

The impact of alternative routes in teacher education on the work and identities of teacher educators: the English case

Jean Murray, Gerry Czerniawski and Warren Kidd, with Caroline Brennan and Andrew Read.

Introduction

Pre-service routes in England now exist within a fragmented and diversifying teacher education system. There are many ways to become a teacher, including alternative, employment-based routes. These routes exist alongside and sometimes inter-woven with traditional study at degree or post-graduate levels, as we describe later. In this chapter we briefly trace the development of the pre-service system, emphasising its politicisation since 1984 and exploring the concept of ‘partnership’, which has created both past and still -present practices.

In order to provide some context for the chapter, we explore the impacts which these factors have had on teacher educators’ work in the past, but our main focus is the effects of the still-controversial School Direct programme in existence since 2010. School Direct is an employment-based route in which schools recruit intending teachers, provide the majority of their school experience and arrange any other training towards qualified teacher status. This route, in particular, has brought a new cohort of school-based teacher educators into teacher education, sometimes – but not always - working alongside the traditional occupational group of Higher Education (HE)-based teacher educators.

Some of the emerging evidence about this route is reviewed in the chapter, alongside an analysis of its effects on the participating teacher educators in both schools and universities. Research here is still limited so in order to achieve the aims of the chapter, we draw on two small scale studies we have conducted. Although we freely acknowledge that the scale of these studies means that they cannot form the basis for generalisations, we nevertheless claim that they offer in-depth glimpses of how both school-based and HE-based teacher educators are operating in the the rapidly changing and diversifying contexts.

Context

With a teacher workforce of approximately half a million teachers, pre-service teacher education (here referred to as Initial Teacher Education (ITE)) is on a considerable scale. The numbers of student teachers (now often called ‘trainees’) in 2015/16 is expected to be around 35000. The supply, recruitment and retention of teachers, especially during periods of national economic prosperity - when new graduates are less likely to enter teaching - have long been key government concerns. These issues and the politicised nature of the field of ITE over time have been important in the evolution of alternative routes in England and in the changing roles of teacher educators based in both universities and schools.

ITE has been subjected to repeated interventions by central government and its agencies since 1984, as part of an ever-present focus on raising educational standards in schools. These interventions have included many items of legislation and ‘guidance’, together with the creation of regulatory structures and inspection regimes and quasi-governmental organisations charged with monitoring. Cumulatively, these interventions have changed the language, cultures, governance, regulatory structures and institutional organisation of ITE,

making it a more school-focused and instrumental enterprise (Furlong, 2013) and centring ‘practical’ knowledge of teaching (Murray and Mutton, 2015).

As part of a growing emphasis on the practicum and experiential knowledge, all programmes now include large amounts of time in school. Post-graduate student teachers, for example, have to spend at least 24 weeks of their 36 week programme in schools; under-graduate degree programmes typically include at least the same amount of time in school, if not more. On school-based routes (see below) the amount of training time spent in school is often greater still – up to 100%.

As a result of these changes, ITE has moved away from the dominance of the Higher Education Institutions¹, as seen in most of the twentieth century, and towards schools as far more influential stakeholders. The concept of ‘partnership’ has been central since government legislation in 1984 set up the initial requirements for schools and universities to work more closely together. Further legislation in the early 1990s required that all pre-service programmes must be planned, taught and assessed ‘in partnership’ between schools and universities. By 2000 there was a continuum of partnership models from those led by a university (but in partnership with schools) through to entirely school-led schemes (Furlong et al, 2000).

Under many partnership arrangements, HE-based teacher educators experienced a reduction in the amount of time they spent supervising the practicum – observing and assessing pre-service teachers’ in schools. Experienced teachers, usually termed ‘mentors’ took over many of these functions, meaning that there were new emphases on their expertise, professional development and career opportunities; new roles for HE-based teacher educators to support

and manage partnerships were also emphasised. Large numbers of teacher educators and mentors then became involved in boundary crossing activities offered by them at this time. Teacher educators were often systematically involved in helping mentors develop pre-service teachers' learning on the practicum and make formative and summative assessments of teaching; this work was accurately summarised as “pedagogies of guidance” by Guile and Lucas (1999: 27) .

These pedagogies, at their best, enabled mentors to understand the learning needs and patterns of student teachers; they also drew upon strong senses of trust, shared values and the genuine exchange of the varying expertise of all the parties involved in educating pre-service students. Such pedagogies had the potential to generate collaborative learning opportunities for both mentors and HE-based teacher educators, working together outside the traditional epistemological boundaries of schools and universities.

Some forms of partnership activities in England in the 1990s, then, certainly created versions of what Zeichner (2010) in the USA was later to call, ‘hybrid spaces’. Such spaces enabled the development of research-informed clinical practice in teacher educationⁱⁱ (Burns and Mutton, 2013). Yet, despite these positive examples and the length of time during which partnership had been mandatory for universities, by 2010 McNamara and Murray (2013:17) noted that ‘weaknesses in some partnership arrangements meant that the sector had been unable to capitalise fully on the potential contributions that universities - and the teacher educators within them - could make to the ... learning of teachers.’

Alternative routes: history and growth

Alternative routes into teaching have a relatively long history in England, with teacher shortages, particularly during times of economic prosperity, often significant drivers in generating them. Another factor, particularly during the New Labour government of 1997–2010, was the desire to diversify the workforce; for example, bringing more men into primary (elementary) school teaching and increasing the number of teachers from Black and Minority Ethnic groups were government targets during this timeframe.

The Licensed and Articled Teacher Schemes established as school-based, alternative routes in 1989 enabled graduates to become teachers without following a post-graduate programme. School-Centred ITT schemes in which schools took responsibility for ITE programmes began in the 1990s. The establishment of these routes was ideologically significant, since they could be implemented without the sustained involvement of universities. In fact, relatively few student teachers studied in this way throughout the 1990s (Furlong et al., 2000) so, statistically, their influence was limited, even if their symbolic importance was high.

The Graduate Teacher Programme - originally aimed at mature graduates not wishing to undertake a traditional university course - was launched in the late 1990s and saw some considerable expansion of the numbers studying on alternative routes. Although successful, the scheme was eventually replaced by the School Direct programme.

In 2010 the incoming Coalition government made wide-ranging changes to schooling, including the implementation of Free Schools (independent state-funded schools that can be set up by groups such as parents, religious bodies and charities) and the acceleration of the academies programme (state-funded schools that are free of local authority control and sometimes managed by ‘chains’ of co-sponsors). The government was also dis-satisfied with

the quality of ITE provision, sceptical about the value of the universities' contributions to it. Teaching was positioned as a basic 'craft' involving limited knowledge, beyond a subject-specialist degree (Gove, 2010); the government therefore implemented yet more 'reforms' of ITE.

At the centre of these latest interventions were new school-led models of training, designed to open up the 'market' of ITE to new 'providers' (a term that indicates organisations validated to train teachers). There are now many such 'providers' and a number of diverse and 'alternative' routes into teaching. These alternative routes exist alongside traditional study for the one year post-graduate programmes or under-graduate degrees giving qualified teacher status.

There are also schemes aimed at particular groups such as Teach First (similar to the Teach for America programme on which it is modelled, this programme recruits only those with 'good' under-graduate degrees) and Troops into Teaching (for ex- members of the armed forces). There is also an 'assessment only' route by which intending teachers can apply for qualification through assessment against the eight current teacher Standards (Beauchamp et al., 2013). Free schools and academies are now permitted to recruit and employ untrained teachers, if they wish, although all other state-funded schools still have to employ trained teachers.

But the main instrument of the pre-service reforms since 2010 has been the employment-based route called School Direct in which schools recruit graduates who wish to become teachers, provide the majority of their school experience and arrange any other training which the school judges to be necessaryⁱⁱⁱ. Schools can opt for their trainees to obtain a basic

qualification through school-based training only or for the trainee to work with another provider to follow a programme leading to a post-graduate award.

First introduced as a small-scale pilot in 2011, by 2013/14 25% of all ITE places were notionally allocated through School Direct, with ‘the scale and speed of the growth’ taking many in the university sector by surprise (UCET, 2014:2). At the time of writing then, the scheme is already a significant route into the profession. Its impact has been compounded by a revised and more rigorous inspection framework aimed at improving the performance of the sector. Financially, many universities were hit hard by the swift introduction of School Direct and the accompanying cuts in their allocated pre-service numbers. A number of small, subject-specific secondary programmes were closed, some HE-based teacher educators were made redundant and many commentators feared for the on-going viability of other HE provision.

In order to protect their surviving programmes in this new ‘market’ for ITE, many universities needed to rely on gaining ‘training contracts’ from schools under the School Direct scheme in order to recruit their pre-service teacher numbers. The market-led model in use here may be seen as one of purchase by customer (the school) of an ITE programme from a ‘service provider’ (not necessarily a university), sometimes following a process which resembles competitive tendering, as explained in more detail below. The model means that pre-service in England now exists within a fast changing, fragmented and diversifying teacher education system in which there are multiple ‘providers’ of programmes and diverse routes into teaching existing alongside and sometimes inter-woven with traditional study at degree or post-graduate levels.

Whitty (2014:471) sees this fragmented context as resulting from the ‘neo-liberal combination of the strong state and the free market’. Certainly, the principle of universities making a distinctive and necessary contribution to ITE has been steadily eroded in the multiplicity of providers and routes now involved in the ‘marketplace’ of school-led pre-service. In particular, the increasing emphasis on alternative, school-based routes has had significant implications for teacher educators as an occupational group and for their changing roles.

Teacher educators: changing definitions, roles and responsibilities

Perhaps the most significant result of these changes has been the enlargement of the occupational group of teacher educators. Only a decade ago, in England as in many other countries, this group could be defined, in the main, as those employed by universities on full or part-time contracts (Murray, 2005; Davey, 2015). But that HE-based occupational group has now been joined by various types of school-based teacher educators.

The School Direct route, in particular, has brought a new cohort of such educators into teacher education. For example, in addition to the mentoring roles, defined earlier, which have existed to support the practicum since the early 1990s, there are now school-based teacher educators who take on responsibility for organising all aspects of ITE courses, including the recruitment, design and implementation of programmes and assessment at the end of the training process. Most of these educators also teach or mentor pre-service teachers within the school workplace. Depending on the type of training route offered in their schools, these school-based educators sometimes - but not always - work alongside the traditional cohort of HE-based teacher educators.

Two of the authors of this chapter, Gerry Czerniawski and Warren Kidd, conducted one of the few studies of this emerging occupational group of school-based teacher educators (Czerniawski et al, 2013). This small-scale study, undertaken just as the implications of the School Direct scheme were becoming clear for schools and universities, used a sample group of 22 school-based teacher educators working in six schools. The sample can be further subdivided into two groups: senior school staff co-ordinating, implementing and developing all the ITE provision in the schools; and subject specialists, often less experienced teachers, undertaking roles in inducting individual trainees into the school, guiding and mentoring their progress, observing teaching and giving feedback, and finally assessing. All of these school-based teacher educators were working on both traditional post-graduate and School Direct programmes which ran in partnership with a university.

The research tools were semi-structured interviews, designed to capture individuals' understanding of their identities and knowledge as both teachers and teacher educators, and their perceptions of university-based teacher educators. All interviews were conducted face-to-face. Considering the small-sample size and the potentially sensitive nature of the data, all participants were given additional assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. The qualitative data from the interviews was fully transcribed and subjected to an initial content analysis generating a number of emergent themes through the use of open-coding (Strauss and Corbyn 1990). These codes were then refined by repeated analysis and used to identify recurring themes and core categories (Glaser and Strauss 1967).

The study data gives numerous examples of new practices being 'grown-on' or 'extended' from previous ways of working. The sample group showed considerable confidence in the

knowledge, experience and skills they now possessed to be school-based teacher educators and to take on extended responsibilities for pre-service teacher learning in their schools. In these new models the educators were often operating in Zeichner's (2010) 'hybrid' or 'third spaces' with clear benefits to both their trainees and themselves.

They saw themselves as playing crucial roles in the professional development of trainees, through their ability to 'lead the teacher to a place where they can solve their own problems and find their own solutions, where they can think through issues themselves', as one educator said. They assigned themselves roles as 'guides', 'good practitioners' and were engaged in 'modelling classroom skills and best practice' for and with their student teachers. Other practices described included 'developing enquiry and critical thinking skills about teaching', encouraging students to 'question dominant ideas and practices', and supporting 'reflection and using it to develop practical theory'.

In order to teach and mentor students in these ways, the teacher educators saw themselves and their colleagues as needing 'commitments to reflective practice', on-going interest in 'the debate about teaching and learning' and 'flexibility'. One person agreed that the last quality was important as educators should not be 'stuck in their own comfort zones' in order to 'empathise (*with*) and enthuse our student teachers'.

These school-based teacher educators, then, often - rightly - claimed and celebrated their expertise, knowledge and pedagogical skills in teaching teachers. They also saw their knowledge bases of school teaching, as significantly enhanced by their roles as teacher educators; as one person commented:

I get my knowledge of classroom practice by being in it, from the new ideas coming into the school through government policy and by my ability to explore with my trainee a sense of ‘why’ we do things

This educator’s developing identity and practices as a school-based teacher educator were formed by a synergetic and symbiotic process, centred on her own developing knowledge of school teaching, but further enhanced through the collaborative learning that took place whilst she mentored student teachers.

In this study the most experienced educators legitimised their own knowledge bases by referencing the variety and depth of experiences they had had as teachers working in a number of different schools. This was seen as important because they were training pre-service teachers to work in many situations so variety and depth of personal knowledge gave these educators opportunities to offer ‘alternative ways of doing things’. One senior school-based teacher educator noted, for example, that:

I’ve taught in six schools. If you’ve only worked in one school you either spend your whole time critiquing it or believe that this is the only way of doing things. It is therefore essential to have been in more than one school.

Less experienced school-based teacher educators thought that their *recent* qualification as teachers, and therefore their relative *lack* of experience, was significant in terms of the skills and knowledge they brought to their practices in teaching teachers. ‘Familiarity with being mentored myself’ contributed to their senses that they could bring ‘empathy’, ‘understanding’ and ability to ‘identify’ with student teachers to their teacher educator roles.

New and hybrid ways of working, then, were being forged whilst working on the new route of School Direct. These were underpinned by the school-based teacher educators’ senses of

confidence in their professional credentials and authority to engage in teacher education work. Those new practices and enhanced senses of confidence had also developed from the schools' previous partnerships with the university and the structures and relationships which those involved.

The more traditional group of teacher educators based in HE have also seen considerable changes in their work, roles and identities as alternative pre-service routes have proliferated. Research on these teacher educators in England shows that their work has long been characterised by heavier workloads, longer teaching years and less research engagement than typically undertaken by other academic groups (Murray, 2002).

But McNamara and Murray (2013) argued that, between 2000 and 2010 as a result of successive reforms, the growth of alternative routes and an increasingly casualised workforce in universities, a number of changes to teacher educators' work had occurred. First, some of the traditional roles of HE-based teacher educators had been eroded and replaced by other work. For example, many teacher educators now spent less time in supervising and assessing students of the practicum in schools, but more time in managing partnerships with schools, work which Ellis et al (2012) term 'relationship maintenance'. Second, levels of bureaucracy had increased both specifically in ITE and in universities in general meaning that educators had to engage in more work in managing audit and performativity measures for their student teachers and for themselves (Murray et al, 2011).

Third, many Schools of Education showed ambivalence in their commitments to supporting research activity for some teacher educators, particularly those without conventional research profiles, in the run up to the quinquennial research audits. As a result of this, engagement in

research by teacher educators became more limited in some HEIs, adding to historical senses of marginalisation in research (Gilroy and McNamara 2009). Fourth, there was a growing emphasis on experiential, recent and relevant knowledge of schooling within teacher educator professionalism. This knowledge was prioritised in recruitment (Ellis et al., 2012) and monitored during inspections.

Furthermore, experiential knowledge of schooling and identities as ‘once-a-teacher’ often formed the foundations of pedagogy for many teacher educators (Murray, 2014). The knowledge and pedagogical skills of teacher education itself - second order knowledge (Murray, 2002) second order knowledge (Murray, 2002) or knowledge of teaching teachers (Loughran, 2006) - was often under-valued or unrecognised (Murray et al. 2011). By 2010 then, HE-based teacher educators as a group had already experienced multiple changes in their roles and identities, but further changes were to come as further ‘reforms’ of ITE began.

Three of the authors of this chapter – Jean Murray, Caroline Brennan and Andrew Read - conducted a study of HE-based teacher educators in a period when School Direct was becoming increasingly dominant as an alternative route into teaching. During this timeframe, as the number of pre-service teacher places allocated directly to universities reduced sharply, it became imperative for each institution to secure training contracts for as many of these trainees as possible in order to help their PGCE programmes to remain viable. At the same time the schools which had been allocated School Direct places had to recruit their own trainees, decide on the training programme to offer them (including deciding whether or not to draw support from a university or another designated ‘provider’ in designing and implementing that training programme and whether or not to ask their trainees to gain a post-

graduate certificate or qualified teacher status only) and then assess the trainees at the end of the programme.

A considerable number of schools – but by no means all - did decide to work with universities and in many cases to ask their trainees to complete the post-graduate programmes those institutions offered. But schools were explicitly advised by the National College of Teaching and Leadership (an organisation which regulates ITE) to ascertain carefully what particular universities might offer in terms of recruitment, curriculum provision and assessment - and at what price. Many schools, particularly those in dense urban areas where there were a number of universities close by, therefore followed the market model set up by the government and ‘shopped around’ for their training programmes. In the study, we describe many such schools as becoming ‘smart shoppers’, that is their negotiations were conducted with a shrewd eye for the programme which might offer them ‘best value’.

The study attempted to find out what kinds of work HE-based teacher educators were doing in these rapidly changing contexts of the School Direct route, and whether this was new and different work or an extension of previous work patterns. The study involved a sample of 57 teacher educators, based in 9 universities in England, and used on-line, open-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. We found that School Direct had brought about a number of changes including: teacher educators’ engagement in ‘selling’ their courses to schools; some new forms of shared recruitment practices between schools and universities emerging, alongside some accounts of marginalisation of teacher educator expertise in this area; revised forms of curriculum and assessment practices emerging to accommodate school requirements; and extended forms of the “pedagogies of guidance” (Guile & Lucas, 1999, p. 27) by HE-based teacher educators coming into use.

As the market-led model swung into action and schools became ‘smart shoppers’, some teacher educators were clearly investing a great deal of time in generating and securing training contracts. This investment of time was especially true for senior teacher educators (especially those in charge of post-graduate programmes) and partnership managers (academics whose work is explicitly focused on generating and maintaining the universities’ relationships with schools). These teacher educators were often doing what was described by one interviewee as ‘selling and marketing’ their programmes in schools. This often included undertaking detailed financial negotiations around the business model on offer and deciding exactly how much the university would charge the school for the programme. In this sometimes highly competitive process, much of these teacher educators’ work was physically relocated outside the university and into schools. As one person said,

I spend much more time in schools talking about our School Direct offer and how schools might get involved. I’ve become a salesperson trying to attract custom and outbid other local providers whilst still maintaining the long established close relationships we have with our local colleagues

Another added, ‘I have become a skilled negotiator and diplomat. With my new financial negotiation skills, I can give schools a very detailed breakdown of what £9000^{iv} buys at our university.’ These university-based teacher educators then found that they needed to acquire new roles and skills, more akin to consultancy, marketing and sales work on behalf of their universities. For many these new roles were new, different and unwelcome; as one person wrote, ‘I came into Higher Education to teach teachers, not to be a salesman!’

Another changing aspect was involvement in new forms of recruitment practices, but these were seen as extensions of previous work. Under the partnership arrangements in place between schools and universities since the early 1990s, it was routine to have serving teachers on interview panels, helping to evaluate the suitability of prospective teacher candidates alongside HE-based educators. But the university would often undertake all the recruitment procedures, hold the interviews in the institution and assume the majority of responsibility for the interview and selection process. School Direct changed those processes since the schools now recruited and selected their own teacher candidates. Some schools now chose to undertake these processes alone but others asked for support, particularly during selection interviews, from the university with which they were going to work. In these instances, the HE-based teacher educators in the study described routinely taking part in interviews located in schools and sitting on panels dominated by school staff. In many cases recruitment and selection became shared processes, then.

One of the narratives about the changes shows these emerging co-recruitment practices, with shared expertise, discussion and negotiation. One interviewee, for example, said:

School XX^v was interviewing for two School Direct places in Biology and Chemistry so all the candidates were asked to teach a lesson in their subject, with me and two school staff observing them. Pretty daunting and in the circumstances and given that they had no previous teaching experience I thought they did very well, but the school staff were not impressed because none of them included any element of Assessment for Learning in the lessons.

The HE-based educator was impressed by the six candidates and would have recruited them to the post-graduate certificate because all had ‘training potential’. But the school staff initially wanted to reject all of them because they were unimpressed by the quality of the

teaching they had observed. The educator saw the school's expectations of these inexperienced candidates as unrealistically high and could not understand the school's perspectives. After lengthy discussion, the teacher educator recognised the school's imperatives and was able to persuade his school colleagues that two of the candidates had real potential and, with the necessary support for their professional learning, they could develop into excellent teachers within the school. In this narrative the teacher educator's knowledge of pre-service teachers' potential and development was recognised and accepted by the school which went on to appoint the two candidates.

But the teacher educators also had to be flexible and empathetic; he was able to draw on his understanding of the school's perspectives and merge that with his existing knowledge of recruitment and student learning and to implement "pedagogies of guidance" (Guile & Lucas, 1999, p. 27). Working together, school staff and teacher educator were able to recruit two strong candidates – a good outcome for all.

Other examples of changing recruitment practices were less positive, though; these indicate how the power shifts within ITE were giving far more autonomy and power to schools. One HE-based educator recounted that,

When school XX was recruiting with us (*her university*) for a School Direct trainee in physics, the interview panel consisted of me, the head teacher, the head of subject and the year tutor. There were four candidates, three of whom had degrees in the subject so they are like gold dust. I would have recruited all three of them for the post-graduate programme at the university like a shot. One of them was particularly outstanding, I thought.

The educator's narrative goes on to relate how, after four interviews and much panel discussion, the school decided not to accept her preferred candidate but to select instead a candidate with a degree in Biology but 'only an A level^{vi} in physics and little other subject knowledge'. This candidate was, however, a mature person making a career-change and the school staff felt that he 'will fit in here'. He was therefore recruited, despite his apparent lack of degree level subject knowledge.

In this narrative the teacher educator felt that her previous 'gate keeping' experience and guidance were 'marginalised' by the school and the subject knowledge imperatives she felt were important in teaching were over-ridden by the school's preference. She did not feel 'in control of the process' and had been 'relegated to the role of ignored recruitment consultant'. In this – and other similar examples from the study – there was a clear power shift, with the traditional 'gate keeping' responsibilities of HE-based teacher educators reduced. Across the study as a whole, there was evidence of considerable divergence occurring in recruitment practices, with many shared practices emerging but also some perceived marginalisation of HE expertise.

HE-based educators were also commonly negotiating new structures and content in the programmes they were offering to schools; these included revised curricula and revised assessment procedures. A recurring theme in the study data was requests from schools for particular curriculum areas to be covered in programmes. For example, one school requested that the post-graduate course to be followed by their School Direct trainees should be amended to include 'substantial coverage of behaviour management, teaching English as a second language, creativity and teaching in faith schools.' (It should be noted at this point that all of these topics except the last named would be routine parts of any standard post-

graduate programme). But the rationale for this request was that all the named topics should be covered in depth and tailored to reflect the specific ways in which the school taught and its pupil intake. Other schools also requested amendments to reflect their particular approaches to pupil learning; one school, part of a large ‘chain’ of academies stated that their ‘trainees needed to learn how to teach in the XX Academy way’.

Schools also asked for new forms of assessment for the trainees they had recruited. In one case, for example, a group of schools all asked for trainees to pass a written assignment on ‘behaviour management techniques’. In other examples from the study schools took active roles in re-negotiating the assessment modes, during and at the end of the practicum that they had used within many of the previous university-school partnerships. In some cases HE-based teacher educators’ decision making on assessments were explicitly challenged by schools which wanted ‘more rigor and tougher judgements on failing students’ and were sometimes keen to ‘get rid of students (*trainees*) they saw as poor or who didn’t fit into the school quickly without giving a chance for learning how to teach to take place’.

In negotiating these changes around the curricula and assessment, the HE-based educators had to work in schools with their school-based counterparts, especially those who had responsibility for the School Direct programme. They described doing what interviewees variously termed ‘drawing on’ but ‘adjusting’, ‘developing’ or ‘growing on’ their previous knowledge and experience of previous practices in order ‘to mediate with the schools and reach consensus’. Their previous knowledge of working in partnership with schools and of ‘relationship maintenance’ (Ellis et al., 2012), together with their understanding of the educational and socio-geographical contexts in which the schools operated, were highly relevant here, as were their abilities to implement ‘pedagogies of guidance’ (Guile & Lucas, 1999, p. 27) about student teacher learning patterns. HE-based teacher educators were then

often operating in ‘hybrid’ or ‘third spaces’ (Zeichner, 2010), working across and between schools and universities to consider practice and research relevant for both sites. Because of the need for flexibility in accommodating school requirements, there was considerable evidence of diverging practices in operating as ‘hybrid educators’ in this way.

Conclusion

We acknowledged earlier in this chapter that the scale of these studies means that they cannot form the basis for any generalisations. Nevertheless, they do offer some views on how both school-based and HE-based teacher educators are affected in the diversifying contexts of teacher education in England. In the case of school-based educators, our findings are similar to those found in other small scale studies (see, for example, White et al, 2014). In general though, we must stress that detailed accounts of such impact on teacher educators are not yet clear.

This chapter has shown how, within the highly regulated and politicised context of ITE in England, increasing emphases on ‘partnership’ and the generation of alternative, school-led and school-based routes have had significant, long-term implications for teacher educators as an occupational group. As we have described, these changes have been underway since 1984 but have accelerated in the twenty first century. In particular, as this chapter has shown, the introduction at scale of School Direct as an alternative route into teacher education in England has had significant and almost certainly long-lasting effects for all teacher educators since 2011.

This chapter has shown a new occupational sub-group of school-based teacher educators emerging in one context; these educators showing growing confidence, skills and expertise in

their second order knowledge (Murray, 2002) for working with student teachers. These educators rightly claim and celebrate their new hybrid roles and practices – often working as both teachers and teacher educators simultaneously - and contribute new and valuable voices to teacher education.

For some HE-based teacher educators aspects of their work have been re-focused towards new and different roles more akin to consultancy, marketing and sales work on behalf of their HEIs. But other educators were extending, ‘growing-on’ – or developing – their previous practices, based on their past work with partnership schools. Those practices include enhanced roles as brokers between schools and their HEIs to support student teacher learning (Lunenberg et al, 2013), operating more extensively in ‘hybrid’ spaces located between schools and universities and developing extensive ‘pedagogies of guidance’ (Guile & Lucas, 1999, p. 27) for working with school-based teacher educators.

There is considerable evidence of divergence in these extended practices. Some seem less than positive, especially where they result in narrow and instrumental forms of ITE, constructed around strong ‘local knowledge’ (‘how we teach in this school is the right and only way, as one HE-based educator encapsulated it); these forms of knowledge ignore broader constructions of teacher education and teaching as necessarily research-informed. To the authors of this chapter, these are very worrying trends which could lead to less critical and theoretically relevant forms of teacher education. In other cases new practices ignore the accumulated experience and expertise of HE-based teacher educators – expertise which the system can ill-afford to lose; others – particularly those involving ‘sales and marketing work’ run the risk of generating yet more bureaucracy in an already over-stretched and over-regulated teacher education system.

But the majority of new practices described in these two small studies seem to have positive potential for the system, if they were to be replicated at scale. In the studies, more educators from both groups are operating in what might be termed ‘hybrid’ or ‘third spaces’ (Zeichner, 2010), located between the domains of knowledge and the locations for learning traditionally allocated to schools and universities as seemingly separate entities, valuing different knowledge about teaching. Here, from the reconfigured spaces of teacher education new practices emerge; many of these are shown here to be co-constructed between school- and HE-based teacher educators and involving shared expertise; these practices generate new forms of distributed knowledge.

These new spaces or settings have some features in common with the new ‘grounded understandings and knowledge’ which emerged within an ‘edge community’, constructed between a school and a university programme (Gorodetsky and Barak, 2008:1908). As these authors emphasise such communities ‘are often uncomfortable settings because being in the edge or peripherality is the means for new growth and not a space for enculturation to existing core communities’ (ibid: 1909).

In this study too operating on the edge of change brings degrees of discomfort, as well as senses of new growth: shifting roles and types of work mean adjustments for teacher educators, not least in forming their new practices and relationships amidst new and shifting forms of power relations, autonomy, trust and economic models in ITE. There are complex tensions around these new – and sometimes diverging - practices for all teacher educators, wherever they are located, in brokering and navigating these changes. In effect, all these teacher educators are creating new spaces, structures and relationships in action as the

landscape of teacher education shifts around them. These reconfiguration may well also allow for a re-drawing of past partnership boundaries and practices and movements towards the development of a critical pedagogy of teacher education, based on new, shared senses of trust (McNamara and Murray, 2013: 23). But, overall, it is of central importance to the development of ITE in England that these new ways of operating – and the ‘market-led’ model of ITE within which they are generated – centre, not on competition and difference between stakeholders, but on communal efforts to improve the quality of student teacher learning – and subsequently, of course, the quality of pupil achievements as learners.

References

- Beauchamp, G., Clarke, L., Hulme, M. and Murray, J. (2013) *Policy and practice within the United Kingdom (Research and Teacher Education: The BERA-RSA Inquiry*, London: BERA. Retrieved from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/BERA-Paper-1-UK-Policy-and-Practice.pdf>
- Boyer, E., Altbach, P. & Whitelaw, M. (1994) *The Academic Profession: an international perspective*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning.
- Burn, K. and Mutton, T. (2013) *Review of ‘research-informed clinical practice’ in initial teacher education. Research and teacher education: The BERA-RSA Inquiry*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Paper-4-Research-informed-clinical-practice.pdf>
- Czerniawski, G., Kidd, W. & Murray, J. (2013) Understanding teacher educators as teachers of teachers: exploring multiple perspectives. *Presentation at the AERA Conference, San Francisco, USA. 1st May 2013*. Education and Poverty: Theory, Research, Policy and Praxis

- Ellis, V., McNicholl, J. and Pendry, A. (2012) 'Institutional conceptualisations of teacher education as academic work in England', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28(5): 685-693.
- Furlong, J. (2013). *Education – an anatomy of the discipline: Rescuing the university project?* Oxon: Routledge.
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C. and Whitty, G. (2000) *Teacher education in transition: Reforming professionalism?* , Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gilroy, P. and McNamara, O. (2009) 'A critical history of research assessment in the United Kingdom and its post-1992 impact on education, *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*', 35(4): 321-335.
- Gorodetsky, M. and Barak, J. (2008) The educational-cultural edge: a participative learning environment for co-emergence of personal and institutional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24(7):1907-1918.
- Guile, B. and Lucas, N. (1999) 'Rethinking initial teacher education and professional development in further education', in A. Green and N. Lucas (eds) *Further education and lifelong learning: Realigning the sector for the twenty first century*, London: Bedford Way Papers, pp 203 – 224.
- Gove, M. (2010) *Speech to the National College Annual Conference, Birmingham on 16 June 2010*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-to-the-national-college-annual-conference-birmingham>
- Loughran, J. 2006. *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education*. London: Falmer.
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F. & Dengerink, J. (2013) Six roles of teacher educators: a review study on the profession of teacher educator. *Presentation at the AERA Conference, San Francisco, USA. 1st May 2013*. Education and Poverty: Theory, Research, Policy and Praxis.

McNamara, O. and Murray, J. (2013) *The School Direct programme and its implications for research-informed teacher education and teacher educators*, York: Higher Education Academy.

Murray, J. (2002) 'Between the chalkface and the ivory towers? A study of the professionalism of teacher educators working on primary initial teacher education courses in the English education system', *Collected Original Resources in Education* 26(3): 1-530.

Murray, J. (2014) 'Teacher educators' constructions of professionalism: Change and diversity in teacher education', *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1): 7-21.

Murray, J. (in press) Teacher Education and Higher Education in The Teacher Education Group (in press) *Teacher Education in Times of Change*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Murray, J. Czerniawski, G. & Barber, P. (2011) Faculty Identities, Academic Communities and Knowledge Terrains in Teacher Education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37.3. pp.105 – 125.

Murray, J. & Mutton, T. (2015) Teacher Education in England: change in abundance, continuities in question in The Teacher Education Group (2015) *Teacher Education in Times of Change*. Bristol: Policy Press.

University Council for the Education of Teachers (2014) *UCET annual report 2014*, London: UCET.

Whitty, G. (2014) 'Recent developments in teacher training and their consequences for the 'University Project' in education', *Oxford Review of Education* 4(4): 466-481.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99.

-
- ⁱ Most, but not all, Higher Education Institutions offering teacher education in England are now universities.
- ⁱⁱ The term ‘research-informed clinical practice’ is variously defined but the term fundamentally implies bringing research-based understandings of teaching and learning into dialogue with the developing professional understandings of student teachers (Burns and Mutton, 2013)
- ⁱⁱⁱ There are two sub-routes on School Direct: most trainees follow the basic route, as described above, but the School Direct salaried route offers older graduates the chance to work and be paid as an unqualified teacher whilst training.
- ^{iv} £9000 is currently the fee charged by most English universities for a year of post-graduate study.
- ^v The names of all the institutions in this study have been removed to protect teacher educator and school anonymity.
- ^{vi} ‘A or Advanced level’ qualifications are taken at the age of 18 in England and often form the basis for admission to university.