle and Wallace, 2005) activist (Sachs, 2000) professionalism; altruism, expertise and autonomy (Sachs, 2000) which are founded in the integrated knowledge tradition (Furlong & Whitty, 2017). A simple conclusion is therefore that ITE should include the development of academic dispositions,
of critical enquiry. However, my findings suggest that, even when students follow a master's level course of ITE, or indeed the same course as each other, their conscious use of the practical and academic knowledge included in that course can be different. The challenge for ITE may be not only to draw appropriately on the academic and practical knowledge traditions but also to make the value of integrating the academic and practical knowledge traditions overt. A next step in my research would be into ways in which that challenge could be met. Some examples of possible approaches have been noted in the course of this study, for example, Sachs's (2000) findings about the value of joint research projects between HE and schools which develop understanding rather than competition between sites of learning in ITE and DeMink-Carthew et al.'s (2017) work on the use of core practices to build knowledge and understanding of ITE among novice teacher educators. The perceptions of relatively recently qualified teachers would, again, be instructive in investigating the working of these and other models.

**Limitations of the research**

I am aware that my role as a secondary PGCE course leader in HE may be seen as representing the perspective of a sector under threat from the policy to move ITE into teaching schools. The rhetoric behind policy has often dismissed the sector and the knowledge created by it, and it may therefore be regarded as taking a defensive position. I have sought to understand my own perspective in that context in the same way that I have sought to understand the perspectives of my participants.

My conclusions are necessarily tentative because I pursued a qualitative, inductive approach to my research, I did not seek to reach generalisable conclusions but to investigate individual perceptions. I chose to adopt the approach of IPA, to treat ITE as the phenomenon, or lived experience, under investigation. Starting from my interpretivist epistemology it was important for me to accommodate my acknowledged view within the process of research. Rather than allow my position to dictate my findings I wanted to note my role in data collection and analysis alongside my attempt to understand the perspectives of each participant. IPA builds in the double hermeneutic (Smith et al, 2009) that allows analysis to dance between the perception of participant
and researcher (Finlay, 2008). It is a methodology that values subjectivity and I consider that it was highly appropriate but not without challenges.

The phenomenological aim of presenting each participant’s perspective in depth proved difficult because giving due weight to all the data generated from line-by-line analysis of seven participants and their different viewpoints had to be balanced with the need to reduce the data to themes common across all participants. I wanted to be true to the subtlety of what was said, to represent each person accurately and fairly, but I also had to work within the constraints of this study. If I conducted another IPA investigation into teacher perspectives I think that a more suitable mode of presentation might be individual case studies, so that I could discuss subtleties within those cases to satisfy myself that I had represented each accurately. To that end, I would favour a follow-up interview for each participant so that their intended meaning could be clarified and any points occurring to them post interview could be included. In that case, the number of participants and therefore the range of perspectives would need to be reduced. My feeling when starting the research was that seven was already a small number for the purpose of the study, even though Smith et al (2009, p51) suggest that ‘it is more problematic to try to meet IPA’s commitments with a sample which is ‘too large’, than with one that is ‘too small’ and that the number of interviews (rather than participants) for this type of study could be between four and ten (ibid., p52). However, having conducted the study with seven participants I would be loath to omit any of them; each has a valid and informative perspective.

I put the agenda for the interview in the hands of the participants in my desire to understand their viewpoints and to find out what they genuinely considered significant in their ITE. I think, as discussed elsewhere, that that was a valuable approach but it made it difficult for me to define ways in which the themes emerging from the data were common across all participants. Had I imposed a set of questions, analysis might have been a more straightforward task because it might have been possible to compare and contrast responses to those questions across cases.

The research is limited to a small sample of participants from one partner school. The boundaries for selection were helpful. More than one school context or including teachers with longer service would have been additional,
complicating factors. While there are advantages in working with a school with close professional links to my university, such as established trust and respect, there are ethical issues, discussed in chapter 3, and the limitation of knowing several relatively recently qualified teachers in the school who might be included in my sample. My sample included four teachers who had been students on the PGCE course I led. I had to consider whether they would feel constrained in what they said, or whether I might have preconceptions about the value of aspects of the course. The ‘bracketing’ required for IPA was significant for me in accommodating these concerns. I noted in my research journal that I ‘inevitably felt pleased or not about some comments’, that there was some criticism, ‘interestingly offered as advice’ in one case (journal notes 25.9.18). Noting these immediate reactions enabled me to acknowledge my subjectivity while concentrating, in the first stages of analysis, on describing what was said; that is to separate my view from the participant’s view, so that I could concentrate on what was said rather than what I thought about what was said (Smith et al, 2009, p90). An advantage of including students from ‘my’ course was that I was reminded that perspectives are about what people remember or identify as significant to them. The four former students talked about the course in different ways, they recalled specific details (dates for example) differently, which reinforced to me that my aim was to find out what the experience meant to them, not establish any reality about events. I could then apply that principle to other participants, accepting that each was recalling their experience and talking about its significance to them.

**Contribution to knowledge**

My research has contributed to our understanding of the knowledge traditions of ITE and models of teacher professionalism. I have found a range of views which illustrate how relatively recently qualified teachers think about their ITE. What they say helps to provide a particular perspective; from a position where the impact of ITE can be seen in relation to the day-to-day experience of practice. It is a valuable view to consider because it gives voice to the consumers of ITE. It is a different view from those considered elsewhere, for example ITE providers, NQTs, head teachers as employers, or as part of a combination of those perspectives. My study therefore contributes a particular perspective to the debates about the significance, and challenges, of integrating the practical and academic knowledge traditions in ITE.
I have also made a modest methodological contribution to the framework of IPA. While retaining IPA’s approach and stages of analysis, the addition of diagrams to provide the focus for interview and insight into individual perception has been significant. It has supported me in the complex process of bracketing and helped me to focus on the perspective of the participant in the double hermeneutic approach to analysis required to develop an understanding of perceptions of the phenomenon under investigation.

**Professional implications**

In my professional role as leader of a secondary PGCE course, from which I have now retired, I was aware of increasing conflict about the demands and aspirations of ITE. My experience was of working in a university with a tradition of teacher education combined with a strong and mutually supportive partnership with schools. The direction of ITE policy since 2010 threatened to undermine that working relationship. As elsewhere in the sector, the university was torn between promoting an academic, analytical foundation of teaching as a profession and retaining a share of the ITE ‘market’. Partner schools were torn between loyalty to a programme they valued and being active in an increasingly school-led ITE. Teacher shortages and difficulties with recruitment exacerbated the situation, encouraging some schools to see involvement with ITE as an opportunity to recruit NQTs at the earliest opportunity. We appeared to have moved from a highly co-operative, respectful relationship into a competitive situation. The links I have explored here between knowledge traditions and concepts of professionalism have helped me to identify and make sense of those conflicts. I am now in a position to explain to others, both in schools and HE, why the knowledge base of teaching is relevant to the sort of teachers and indeed the sort of profession we would like to emerge from our training.

**Dissemination**

Work for this study has contributed to two chapters in forthcoming books on ITE, one designed to support new teachers (Shelton & O’Kelly, 2019), the other to support school-based mentors (O’Kelly, 2019). I have continually discussed my findings with tutor colleagues as my study has progressed, and I intend to
base a conference presentation on my conclusions. I anticipate using a similar approach to that of this study to produce a book based on a series of case studies of teachers' reflections on the value of their ITE in order to illustrate further where the value of ITE is perceived, by this group, to lie.

**Final remarks**

While this study has developed my understanding of the value of ITE through considering the perceived experiences of recently qualified teachers, it has also demonstrated its complexity. My research has emphasised that participants' perceptions are influenced by the purpose to which initial teacher education is put and that those purposes are varied. For ITE to have lasting value it needs to provide the foundation for a range of experience, its value for one individual may be different from another. Some participants' comments demonstrate how an academic underpinning of their teaching enables them to understand and deal with change and challenge, while the limitations of relying on practical knowledge is illustrated by others. Courses may introduce new teachers to a variety of knowledge traditions but they do not all receive it, or value it in the same way. My next research challenge is to investigate whether, and how, the value of integrating academic and practical knowledge can be made overt so that student teachers are open to broadening their aspiration beyond acquiring skills, and are equipped to cope with challenge and change.
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Appendix 1: Example page – initial noting

coming from that reflection, definitely
reflection, that's a biggy for me is why didn't
something go well or why do I feel
something about a class at the moment and
try to unpick it and I think the PGCE
definitely sets you up to do that so you have
you had a worked with a SCITT student um
do you think that has been, that ability has
been lesser as a result of the way it's been
taught to them? Or? Yuh, I think, I don't
know about, I'm not sure exactly what
teaching they have with the SCITT um but I
do feel that that sense of reflection isn't as
strong, in that they just seem to go through
the motions, through the days and things
just get progressively worse, without
unpicking and then it's become a crux point
and then, once you unpick it with the
student and they realise and then they get
that help um I don't think, I think they have
is it one university day but I felt that they but
I felt that it was that break, that changing
school, that whole, I know they do their
primary school placement and they do have
a smaller period of time but I think the
breaking of the day, like with ours was
much stronger in that allowing for that
reflection time and the teaching um yuh and
and that writing at masters level doing the
assignments and the focus on that and the
students teaching around that in professional studies
that they, I don't think that they get the
same focus on yuh as a route but yuh, I
mean I understand I think you know
obviously it would suit some people
differently but no I do value the route I took
yuh. And you talked about this CPD here
and this evidence based thinking, can you
tell me a bit about what that looks like, what
that's about. We have here um we're very
lucky to have a few of us that engage in
journal reading or in looking at um
educational reading um so um who
you know um she, she's one of the students
that's done journal club here so we often
have um a reading of a text before, then
have a meeting then discussion then we try
to emulate something from that reading into
a lesson and feed back if it worked or not,
so that's one CPD process of that um so it
might be something about um classroom
management, behaviour relationships, that
sort of thing, or it might be something more
on like memory and thinking and how does
Appendix 2: Example page - emergent themes from each participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 2</th>
<th>ITE content/context SD</th>
<th>Emergent theme</th>
<th>Extract from transcript</th>
<th>Page &amp; line no.</th>
<th>Exploratory comments/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive about being part of a group</td>
<td>We all came together as a 4 to study that and share our practice which was lovely</td>
<td>2:55-57</td>
<td>The 4 SD trainees at different subjects met together for their own PS. Sharing practice, discussing experience together valuable. ‘lovely’ = range of value, not just topics or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referred to process of making diagram as therapeutic</td>
<td>I think sometimes you can be so, have your head so embedded into now, what your priorities are now that you often forget where you came from and how much you’ve developed</td>
<td>2:67-70</td>
<td>Good to break day to day concentration on immediate concerns. Sense of achievement looking back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs about why she chose SD</td>
<td>There were PGCE routes available to me but from 2013-2014 I had worked in an academy up in London and I was employed eventually</td>
<td>2:86-89</td>
<td>Teaching experience linked by her to appropriateness of SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD continuing work</td>
<td>I saw schools direct as a way of continuing that so for me it was an ideal choice and I was slightly older when I started so I was sort of</td>
<td>2:101-105</td>
<td>Continuation of working, so saw herself as established in work rather than as a student. Reluctant to ‘go backwards’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept of uni-led course</td>
<td>I didn’t want to go back to the kind of student life that was in my head, I guess of you know lecture halls or seminars so for me I wanted to carry on the working process and the working routine so it was ideal for me having worked in a school for a year already</td>
<td>2:106-113</td>
<td>Knows this was ‘in my head’ so perhaps she didn’t consider that it might be different. Starting out with a view that she was able to teach already and needed more practice and some assessment to achieve QTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted to be seen as a proper teacher, to belong in the school, to be seen as a professional</td>
<td>It’s nice to be seen as a member of the team and as a professional from day 1, I had the hands-on experience,</td>
<td>3:126-128</td>
<td>Workplace learning I think ‘professional’ here mean employed as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learnt to be tough – necessary characteristic</td>
<td>I put here it made me tough um I think because you are seen</td>
<td>3:128-132</td>
<td>Is this suggesting that you are considered to be ready to teach, so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a professional and you are thrown in early to teaching lessons and I think there's an ethos as well of the sooner you get in there the sooner…</td>
<td>not given preparation so you sink or swim?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Example page - grouping the emergent themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 5</th>
<th>Interview 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of Masters</td>
<td>Subject knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct use of PGCE or reference to PG learning</td>
<td>Work ethic/ skills from PGCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject knowledge</td>
<td>Theory – practice relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of university/distance including comparison with SCITT</td>
<td>Reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with schools</td>
<td>Selection rigour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Problems with teaching/ retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload/ disaffection</td>
<td>Reasons to stay/ motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour/ drop-out/ work ethic</td>
<td>Career progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and motivation</td>
<td>Reference to SCITT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and collaboration</td>
<td>Key advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key advice</td>
<td>+ 1 quote about peer support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Example page - identifying common or super-ordinate themes across cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 7</th>
<th>Collation across cases</th>
<th>Number of interviews mention this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters, its value and difficulties and career aspiration</td>
<td>Collated as RETENTION in 2 parts – Reasons to stay and Reasons to leave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of university including problems with SCITT as exemplification</td>
<td>Peer support</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) As a safe space</td>
<td>Academic study: Masters. Subject Study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) As the foundation for your teaching life</td>
<td>Knowledge from schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of support from subject cohort</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject knowledge</td>
<td>Reflective practice/relationship between theory and practice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>Value of university</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious return to ITE</td>
<td>Rigour of ITE/work ethic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as part of teaching learnt in ITE</td>
<td>Continuing value of ITE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons to leave</td>
<td>Key advice/preparation</td>
<td>3 but I have added from all the others except interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and preparation for ITE</td>
<td>career progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5: Example page - illustrative comments for each common, super-ordinate theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Academic Study</th>
<th>Subject Knowledge</th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Divide between PS and subject study</th>
<th>I felt very confident going into lessons that we’d had direct contact time for, for particular sports</th>
<th>1:23-25</th>
<th>Value of uni taught topics – subject study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing perception of knowledge during ITE</td>
<td>It’s not until you begin in school that you realise just how relevant some of that stuff was</td>
<td>1:31-33</td>
<td>Link between knowledge gained in different parts of the course although different knowledge belongs in different sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The standards and key people</td>
<td>I think that you have to have someone, people at the top who are very knowledgeable about what those good teaching standards look like to an outstanding level, and I think they become more apparent at different times</td>
<td>3:142-147</td>
<td>Tutors’ knowledge evident in sessions and in relation to ‘hitting’ the standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division between PS and subject study</td>
<td>I think it’s right in secondary to learn about your subject that you’re going to teach because then that’s what gives you um the real building blocks that help you directly when you walk through that door and teach the subject um or perhaps have you know the knowledge or the confident to perform those skills or know the rules of the game</td>
<td>8:363-371</td>
<td>Link between subject teaching knowledge and confidence – why this may be seen as most important at early stages of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasting impact of the way the course was structured</td>
<td>I keep them very separate because I think that they were taught separate on the course and I suppose that’s the view that I have that in order to be a good teacher overall and meet those teaching standards you need both</td>
<td>8:372-377</td>
<td>Using separate strands as a way of organising knowledge but goes on to explain how they actually merge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How PS and subject knowledge separate at first and merge as</td>
<td>My job now as a teacher a lot of these merge but at the time it was very I think a good way of knowing</td>
<td>8:377-380</td>
<td>Could be she learnt the division, that’s all she knows and has understood that this is a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the course continues and in future career</td>
<td>that there were two parts to your job…… I think it was important at the time to isolate them and know the difference I like the way that they were kept very much separate Now they’re very much reinter-changeable</td>
<td>384-385 pragmatic division for organisational reasons Could be she likes to be organised herself so favours compartmentalising in her own mind Could be that she would always have understood knowledge in this way Certainly understands that they overlap and thinks they are both part of being a teacher uses the term <em>professional</em> judgement when referring to use of PS knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Example page of notes from each super-ordinate theme collated into main themes

1. Academic knowledge

Place of Academic knowledge – Subject Study
Step 7

[is interesting as somebody who did not have subject study and she can see the void that has left – she links it particularly to motivation, being able to be creative in her planning and to enthuse and motivate her students. Interesting that subject tutor seemed to have some notion that subject knowledge was undergraduate knowledge of the subject she was going to teach. Contrast with [ and [ and who all mention how different the knowledge for teaching your subject (your subject in school) from degree level knowledge.

[ links subject knowledge with confidence, perhaps credibility?

[ notes how her subject tutor was out of touch/less able to apply subject knowledge to practical issues of teaching it in school, this is to do with her tutor taking, for her, a too academic approach to subject knowledge for teaching and not applying that to practice for her.

Still learning subject knowledge is widespread. Obviously [ (developed a passion for the subject) – lots here about what subject study in PGCE gave him that he draws on now but also where he gets subject knowledge from now – ex HoD, subject association, GCSE specification, gradual build-up of KS teaching. Others – [ , also GCSE specification. [ speaks elsewhere about using the exam specification for planning but doesn’t refer to it so much as subject knowledge.

[ through your job
Justification for your time in the curriculum

Place of Academic knowledge – Masters
Step 7

Variety of uses of Masters noted
Foundation in writing academic papers [ Somebody who has completed Masters and sees it as contributing to whole school initiatives, in this case setting up school led ITE. Investigating an area of ITE she felt was flawed for her also referred a lot to writing process but with a different slant. Would have liked more time on how to write, could be taught to do this. This, lack of confidence in writing, is holding her back from continuing Masters and she sees this as helping her to become a Head. She also sees writing at Masters as fitting her for teaching school pupils to write, so a transferable skill, almost as subject knowledge for any teacher.

[ more emphasis on the way of thinking that Masters work encourages – ability to work out how pupils are learning. She is continuing Masters, values access to academic resources. Uses this and PGCE in school CPD to encourage evidence based learning. Value to the school of the discoveries made through her masters study. Keen for longer established teachers to return to academic study to improve their understanding of teaching. Identifies lack in SCITT training, need university tutors.
### Appendix 7: Revised charts of super-ordinate themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge from school and mentor</th>
<th>SUPER-ORDINATE REVISED</th>
<th>Linda</th>
<th>17:844-846</th>
<th>School colleagues not necessarily well informed of current thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different school contexts affect what you can do/try out</td>
<td>You might have a group of professionals in a school that aren’t very up-to-date with current ways …</td>
<td>17:848-851</td>
<td>School colleagues may be set in their ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to follow practice of school colleagues even if you think something else would work better</td>
<td>Therefore you’ve got all these great ideas but you feel like you can’t use any of them because they’re so set in their ways</td>
<td>11:546-548</td>
<td>Needed to have a broader view of knowledge about approaches to teaching drama.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have learnt by knowing what people were doing in other schools</td>
<td>Mmmm even something as simple as going to a few other schools and watching maybe a piece of assessment work… I had obviously one placement at and I got a perspective from those two schools but it wasn’t hugely broad, um and because it, I wasn’t receiving it here in those 10 days, I think I lacked the enrichment of the subject to take forward um and that’s where I find sometimes I sit down and go what’m I going to do,</td>
<td>30:1601-1602</td>
<td>Aware of problems of matching mentor and student and school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject study would have stimulated creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1607-1612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>I think probably another factor which you can’t control is the mentors… all very different people and I think the way that some mentors work work for some people and the way that some mentors work don’t, um, and it’s not always easy to pair people up right at the very beginning… I think it’s a real minefield</td>
<td>31:1617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>New school change is huge, completely different Contextual knowledge whereas moving from school to school it does feel like I’m, everything is completely different, so, here I feel like I’m building on previous knowledge but when you get to a new school it’s almost like you drop down to the bottom of this tower again, you’re learning how to be a new teacher all over again.</td>
<td>2:98-105</td>
<td>New school is like going back to the beginning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Confidentiality/Anonymity
- Disclosures/limits to confidentiality
- Data storage and security both during and after the research (including transfer, sharing, encryption, protection)
- Reporting
- Dissemination and use of findings

**Sampling**

I will draw my sample from one school in my university’s school partnership. It is possible/likely that a participant’s perception of the utility/relevance of ITE could be affected by the nature of continuing professional development (CPD) in an employing school (participants may make comparisons or connections between their initial and continuing training). Drawing from one school will not necessarily ensure that all participants have only been employed in that school, it is possible that some may be in their second or third school, but it will limit their immediate...
context to one school. It will be important to be clear when I make contact with the school that I am not selecting the school on the basis of any perceived strength or weakness of their CPD or support for NQTs, and that I will only be asking participants to reflect on what they find significant in the present about their past experience (of their initial training).

I will select a school with which I have established links so that I know the context in which the teachers are working. I do not want to be diverted by discussions of the post-training opportunities for development that individual teachers have experienced so I want to know that the school is committed to teacher training. Therefore I will choose a school which works with a variety of providers as well as being a teaching school and lead school for a SCITT. I anticipate that a SCITT lead school will consider involvement in my project to have some value for them and will be less likely to be intimidated or feel threatened by my research than a school which is not itself aspiring to be engaged in school-based research. I will reject any schools in particularly challenging circumstances or process of significant change. I will take advice from the Head of School Partnership about any pressures on schools that she might be aware of. I will know, from my programme records, where ex students from the PGCE course for which I am responsible were employed 3, 4 and 5 years ago, and which schools regularly employ NQTs. This will give me an indication that there will be teachers with the range of experience I am looking for in that school. This will reduce the number of possible schools to about 3. I will then contact the professional tutor, following the protocol established in our Partnership Agreement.

Gatekeepers

I will email the professional tutor a very brief outline of my thesis proposal. I will ask her/him whether CPD is part of her role and, if not, who I should approach for agreement in principle to participating in my research. Once I have that agreement, I will contact the head teacher to gain permission to carry out my research in the school. I will need to assure her that my purpose is not to pass judgment on the school’s ITE, CPD or its retention of new teachers, but to investigate the residual impact of ITE.

I will then ask the CPD co-ordinator for the names of teachers who were NQTs in 2012 or 2013, with some information about where and by which route they completed their ITE. From those I will select 8 to approach directly, setting out the aims of the study and asking if they wish to be involved. I will select participants who have been trained through a range of training routes and providers. I will not avoid those trained through the programme for which I am responsible but if I include them I will need to be aware of the possible power relationship; that they might feel obliged to be complimentary about their ITE. I need therefore to make sure that I explain clearly that my research is not an evaluation of any particular route into teaching. In my introduction to the interview I will acknowledge my position overtly and explain that, although I make every effort to provide what I believe to be the best ITE I can, based on student evaluation and feedback from school partners, what I am interested in in this study is the long term impact of ITE. When I ask participants to draw a diagram of their perspective of their ITE I will explain that I am interested in finding out different perspectives. Because I have my own viewpoint, I accept that other people will have their own (different) viewpoint. The position from which a person sees an experience will affect the interpretation they make of that experience. I am interested in how and why people will have different views
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about what makes ITE effective and therefore, what the aims of initial training might usefully be.

It may, indeed, be helpful to include some of these teachers because I will know the ITE that they received and therefore will be able to make some comment on the difference between their perception of the course and my understanding of its intentions/composition. This may give me an indication of how other teachers, whose training I don’t know well, may recall their experience. In my initial contact email to potential participants I will explain briefly that there are few opportunities for teachers to comment on ITE in the light of their experience beyond the NQT year. I will explain that my objective is to give teachers a voice in the debate about the content of ITE and that therefore their genuine view is important. The study seeks to reflect the opinions of those in a position to assess what they needed to know when they began teaching because they have had the experience of applying their ITE in practice. ITE policy is constructed from the perspective of policy makers, who may or may not have relevant experience to inform that policy. It is important to offer the perspective of the ‘consumers’ in any debate about the content and purpose of ITE. This study intends to demonstrate that there are a number of valid perspectives, depending on experience, context and concepts of professionalism. My analysis of the data will draw on concepts of professionalism and professional knowledge which underpin views about the nature of teacher training, where it can take place, and what it is trying to achieve.

Limits to confidentiality
I will use pseudonyms rather than refer to the school or the participants by name when I report my findings but it is possible that they could be identifiable from specific comments they might make – they might refer to their subject, or to specific events for example. I will need to make every effort to avoid such inadvertent identification by including only such information about the participant as is strictly necessary to explain the relevance of the data. If participants reveal unprofessional practice, such as issues with the support they have received, I will face a dilemma. I must be clear therefore about the purpose of my study – that it is to understand the significance to teachers of their initial teacher education – rather than to consider the support offered to individuals either by providers of ITE or by schools once they are employed. I must warn participants that if they reveal serious misconduct I would be obliged to refer it through the relevant channels.

Data storage
The interview data is unlikely to be highly sensitive but it will be the personal views of participants and therefore needs to be kept securely. I will record interviews on my mobile phone, which is password protected, then export to my laptop (again password protected), write the transcripts myself and delete the voice recordings as soon as the transcripts are written. I will ask participants if I can keep the visual representation of the value of their ITE to them as teachers after the interview so that I can refer to them during data analysis. If participants do not wish me to keep the image I will rely on the interview data.
### if not attached

Information sheets, consent forms and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research (*List attachments below*)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information sheets, consent forms and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research (List attachments below)</th>
<th>Yes ✔</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Initial contact email text

Information sheet for participants

Consent form for participants

**If applicable/appropriate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval letter from external Research Ethics Committee</th>
<th>Yes ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal (‘case for support’) for the project</td>
<td>Yes ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full risk assessment</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I confirm that to the best of my knowledge the information in this form is correct and that this is a full description of the ethical issues that may arise in the course of this project.

I have discussed the ethical issues relating to my research with my supervisor. Yes

I have attended the appropriate ethics training provided by my course. Yes

**I confirm that to the best of my knowledge:**

The above information is correct and that this is a full description of the ethics issues that may arise in the course of this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Julia O’Kelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>21 February 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please submit your completed ethics forms to your supervisor for review.

**Notes and references**
Professional code of ethics
You should read and understand relevant ethics guidelines, for example:
Code of Human Research Ethics
or
or
British Sociological Association (2002) Statement of Ethical Practice
Please see the respective websites for these or later versions; direct links to the
latest versions are available on the Institute of Education
http://www.ioe.ac.uk/ethics/.

Disclosure and Barring Service checks
If you are planning to carry out research in regulated Education environments
such as Schools, or if your research will bring you into contact with children and
young people (under the age of 18), you will need to have a Disclosure and
Barring Service (DBS) CHECK, before you start. The DBS was previously known
as the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) ). If you do not already hold a current DBS
check, and have not registered with the DBS update service, you will need to
obtain one through at IOE. Further information can be found at

Ensure that you apply for the DBS check in plenty of time as will take around 4
weeks, though can take longer depending on the circumstances.

Further references
The www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk website is very useful for assisting you to think
through the ethical issues arising from your project.

Robson, Colin (2011). Real world research: a resource for social scientists and
This text has a helpful section on ethical considerations.

Alderson, P. and Morrow, V. (2011) The Ethics of Research with Children and
This text has useful suggestions if you are conducting research with children
and young people.

A useful and short text covering areas including informed consent, approaches
to research ethics including examples of ethical dilemmas.

Departmental use
If a project raises particularly challenging ethics issues, or a more detailed
review would be appropriate, the supervisor must refer the application to
the Research Ethics and Governance Coordinator (via
ioe.researchethics@ucl.ac.uk) so that it can be submitted to the Research
Ethics Committee for consideration. A departmental research ethics
coordinator or representative can advise you, either to support your
review process, or help decide whether an application should be referred
to the REC.
Also see ‘when to pass a student ethics review up to the Research Ethics Committee’:
http://www.ioe.ac.uk/about/policiesProcedures/42253.html
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<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/first reviewer signature</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
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</tbody>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
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<td>21/02/18</td>
</tr>
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</table>

**Decision on behalf of reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Approved subject to the following additional measures</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not approved for the reasons given below</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to REC for review</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Appendix 9: Contact emails

Dear (head teacher/professional tutor),

I am embarking on some research for my Doctorate in Education for which I would like to find out from practising teachers with 3 – 6 years’ teaching experience how they perceive their ITE. I would like to give teachers a voice in the debate about what the aims of ITE should be; what they feel has been valuable to them in their career so far, and what may have helped them to develop as teachers since their training experience. My study is not designed to make judgements about the quality of training in individual programmes, universities or schools, simply to find out how teachers view their experience. I will not name your school and I will anonymise any references to interviewees.

I would very much like to interview eight teachers in one school who have this range of experience for my research and would be grateful if you would consent to my doing so. I am attaching the information sheet and consent form which I will give to all participants before interviewing them for your information. Could I ask you, if you are happy for these interviews to go ahead, to reply to this email stating briefly that you give your consent.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Dear (Teacher)

I have been given your name by (professional tutor) as a teacher with between 3 and 6 years of experience in teaching.

I am embarking on some research for my Doctorate in Education for which I would like to find out from practising teachers with 3 - 6 years' experience how they perceive their Initial Teacher Education. My study is not designed to make judgements about the quality of training in individual programmes, universities or schools, simply to find out how those who have experienced that training reflect on its value. I am interested in all perceptions – what seemed important at the time of training, what seems important now, what teachers draw on once they are in post, whether there are key aspects that should be included in all training programmes...

I would very much like to interview you as part of this research and would be very grateful if you could spare some time to do this? When writing up my research I will not name your school and I will anonymise any references to what you have said in the interview. I am attaching my research information sheet which explains what is involved and a copy of a consent form which I will ask you to sign before we start the interview, for information.

Do you think you would be able to help with this?

I think it will be very useful to find out how practising teachers perceive their initial training, to give teachers a voice in the debate about the shape of future ITE.

I look forward to hearing from you.
Appendix 10: Participant information sheet

Participant Information Sheet for Teachers
UCL Research Ethics Committee Approval ID Number: Z6364106/2018/03/48
social research

YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS INFORMATION SHEET

Title of Study:
What do teachers think Initial Teacher Education should be?

Department: Curriculum Pedagogy and Assessment

Name and Contact Details of the Researcher:
Julia O’Kelly

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what participation will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

What is the project's purpose?
The purpose of this research is for my own doctoral study. I aim to find out what teachers who have been teaching for 3 – 6 years perceive to be the role of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in preparing them for their career in teaching. In order to do this I will interview eight teachers with similar experience. To achieve some similarity of experience all the teachers will currently be teaching in the same school. I will complete the research in one year.

Why have I been chosen?
I am asking you to take part because you have been teaching for between 3 and 6 years. You will be one of eight teachers in your school taking part in my study.

Do I have to take part?
It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. You can withdraw at any time without giving a reason. If you decide to withdraw you will be asked what you wish to happen to the data you have provided up to that point.

What will happen to me if I take part?
I will collect the data for my research between March and July 2018. You will be interviewed once. The interview will last about an hour. I will ask you to make a diagram/picture before the interview to show how you view your ITE, and its value to you as a teacher. During your interview I will ask questions about your views of how your ITE prepared you for your career. I will ask you to talk about your diagram. I will come to your school for the interview at a mutually convenient time. I will ask you to sign a consent form before the
interview begins, provide you with a copy and retain a copy myself. I will have
your school’s permission to conduct my research.

**Will I be recorded and how will the recorded media be used?**
I will record your interview and transcribe it. I will store the transcripts on
password protected devices and delete the recordings. I will send you a copy
of the transcript so that you can check for accuracy, or ask for any material to
be removed. The audio recordings made during this research will be used only
for analysis and for illustration in my EdD thesis, conference presentations and
lectures. No other use will be made of them without your written permission,
and no-one outside the project will be allowed access to the original recordings.

**What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**
You may feel under pressure to give answers which you think I want to hear,
however, the purpose of the research is to seek a range of views, all of which
are equally valuable. There is no preferred answer. If, at any time, you feel
uncomfortable about the questions you are asked, you may decline to answer,
or you may withdraw from the research.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**
The benefit of taking part in this research is that it will inform providers of ITE
about what the priorities should be when constructing courses; what teachers
themselves consider valuable.

**What if something goes wrong?**
If you have any concerns about the way in which my research is conducted,
you wish to withdraw, or to retract anything you have said, please contact me,
j.okelly@chi.ac.uk
If you have a complaint about the way my research is conducted you may
contact my supervisor, Jane Perryman at j.perryman@ucl.ac.uk
If you have a complaint which you feel has not been handled to your satisfaction
you can contact the Chair of the UCL Research Ethics Committee at
ethics@ucl.ac.uk

**Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?**
All the information that I collect during the course of the research will be kept
strictly confidential. You will not be able to be identified in any ensuing reports
or publications. I will transcribe the interviews myself.

**Limits to confidentiality**
Confidentiality will be respected unless there are compelling and legitimate
reasons for this to be breached. If this was the case I would inform you of any
decisions that might limit your confidentiality.

**What will happen to the results of the research project?**
The results of this research will be included in my EdD thesis. It is expected
that this will be by July 2019. I may present my thesis findings as a conference
paper or journal article and I may draw on this material to inform my subsequent
studies. The data collected during my research will be deleted on completion
of my EdD.

**Data Protection Privacy Notice**
In accordance with guidelines relating to the Data Protection legislation –
Notice:
The data controller for this project will be University College London (UCL).
The UCL Data Protection Office provides oversight of UCL activities involving
the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at data-
protection@ucl.ac.uk. UCL’s Data Protection Officer is Lee Shailer and he can
also be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk.
Your personal data will be processed for the purposes outlined in this notice.
The legal basis that would be used to process your personal data will be the
provision of your consent. You can provide your consent for the use of your
personal data in this project by completing the consent form that has been
provided for you.
Your personal data will be processed so long as it is required for the research
project, this is expected to be approximately 18 months. If I am able to
anonymise or pseudonymise the personal data you provide I will undertake
this, and will endeavour to minimise the processing of personal data wherever
possible.
If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, please
contact UCL int eh first instance at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk. If you remain
unsatisfied, you may wish to contact the Information Commissioner’s Office
(ICO). Contact details, and details o data subject rights are available on the
ICO website at: https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/data-protection-
reform/overview-of-the-gdpr/individuals-rights/
Appendix 11: Participant consent form

CONSENT FORM FOR SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RESEARCH STUDIES

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and/or listed to an explanation about the research

Title: What do teachers think Initial Teacher Education should be?
Department: UCL Institute of Education
Researcher: Julia O’Kelly
Research Supervisor: Jane Perryman
UCL Data Protection Officer: Lee Shailer
This study has been approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee: Project ID number Z6364106/2018/03/48 social research

Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organising the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part. If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

I confirm that I understand that by ticking/initialling each box below I am consenting to this element of the study. I understand that it will be assumed that unticked/initialled boxes means that I DO NOT consent to that part of the study. I understand that by not giving consent for any one element that I may be deemed ineligible for the study.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I confirm that I have read and understood the Information Sheet for the above study. I have had an opportunity to consider the information and what will be expected of me. I have also had the opportunity to ask questions which have been answered to my satisfaction and would like to take part in an individual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I understand that I will be able to withdraw my data up to 4 weeks after the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I consent to the processing of my personal information given during my interview and in the diagram I have drawn for the purposes explained to me. I understand that such information will be handled in accordance with all applicable data protection legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use of the information for this project only I understand that all personal information will remain confidential and that all efforts will be made to ensure I cannot be identified. I understand that confidentiality will be respected unless there are compelling and legitimate reasons for this to be breached. If this was the case I would inform you of any decisions that might limit your confidentiality. I understand that my data gathered in this study will be stored anonymously and securely. It will not be possible to identify me in any publications. A pseudonym will be used in any reference to my data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I understand that my information may be subject to review by responsible individuals from the University for monitoring and audit purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tick Box
6. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. I understand that if I decide to withdraw, any personal data I have provided up to that point will be deleted unless I agree otherwise.

7. I understand the potential risks of participating and the support that will be available to me should I become distressed during the course of the research.

8. No promise or guarantee of benefits have been made to encourage me to participate.

9. I understand that the data will not be made available to any commercial organisations but is solely the responsibility of the researcher undertaking this study.

10. I understand that I will not benefit financially from this study or from any possible outcome it may result in in the future.

11. N/A

12. I agree that my pseudonymised research data may be used by others for future research. [No one will be able to identify you when this data is shared]

13. I understand that the information I have submitted will be published as a report and I wish to receive a copy of it. Yes/No

14. I consent to my interview being audio recorded and understand that the recordings will be destroyed immediately following transcription

15. I hereby confirm that I understand the inclusion criteria as detailed in the Information Sheet and explained to me by the researcher.

16. I hereby confirm that:
   (a) I understand the exclusion criteria as detailed in the Information Sheet and explained to me by the researcher, and
   (b) I do not fall under the exclusion criteria

17. N/A

18. I have informed the researcher of any other research in which I am currently involved or have been involved in during the past 12 months.

19. I am aware of who I should contact if I wish to lodge a complaint.

20. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

21. I understand that the data I provide will be used for the purpose stated in the Information Sheet and will not be shared with other researchers.

If you would like your contact details to be retained so that you can be contacted in the future by UCL researchers who would like to invite you to participate in follow up studies to this project, or in future studies of a similar nature, please tick the appropriate box below.

| Yes, I would be happy to be contacted in this way |
| No, I would not like to be contacted |

_______________________
Name of participant

__________________
Date

_______________________
Signature

_______________________
Name of researcher

__________________
Date

_______________________
Signature