

Chapter 12: We Are All Teacher Educators Now: Understanding School-based Teacher Educators in Times of Change in England

Gerry Czerniawski, University of East London, United Kingdom

Warren Kidd, University of East London, United Kingdom

Jean Murray, University of East London, United Kingdom

Abstract

Within the context of the European Commission's recent policy gaze on teacher education (European Commission 2010; 2013; 2015) this chapter contributes to an improved understanding of the hybrid, poly-contextualised identities of school-based teacher educators. At a time of systemic change in the education systems of many countries, teachers in schools are increasingly being asked to be responsible for the education and training of future teachers. Within the English backdrop of a rapidly changing landscape for teacher education we present initial findings from a small-scale study exploring, through interview data, how the knowledge-bases and identities of two groups of insiders, university and school-based teacher educators, were perceived by those hybrid teacher educators (Zeichner 2010) working in schools. Our findings reveal: differences in school-based teacher educators views on their work and the work of university-based teacher educators; on the role of educational research has in the work they do; and the ways in which different professional pathways (e.g. occupational/university; primary/secondary) influence views on what it means to be a teacher educator.

12.1 Introduction

Proposals made by the European Commission have led to the Education Council adopting, for the first time, a European agenda (European Commission 2010; 2013) for improving the quality of teacher education for all countries within the European Union. The Commission, commenting on the professional identity of teacher educators, notes that:

Effective cooperation requires common values for the profession and a shared responsibility for high quality teacher education. Therefore, teacher educators - no matter what role they play in teacher education or how they identify themselves - should have a clear, shared understanding of their roles and of the many aspects of quality of teaching [European Commission. 2013: p9]

There are, however, different globalised, internationalised and localised understandings about how to educate teachers, the nature of what it means to be a professional teacher educator and what is meant by teaching 'quality' (Gewirtz et al 2009; Darling Hammond & Lieberman 2012; Czerniawski & Ulvik 2014). Even within national borders, differences in the constellations, configurations of influence and patterns of professional relationships ensure that the experience of being a teacher

educator differs considerably for different individuals even within broadly similar contexts and settings. Similarly, making generalisations about the student-teacher experience can be problematic, despite the international trend in the adoption and implementation of professional standard frameworks, and, in some cases the increasing take-up of school-based and school-driven teacher education (White et al 2015). Universities and schools differ in their teacher education programmes; university and school departments may vary in their interpretations of the knowledge, skills, practices, ethics, values and attributes that different frameworks prioritise. Teacher educators have their own styles, preferences and images of the 'ideal' teacher, based in part on their own student teacher experience that will inform the ways in which they facilitate the professional development of their own student teachers. Furthermore, tensions, while not irresolvable, exist between the harmonisation of policies that might attempt to determine teacher education in different nation states, and the extent to which such policies are viewed appropriate and beneficial for pupils, teachers and their educators. The chapter will briefly contextualise and outline recent developments in school-based teacher education in England before briefly outlining the research design for this study. The findings of the study are then discussed around three themes: differences in school-based teacher educators views on their work and the work of university-based teacher educators; school-based teacher educators' views on the role of educational research has in the work they do; and the ways in which different pathways to becoming a teacher (e.g. occupational/university; primary/secondary) influence views on what it means to be a teacher educator. In so doing the study draws attention to the parameters of fuzziness that potentially surround, position and limit the work of all teacher educators in England.

12.2 School-based Teacher Training - From Slow Trot to Fast Gallop

Over the last twenty years, the dominant policy agenda in many Western democracies has been to open up teacher education to market forces, deregulation, and cost-cutting (Davey 2013; Grimmer 2009). Nowhere are these characteristics more prevalent and powerfully articulated than in England. While university and school partnerships have been a firmly embedded (and statutory) feature of teacher education since the 1992, the country's schools and universities have increasingly had to navigate their way through an environment of increased competition, *über*-accountability and external evaluation. A variety of occupational or vocational pathways into teaching have subsequently emerged, all subject to professional teaching standards. Alongside existing more traditional university pre-service teacher education courses exists an array of occupational school-based (and salaried) training schemes, that enable non-qualified teachers to start teaching in the classroom immediately, learning on-the-job from more experienced colleagues. With the exception of the traditional three-year Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) degree course, historically associated with primary student-teacher pathways, both the university courses ('Post' and 'Professional' Graduate Certificate in Education [PGCE]) and the occupational pathways normally run for one academic year. The relatively short

duration of these courses, combined with the legislative and standards-driven requirements that such courses have to abide by, limit the extent to which teacher educators can provide breadth and depth in the curriculum offered to student/trainee teachers. School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) programmes represent one strand of these occupational routes and are run by school consortia and colleges. School-based programmes in general offer courses that will award a 'recommendation' for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) although in many cases this is *not* accompanied by a PGCE that has been validated by a higher education institution, therefore limiting the international currency such programmes possess.

With new professional standards for teachers, accompanied "by a wider discourse of research-informed teaching" rather than "scholarship-informed" (Gewirtz 2013), these developments mean that schools have replaced universities at the heart of the decision making process in terms of who can/cannot be recruited into the profession. Furthermore both Schools Direct (SD) and SCITTS represent a significant threat to Higher Education institutions (HEIs) not just in terms of the decreasing student numbers (and therefore income) but also the extent to which educational research remains viable within the academy. McNamara and Murray (2013) argue that SD, and the wider reforms that accompany these developments are radical in that they combine three elements:

- An ideologically driven understanding of teaching as essentially only a 'craft' rather than a complex and fundamentally intellectual activity;
- An apprenticeship model of teacher training that can be located entirely in the workplace;
- And the related and highly questionable assumption that a longer period of time spent in schools inevitably - and unproblematically - leads to better and 'more relevant' student learning

[McNamara & Murray 2013: 14]

The authors of this chapter acknowledge these elements as challenges to teacher education in England across the multiple contexts into which teachers are socialised into their profession. In the next section of this chapter we address the conceptual framework and methodology we use to capture and analyse the views of some of the teacher educators working in these contexts.

12.3 Research Design

The conceptual framework for this study draws, in part, on earlier work by (2002) that views teacher educators within Higher Education as *second order practitioners* involved in the processes of (re)production of the discourses of the *first order field*, within a partnership system of professional teachers and paraprofessionals working within schools. In line with earlier work (Murray et al., 2011), we see professional knowledge and identity as intricately related in the formation and development of teachers and the ways in which they choose to deploy their knowledge in professional practice. We

draw on the notion of professional capital (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2013) and the many ways in which that capital is deployed by the school-based teacher educators in this study.

This chapter reports on research with an opportunistic sample of school-based teacher educators in England. Twenty-two teacher educators drawn from two primary schools and four secondary, took part in semi-structured interviews. The research design¹ enabled a dual-focus on these participants both in their primary role as teachers, and their secondary role as teacher educators. The six schools chosen for this study are, themselves, training schools. In terms of their own training trajectories as former student teachers, participants represent training routes from both university and occupational pathways. The research tools were designed to capture individual understandings and experiences of their identities and working lives in their dual roles as both teachers and teacher educators. However this focus has been extended to elicit their views on the identities and knowledge-bases of the university-based teacher educators they professionally engage with.

Some of the terminology in this paper (e.g. “trainee teachers”; “student teachers”; “teacher education” and “teacher training”) reflects the often shifting and contested historical and discursive positioning of teacher education and those that are trained/educated. For this reason it is appropriate here to acknowledge that the terminology used reflects that often contested positioning but also the variations in usage by participants in this study. The decision has therefore, reluctantly, been taken to use the term ‘trainee’, where appropriate, to describe student teachers and those ‘trainee’ teachers who embark on occupational pathways to qualification (e.g. SCITT; Schools Direct etc.). However the authors of this chapter recognise the problematic nature of this term.

12.4 Findings

Our findings reveal: differences in school-based teacher educators’ views on their work and the work of university-based teacher educators; on the role of educational research has in the work they do; and the ways in which different professional pathways (e.g. occupational/university; primary/secondary) influence views on what it means to be a teacher educator. These three themes are briefly presented below.

12.4.1. I Train and They Educate

Most school-based teacher educators in this study differentiated themselves significantly from university-based counterparts in their views on the work they did, the relationships they had with their trainee teachers and the types of knowledge they engaged with. In almost all cases the participants,

¹ See Czerniawski et al (2013) for a more detailed explanation of the research methodology deployed in this study

unsurprisingly, identified themselves as first and foremost ‘teachers’ and, in most cases, viewing themselves as ‘teacher trainers’ rather ‘teacher educators’ the latter of whom they associated with the work of their university-based colleagues. As teachers and teacher educators, most participants identified their multi-functionality as symptomatic of working in ‘hectic’, ‘ever changing’ and at times ‘chaotic’ school environments far removed from the ‘ivory tower’ environments they associated with those working in Higher Education.

The participants’ knowledge *of* teaching, as opposed to knowledge *about* teaching (Smith & Levi-Ari, 2005) was emphasised as a key component of their work with student teachers. Despite only one participant using the word ‘pedagogy’, the knowledge of how to teach specific subjects, the use of appropriate resources and the ability to deploy a range of teaching strategies were all seen as elements that they could, should and did model to their student teachers. In relation to modelling, two mentors stressed the importance of teachers in this role. Expressed variously as ‘letting them become their own person’; ‘troubleshooting obstacles’ and ‘helping them through their journey’, mentoring was highlighted as a significant feature of their work with student teachers. Articulated along-side an equally powerful ethics of care, ‘tough love’, ‘professional mothers’ and ‘handholding’ were seen as features of their work, often couched in terms of its similarity to being ‘just like a teacher’. This mentoring role was often contrasted with what was seen as the more ‘formal’, ‘distant’ and ‘tick-box’ approach adopted by some university teacher educators on their visits to schools. Melissa, for example, spoke of the way that she and her colleagues in school would:

...watch the trainees sitting down with their tutors and it seemed that they came over as the ‘expert’, that they would be telling them how they should be doing it and how they needed to do this to get a higher grade [Melissa, primary school-based teacher educator]

If the knowledge of school-based teacher educators was generally characterised by this group of insiders as ‘hands-on’, ‘practical’ and ‘realistic’ then the knowledge of their colleagues working in universities was often seen as more ‘holistic’, ‘theoretical’, ‘academic’ and ‘removed’. And while knowledge *of* teaching was the domain laid claim to by teacher educators in schools then knowledge *about* teaching (e.g. different student teaching learning patterns, adult pedagogic and modelling strategies and experiential knowledge of different schooling systems) was perceived to be an area of knowledge more likely to be embedded within those teacher educators working in universities. A further distinction was made between those colleagues in university whose primary purpose, as ex-teachers themselves, was to ‘support’ and ‘nurture’ their student teachers and those colleagues who, for some seemed ‘out of touch’, ‘close to retirement’ and/or ‘more interested in their own research’. It was generally accepted that teacher educators working in universities had a much better understanding of the assessment criteria to pass the courses, the ‘mountains of paperwork’ associated with the student teacher experience and ‘the many hoops they needed to jump through’ to pass the

course. Most participants conveyed their belief that it was essential that teacher educators in universities must be former teachers. It was also generally thought that teacher educators in university would and should know about ‘research’ in teacher education. It is to the often ambiguous and contradictory views held about what research is and who should carry this out that we now wish to turn to in this chapter.

12.4.2. Research Informed Practice and School-based Teacher Educators

The recent BERA/RSA (2014) inquiry into research and the teaching profession in the UK states that “schools and colleges become research-rich environments in which to work” (BERA-RSA 2014:2). Findings in this study problematize this seemingly straightforward assertion. In earlier work we (Murray, Czerniawski, & Barber, 2011) have identified a distinction made by university-based teacher educators between research with a small (r) and capital (R). This distinction is evidenced here with school-based participants in this study. Small ‘r’ research, akin to Boyer’s (1990) ‘scholarship of teaching’, seen here for example as the reading around preparation of lessons; new subject disciplines and its associated pedagogy. Capital ‘R’ research is meant here as the production of new knowledge brought about through research activity and often associated with the gathering of primary data. When asked about their position on the role of research in the work they did, participants’ responses varied in terms of its importance and significance although most believed they ‘should be involved’ in ‘some sort of research’. Most, for example, made claim to small ‘r’ research playing a role in the work they did both as teachers and teacher educators. Various expressed as ‘reading up on subject matter’, ‘looking at articles in newspapers’, ‘reading for preparing lessons’ and ‘updating my subject knowledge’, subject mentors and coordinating mentors tended to prioritise these elements above updating their subject pedagogy. The latter activity was conveyed through ‘attending exam-board’ training, ‘copious use of twitter’ and some ‘staff inset’ sessions. More experienced mentors talked of the need to ‘be knowledgeable about school policies’, the ‘latest developments in SEN’ and, in relation to teacher education, ‘the wealth’ and ‘mountain’ of information that ‘floods in from the universities’ in relation to their student teacher courses. Time constraints were constantly flagged up as a limiting factor on the extent to which teacher educators in schools could keep abreast of the requisite knowledge required to train teachers with one participant stating that ‘research is paramount but I rarely get the chance to look at research now’.

Examples of school-based ‘capital R’ research activity included ‘action research’, ‘pupil shadowing’, involvement in ‘student voice initiatives’ focused on ‘raising achievement’, and projects linked to ‘assessment for learning’, ‘the use of questioning strategies’ and ‘the level of challenge pitched in lessons’. However, ambiguous and at times contradictory positions were adopted around the extent to which this sort of research was, or should be a defining feature of the work school-based educators carried out. School-based research was often couched, instrumentally, in terms of the strategic

‘outcomes we [senior staff in the school] have in mind’ and with an examination results focus on ‘A-Stars in the classroom’. Those who were actively involved in research spoke about how it provided ‘opportunities to reflect on their practice, ‘time to talk to colleagues about what actually goes on in the classroom’ and ‘a valuable form of CPD [Continuing Professional Development]’. University colleagues were generally accepted as having greater ‘knowledge’ and ‘experience’ of ‘doing research’ although at times this was not necessarily conveyed enthusiastically. Three mentors, for example, commented on how teacher educators in universities needed to become more involved in schools if there was to be an effective ‘partnership’ between schools and universities over school-based research. For some other participants however, being involved in research was seen less attractively, particularly if they had received their own education and training from occupational pathways:

My role as a teacher must come first - your priority is a teacher and my role in teacher training gives me an edge coz I’m still in the classroom, head of department and that must come first and a long way down the line above doing any sort of research project [Christine, secondary subject mentor].

A former B.Ed. student and subject mentor, commenting on the significance of research and the ‘value-added’ university-based teacher educators bring to the lives of her student teachers, stated that:

Equality and Gender is more than a training session on equal opportunities. Those in universities need to know policy, how it is informed, and where the theoretical basis for that policy has come from. Some subject areas may implicitly ‘get’ these differences but others won’t and that is where the university must step in [Maureen, secondary subject mentor]

This bifurcation in situating the significance of research in the work of educators in schools and universities is further exemplified by this subject mentor saying that:

We all know what outstanding teaching and learning looks like. Universities might have a greater understanding of the research that underpins it whereas in schools it is based on what we see rather than what we read [Simon, secondary subject mentor].

However, despite these, at times, varying and contradictory views on the significance of research for school-based teacher educators the roles of university colleagues were generally seen as a valuable part of the professional development of future teachers:

We *must* keep university input - schools can fully support with classroom practice but we are far less confident with the academic, research side of it. Simply - because we do not have the time to keep up. We do action research in school but that's *different*. We can't keep up with the academic research, or the resources associated with it, or the international side that is so important when understanding what it means to train teachers well [Peter, secondary subject mentor]

This response exemplifies the many fears expressed by those interviewed in this study regarding the potential changes in relationship between universities and schools, the time-constraints imposed on teachers in general within this new policy climate and the limited resources available to carry out research in both its forms. It also exemplifies a potential for identity dissonance (Boyd & Tibke 2012) when attempting to juggle the often-competing demands associated with being a teacher and teacher educator.

12.4.3. Different Pathways, Different Values?

A tentative finding of this study, and one that deserves further research, emerged around the extent to which the pathway school-based teacher educators took when they, themselves, trained as teachers affected their perceptions of what it meant to be a teacher educator. As authors of this paper we had, for example, assumed that those teacher educators who had received longer periods of training (e.g. on the three year B.Ed. degree route) might have been more critical of shorter courses in the development of their own knowledge base. However responses revealed ambiguous and contradictory views from one particular group of (n=4) teacher educators, all of who worked in primary schools and whose training took between three to four years. This particular group of teacher educators' extended period of study was, in their eyes, juxtaposed with the 'short', 'crammed' and 'superficial' experience they felt their own student teachers received on one-year PGCE courses. Furthermore, as teacher educators, they tended to favour, for their own student teachers, the equally short occupational pathways (in contrast to the PGCE experience) in their ability to provide more 'relevant', 'practical' and 'hands-on' experience arguing that their student teachers were being grounded, more quickly, in the 'reality' of teaching through this particular pathway. In part these views from primary teacher educators could be explained by the greater time spent that primary teachers have with their own pupils and the time invested in their own training. Most primary-school teachers will be completely responsible for the educational development of *all* pupils within one particular class rather than the shared responsibility many teachers have when working with pupils in secondary schools. A point emphasised by one experienced mentor (herself the deputy head teacher of her primary school) saying that student teachers "have to be me". She went on to say that:

Quite simply the system of training at the moment does not work. The PGCE, a route instinctively, I prefer but is quite simply too short and while I absolutely believe student teachers need a wide experience in different schools during their training, in a primary school this is problematic because of the nature of what we do. So I am looking for a student teacher, from day one, who can replicate what I do in the classroom, quickly with me there throughout the year to pick up the pieces [Janine, primary co-ordinating mentor].

This replication and the assumption that what is being replicated is good practice, is one of the more unsettling findings in this study. This diminution in the opportunity for critical reflective practice resonates with recent emerging literature on school-based teacher educators (see White et al., 2015; Boyd & Tibke, 2012).

Across the board, criticism was widely voiced by those interviewed for the PGCE experience as a vehicle in the development of a future teaching workforce. Seen as ‘hardly the Finnish model’ with only ‘one year in which to cram everything in’ one mentor, in particular, who had received his training via the PGCE route talked of this route as ‘very much a training course with not much opportunity to be educated as such’. Another former PGCE participant said that his course would have been ‘brilliant if it had been longer with more chance to get to grips with the ideas we studied’. One mentor speaking about one-year preparatory courses in general felt that ‘we are limiting their [future teachers] career opportunities by not giving them the academic rigour they need. Another described such courses in general as ‘monkey see monkey do - trainees do what they need to do to pass the course rather than what textbooks say about what is good/bad teaching.

It was notable that the ‘gate keeping’ role that we identified in an earlier study (Murray et al., 2011) continues for some teacher educators in terms of the ability to decide who should/should not become teachers. At the time of writing this chapter there are many gates, many paths. Gate keeping was a domain of university-based teacher educators identified by school-based teachers in this study although *not* by those who had come through occupational pathways. Those that worked in higher education were singled out as being ‘strong enough to say this is not necessarily the right direction for them’ as well as being able to ‘have that distance’ and ‘spot true potential’. This gate keeping role was aligned with another quality associated with those working in Higher Education, that of the ‘challenge agent’. Having ‘experience of working in a wide variety of different school settings’, and in some cases, different phases, was seen as valued professional capital (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2013) further differentiating the work of teacher educators in universities from their school-based colleagues.

12.5 Discussion

This chapter argues that while similarity in developments of policy making are taking place in teacher education internationally, the pace of change varies considerably and the nature of those changes far from predictable. Ozga and Jones (2006) remind us that while ‘travelling policy’ may be shaped by globalizing trends, ‘embedded’ policy is “mediated by local contextual factors that may translate

policy to reflect local priorities and meanings” (Ozga and Jones 2006:1). It has also been argued elsewhere (Czerniawski 2010) that cultural specificities exist that can account for the variety of ways policies are interpreted and implemented at national, regional and local levels. Making generalisations in a study of this size is unwise, however the findings do contribute to a greater understanding of school-based teacher education at a time when many countries are increasingly developing their own school-based models of teacher education. Under the watchful and (in most cases) caring eyes of qualified teachers, whose primary *raison d'être* is to educate their pupils, England represents, at times, a frightening glimpse into an uncertain future for teacher education and the implications that future has for critical reflective practice. Within an international context in which teacher education is often positioned as a “policy problem” (Mayer, 2013; Grimmet, 2009) there is a danger that many teacher educators lose sight of what their primary focus should be - the preparation of future professional teachers who are equipped to develop young people to play their part in the formation of a socially, economically and environmentally just and viable society. The findings in this chapter reveal how much more complex such a focus can be when teacher education increasingly moves into schools. In England the many structural differences between different types of school play a significant role in teacher education and professional development limiting the potential decisional and social capital of a future teaching workforce. The pick’n’mix array of comprehensive, grammar, specialist, ‘faith’ and independent schools in England must therefore raise concern for those preparing to teach on school-based programmes where the pressure is to train future teachers, or as one of our participants said, ‘mould them’ for that particular school rather than for *all* schools. To be trained to become critical reflective practitioners teachers require many mirrors - many significant others (Mead, 1934; Czerniawski, 2010). Limiting the exposure of becoming a teacher to just one school is likely to therefore limit the opportunities student teachers have to access the valuable knowledge capital of experienced colleagues who work in different and varied educational settings.

A second concern emerges related to the rise of measurement cultures in education at national and supranational levels (Biesta, 2008). Smith (2011), for example, drawing attention to international discussions around evidence-based teacher education, warns that this can “easily lead to a top-down culture of evidence in which all teacher education has to be planned according to the ‘what works’ principle” (Smith, 2011, p.341). The extent to which schools in England have felt obliged to respond and reflect these measurement cultures is well documented (see Gewirtz, 2013; Ball, 2003). With increasingly narrow school curricula dominating school-teaching time tables, often at the expense of extra-curricular activities (e.g. music, sport, school-visits), many school-based teacher educators, as reported in this study, are under pressure to focus their student teachers on getting pupils ‘A*s’ rather than working within a broader holistic vision of what education is. Our concerns here are the extent to which teacher education can retain and enhance its ethical, moral, theoretical and practical commitment to what Kari Smith calls ‘teachership’ (Smith, 2011). The alternative risks producing and

re-producing, in school-based teacher education, “cultures of compliance and a narrowly technicist approach to the education of teachers” (Gewirtz, 2013, p. 10).

One working hypothesis that the authors of this chapter had was around the notion that the pathway that individual school-based teacher educators took might colour their own professional identities as teacher educators working in schools. This hypothesis turned out to be too naïve, too simplistic. The findings in our study indicate that differences do emerge, partially but not exclusively dependent on routes into teaching, in the views of school-based teacher educators about the role of research in teacher education. The findings show that the school-based teacher educators in this study, in general, value educational research, value opportunities to engage in that research and value the professional capital university-based teacher educators have in terms of their knowledge and understanding of that research. However, our findings would indicate that, in the eyes of many school-based teacher educators, the ‘Ivory Tower’ still stands limiting the efficacy of its inhabitants to effectively educate and train its student teachers. The findings also indicate that those in the tower may need to consider the extent to which they can engage more in school-based training activities, the professional development of teachers and the professional development of school-based teacher educators.

At this juncture the authors acknowledge one elephant-in-the-room in the guise of the English PGCE (both types). Almost all participants in this study regarded their school-based practicum as playing a far greater role in their professional development in becoming qualified teachers than their student-teacher experience at their universities. While this, in part, can be attributed to the theory/practice gap often associated with the professional socialisation and development of all teachers (Korthagen, 2010), the PGCE was generally regarded by most participants in this study as inferior to either the occupational pathways or three-year degree programmes many participants had followed. We should add that the authors are not implying PGCE courses are inferior to other forms of teacher preparation (not least because of our own roles as teacher educators on PGCE courses at our own institutions). Rather, the shortness of duration in these courses (e.g. 36 weeks for secondary PGCEs in England) necessarily limits the extent to which ‘theory’ can be sufficiently introduced, discussed, applied and critically evaluated by students and those that educate them. Within this time-constrained context the introduction of theory to many student teachers seems far removed from the realities of the classroom and this strengthened, for some participants, their support for the more practical focus of occupational pathways. While this finding is in itself not new (see Boyd & Tibke, 2012), what is significant for this study is the increasing numbers of teacher educators now working in schools who have been trained on occupational routes. These teacher educators’ experiences of becoming teachers are framed, in part by their own limited engagement with Higher Education when they were training to become teachers. Their distancing from Higher Education combined with the perception that educational theory is of little significance when carrying out ‘hands-on’ teaching is further bolstered by the perception that many PGCE student teachers themselves see much of the theory they engage with as irrelevant to their own practice. Such perceptions may well ‘fit’ conveniently with the recent UK coalition

government's policy rhetoric and discourses of derision (Ball, 2005) surrounding the role of universities in preparing future teachers. However, these perceptions do not fit international evidence (e.g. OECD, 2011; European Commission 2015) in relation the role that universities play in the development of teachers working within the top performing countries. We would argue, therefore, that greater time is needed to prepare teachers within Higher Education (in partnership with schools) and engaging them with the practical, ethical, theoretical and moral dimensions that contribute to becoming a teacher rather than a wholesale transfer of teacher education into schools.

Within the context of the Europeanisation of teacher education, this chapter has been fundamentally concerned with the knowledge bases and identities of teacher educators. The authors recognise that in most cases teacher educators in all locations carry out their work with integrity, passion, and a fundamental commitment to social justice. At a time when many countries are increasing their provision of school-based teacher education the authors are concerned that a fast-gallop to radical change can often bring with it unforeseen externalities. In this particular case these externalities might include:

1. The diminution of the role that research plays informing the quality of initial teacher education and teacher professionalism. Gewirtz (2013) argues that the danger in talking about *research-informed* teacher education is that rather than critically reflecting and questioning taken-for-granted assumptions this particular discourse reinforces a reductionist, techno-engineering model of teaching where teachers, uncritically, implement 'what works'. These concerns have been picked up in the BERA-RSA Inquiry into the role of research in teacher education (BERA, 2014) and the Carter Review (2015).
2. Teachers developing limited and limiting pedagogies as a result of being trained and prepared to teach in *one* school rather than being *educated* to teach in *all* schools. As part of a deregulation agenda the shift in the locus of control of teacher education from universities to schools has the potential to shift "the focus from pedagogy to content knowledge and verbal expression, maintaining [the belief] that pedagogy and professional learning are best acquired on the job" (Grimmet, 2009, p. 10).
3. The diminution in the authority and availability of university-based teacher educators offering high quality research-informed advice, guidance and support to student/trainee teachers as they increasingly are involved in 'relationship maintenance' (Ellis et al., 2011). The fear here is that as universities become ever more reliant on schools to engage their services, universities and university tutors prioritize partnership arrangements with specific schools and colleges over and above the research and supervision required to ensure the high quality of the practicum in general.

12.6 Conclusion

At the start of this chapter we referred to the fuzziness that characterises teacher education and training in England. Its parameters are multiple, overlapping and contradictory. It engulfs what we

mean by 'research', who should carry it out and for whose purpose it serves. For those working in schools fuzziness exists around the extent to which school-based teacher educators should, and are able to prioritise the teaching and learning of their pupils above and beyond that of their student teachers; for those preparing to become teachers themselves, it exists around the reality of being in the classroom and the differing 'takes' on that reality in the eyes of their school-based and university-based teacher educators; fuzziness surrounds the debate about where student teachers should be trained/educated and the extent to which higher education institutions should be involved; and finally fuzziness can obscure, in the eyes of the public, its perception of university and work-based teacher education and the nature of who can, cannot, should and should not teach.

Epistemological and ontological uncertainty and incoherence in teacher education creates spaces into which overly simplistic definitions of teaching as 'craft', teacher knowledge as 'practical' and teacher education as an 'apprenticeship' emerge. The sorcerer's apprentice found himself in deep water mimicking the actions of his master without the requisite skills, knowledge and attributes developed over time with rigour, scholarship and practice. This study draws attention to the fact that many teacher educators working in English schools, in the past, have engaged with varying degrees of hybridized discourses centred around *both* practice and theory. This synergy emerges, in part, out of their own previous experiences as student teachers within the academy and a system of university/school-based partnerships. However findings from this study also draw attention to the fact that that this system risks being replaced by school-based teacher educators situated and positioned within limiting mono-cultural understandings of what teacher education is or indeed should be. It also risks the marginalisation and eventual disappearance of a theory-informed future teaching profession.

References

- Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228
- Ball, S. J. (2005). *Education Policy and Social Class: The Selected Works of Stephen J. Ball*, London: Routledge.
- Biesta, G. (2008). Good Education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Education, Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, 33-46
- Boyd P. & Tibke J., (2012). Being a school-based teacher educator: developing pedagogy and identity in facilitating work-based higher education in a professional field. *Practitioner Research*, 6(2), 44-57.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

- British Educational Research Association-RSA. (2014). *Research and the teaching profession: Building the capacity for a self-improving education system*. Final report of the BERA-RSA Inquiry into the role of research in teacher education.
- Carter, A. (2015). *Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (ITT)*. London: Crown Copyright.
- Czerniawski, G. (2010). *Emerging teachers and globalisation*. Routledge, New York
- Czerniawski, G. (2013). Understanding teacher educators as teachers of teachers: exploring multiple perspectives. Symposium paper presented at the *American Educational Research Association Conference*, San Francisco USA. 1st May 2013.
- Czerniawski G., & Ulvik M. (2014). Changing context, changing landscapes - a review of teacher education in Norway and England. In P. Rabensteiner & G. Rabensteiner. *Internationalisation in Teacher Education*. Balmannsweiler: Schnieder Verlag Hohengehren.
- Davey, R. (2013). *The professional identity of teacher educators: Careers on the cusp?* New York: Routledge.
- Ellis V., McNicholl J., & McNally J. (2011). *The work of teacher education*. Bristol: ESCalate [online]. Available from: <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/subjects/escalate/8353.pdf> [1 September 2012).
- European Commission, (2010). *Improving teacher quality: The EU agenda - lifelong learning: Policies and programme*. Brussels, April 2010, EAC.B.2. D (2010) PSH.
- European Commission, (2013). *Supporting teacher educators for better learning outcomes*. European Commission, Brussels
- European Commission, (2015). *Strengthening teaching in Europe: New evidence from teachers* compiled by Eurydice and CRELL, June 2015. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/policy/teaching-profession-practices_en.pdf
- Florian, L., & Pantic, N. (2013). *Learning to teach: Exploring the history and role of higher education in teacher education*. London: Higher Education Academy.
- Gewirtz, S. (2013). Developing teachers as scholar-citizens, reasserting the value of university involvement in teacher education. In L. Florian & N. Pantic (Eds), *Learning to teach: Exploring the history and role of higher education in teacher education*. London: Higher Education Academy.
- Gewirtz, S, Mahony, P, Hextall I., & Cribb, A. (Eds) (2009). *Changing teacher professionalism: international trends, challenges and ways forward*. London: Routledge.
- Grimmett, P. (2009). Legitimacy and Identity in Teacher Education: A micro-political struggle constrained by macro-political pressures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 5-26.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan M. (2013). *The power of professional capital*. *JSD*. 34(3), 36-39.

- Korthagen, F. (2010) The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education. I: E. Baker., B. McGaw, & P. Peterson (Eds). *International encyclopedia of education*, vol.7. (pp. 669-675) Oxford: Elsevier.
- Mead, G. H., (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University Press.
- Mayer, D. (2013). Teacher Education: Beyond the Policy Problem. *EduResearch Matters: AARE Blog: A voice for Australian Educational Researchers*. Blog Entry Date: March 20th 2013.
- McNamara O., & Murray J., (2013). The School Direct programme and its implications for research informed teacher education and teacher educators. In L. Florian & N. Pantic (Eds), *Learning to teach: Exploring the history and role of higher education in teacher education*. London: 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 (CORE)* 26:,1-530.
- Murray, J. (2012). Towards the re-articulation of the work of teacher educators in higher education institutions in England. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 31(1), p. 17-34.
- Murray J., Czerniawski G., & Barber P. (2011). Teacher Educators' identities and work in England at the beginning of the second decade of the twenty-first century. *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 37(3), p. 261-277.
- OECD (2011) Lessons from PISA for the United States: Strong Performers and successful reformers in education [online]. Available from: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/50/46623978.pdf> [11th October 2012).
- Ozga, J. & Jones, R. (2006) Travelling and Embedding Policy: the case of knowledge transfer. *Journal of Education Policy* 21(1), 1-17.
- Smith, K. (2011) The multi-faceted teacher educator. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 37(3), 337 - 349.
- Smith, K., & Lev-Ari, L. (2005) The place of the practicum in pre-service teacher educator: the voice of students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. 33(3), 289-302
- White E., Dickerson C., & Weston K. (2015). Developing an appreciation of what it means to be a school-based teacher educator. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 38(4), 445-459.

