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ABSTRACT

The reform of teacher education in Australia has been an issue of significant challenge to higher education providers in recent decades. The granting of autonomy to state-based teachers’ colleges in 1972 heralded in a supposed era of autonomous university level teacher education as an exclusive model of teacher preparation. Subsequently, the context of teacher education has been in an almost constant cycle of political review and reform. Across the period of this study, 2010-2015, the pace of these cycles has increased to the point where the the outworking of one review has not been completed before the next wave of actions are rolled out. One notable example being the release of the second iteration of the National Program Standards for initial teacher education courses in December 2015 (AITSL, 2015). Considering the length of an undergraduate initial teacher education course and the time taken in accrediting a course, the review and reform of the first iteration of the program standards, released for commencement in 2012, has come before any evidence of their usefulness could ever be collected. In the climate of review and regulation that has taken hold, the impact of political intervention on the processes and practices of teacher education is significant.

The outworking of political review and reform is experienced by teacher education as change and continuity. While change and continuity are often described as externalised abstract conceptions, the thesis developed from this study has identified change and continuity as subjective, contextualised social processes. From this perspective, it is argued that change and continuity are the key means that individuals, institutions and organisations engage in seeking to improve or develop teacher education and its outcomes towards a preferred future. Given the multiplicity of voices consistently present in the practice of teacher education, the reform of teacher education through the outworking of change and continuity has always been a deeply political activity. As such, the core issue facing teacher educators is finding the space to be both heard and heeded amongst the cacophony of voices that have influence in political review and reform processes.

A critical grounded theory methodology was designed for this study into the political practices surrounding the reform of teacher education. In doing so, it specifically employed two core purposes identified from the integration of critical theory with grounded theory. These were to; critically analyse the knowledge and power relations at work in the political practices of reform, and to consider emancipatory possibilities for teacher educators. With this in mind, the methods employed gave purposeful voice to teacher educators through historical texts written by and contemporary interviews conducted with teacher educators. Two substantive theoretical models emerged from the critical analysis of the data. These models highlighted the; nature of the social process of change and continuity evident in the historical context of teacher preparation in Australia, and importance of the local social context of change and continuity across contemporary international teacher education.

The conclusions drawn from this study have used a comparative analytical process to theorise a social approach to change and continuity. The thesis presented is that the outworking of reform towards educationally justifiable outcomes is predicated upon the employment of educational voices in socially mediated decision-making processes. For social engagement in the political practices of reform to be successful, teacher educators need to foster carefully nuanced relationships, provide clear and purposeful communication, and maintain a positive psychological disposition. It is argued that the future of teacher education and its potential to impact the professionalisation of teachers is entirely dependent upon the capacity of teacher educators learning to productively occupy the space available for their voice in the political context of reform.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Since its inception in Australia in the late 1800s, teacher preparation has been developed, organised, scrutinised and regulated by and for political purposes. While contemporary teacher educators have a tendency to think, talk and write positively about educational processes and practices for teacher preparation, the same cannot be said of the political discourses about that same preparation. In Australia, as with many other international jurisdictions, the political and media discourses do not reflect the positivity present in academic discourses (see for example Blake, 2013; Donnelly, 2012; Ferrari, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015; Hare & Bita, 2015; Matchett, 2011). Rather, there is a constant cycle of questioning the quality of teacher preparation, followed by political review processes that set out a range of recommendations which are barely implemented before further questioning emerges. In the last 30 years, during which time teacher education has been the typical approach to teacher preparation in the Australian context, this cycle of questioning, reviewing, making and then largely ignoring recommendations has happened no less than 110 times in either the national or one of the state-based jurisdictions (Dinham, 2013; Standing Committee in Education and Vocational Training [SCEVT], 2007).

The consequences of this cyclical pattern of political interrogation into the processes and practices of teacher preparation have had an interesting impact upon the work of teacher education and teacher educators. For the majority of the history of these review processes it would appear that teacher educators have considered it a somewhat intriguing political phenomenon that had little impact upon their work in teacher education. While some educators participated in a critique of the practices and the outcomes of the processes (Louden, 2000; Louden & Wallace, 1993), the majority appeared to remain unimpeled by it. However, recent developments in the regulatory climate towards a standards model that is supported by sanctions have served to provide impetus to more active involvement of teacher educators with the regulations and the regulatory processes. This is exemplified by the increased activity of teacher educators in research and other scholarly activities that interrogate with contemporary standards that impact upon the teacher preparation.

The engagement of teacher educators with professional regulatory requirements has increased markedly since the introduction of national requirements in 2012. A number of recent Office for Learning and Teaching fellowships, grants and projects undertaken by education academics have directly involved an application to or analysis of various aspects of the regulatory climate. Of particular note is Lloyd’s (2013) report, Troubled times in Australian teacher education: 2012-2013, which concluded a fellowship that considered whole-course design in light of the regulatory developments taking effect across 2012-2013. While it would be expected that government grants relating to teaching and learning in teacher education would favour proposals that focussed on government-sanctioned standards, the same might not have been expected of the research and scholarship presented at an academic conference.

In Australia one of the key conferences in the area of teacher education is the annual conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association (ATEA). An analysis of the abstracts included in the conference proceedings in 2012, when the current regulatory climate was initiated, and 2014 shows a significant increase in the development of research work that considers issues relating to regulation. The number of papers related to regulation has more than doubled from 24% of papers in 2012 to 56% in 2014 (ATEA 2012; ATEA 2014). Table 1.1 breaks this down further to show the increases in the
abstracts that directly mention the standards or the regulator compared with those that indirectly reference some aspect of the regulatory climate.

Table 1.1 Comparison of ATEA Conference Proceedings: 2012-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number (n) of Abstracts</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mention of regulations</td>
<td>12% (n=10)</td>
<td>25% (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect reference to regulations</td>
<td>12% (n=10)</td>
<td>31% (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated to regulations</td>
<td>76% (n=65)</td>
<td>44% (n=36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This demonstrates that in the two years since the introduction of the current regulatory standards, the research and scholarship presented at ATEA conferences by teacher educators that related to regulation and the standards has increased significantly. As a consequence the research themes, topics and issues covered by the ATEA delegates have narrowed from 2012 to 2014. This is not just evident in the reduction in the range of topics covered by the abstracts that remained unrelated to the regulations, but also in the narrow focus that is evident in the abstracts that do consider regulations. Across the scope of possible consideration of the regulatory climate, there are only two aspects that are consistently referenced. These are the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST) with an emphasis on the graduate level of these standards, and the university-school partnerships for professional experience, which is just one of the required program standards (Australian Institute for Teachers and School Leaders [AITSL], 2011; ATEA, 2012; ATEA 2014).

Interestingly, this same focus on the nature of the politically driven regulatory climate has also been reflected in the keynote addresses delivered at the ATEA conferences in both 2012 and 2014. In 2012 one of the three keynote addresses was directly relevant to the regulatory climate. This was co-presented by Graeme Hall and Edmund Misson, both employed by the national regulatory authority, and addressed the topic, *Quality Teacher Education: More than accreditation* (ATEA, 2012, p. 10). In effect, this address served as thinly veiled propaganda designed to introduce and reinforce the scope and reach of the newly established regulatory climate. In 2014, two of the three keynote addresses focussed on the regulatory climate, but from very different motivations. Claire Wyatt-Smith, the then Executive Dean of Australian Catholic University gave a keynote titled, *Profiling productive shifts in teacher education: Where to next?* (ATEA, 2014, p.17). This presentation considered the implications of the regulatory climate, with particular emphasis on the APST, on teacher education. It served as a cautionary presentation that highlighted issues that have emerged because the ‘required shifts in teacher education have been underestimated’ (Wyatt-Smith, 2014, p. 64). Ian Menter’s address, *Only Connect! – Research and teacher education in the UK* (ATEA, 2014, p.10), discussed the implications of the politically driven regulatory climate in the United Kingdom on educational research from his perspective as Professor of Education at Oxford University. The address was given as a direct warning about the negative impact of the current politically driven practices in teacher preparation in the United Kingdom on teacher education and educational research, which he described as ‘damaged beyond repair’ such that it ‘threatened the quality of teachers and teaching’ (Menter, 2014, p.47). One of the key questions he addressed was, ‘Why has it proved so easy for the Westminster government to undermine and destroy what had taken many decades to create?’ (Menter, 2014, p.47).

While Menter’s question related to teacher education and educational research in the United Kingdom, its relevance to the current regulatory climate in Australia cannot be underestimated. Given the strong historical tendency for educational policy in Australia to either copy or at least reflect policy from the United Kingdom, warnings about the dangers of their policies can be quite alarming. The
concerns raised by Menter related to the shrinking of both teacher education and educational research in the United Kingdom, which has been one of the key consequences of the transference of teacher preparation from a university-based to a school-based activity in the United Kingdom (Robinson, 2012). Politically, this move emerged out of the rhetoric of the English Education Secretary, Michael Gove, who repeatedly and consistently describes teaching as a ‘craft’ that ‘you learn in a work-based environment’ (TES New Teachers, 2010). This political discourse was used to lever teacher preparation away from higher education institutions and as Gove stated, ‘By 2015 well over half of all training places will be delivered in schools’ (Robinson, 2012). By 2014 the situation in the United Kingdom was well and truly on track to achieve that goal (Menter, 2014; Vaughan, 2014). While the most recent standards developed by AITSL continue to uphold a higher education course as the minimum requirement for registration in Australia (AITSL 2011a; see Program Standard 1.3), this type of political protection of the role of higher education in teacher preparation should not be assumed to be guaranteed into the future. Internationally, the perceived crisis in teacher quality and therefore teacher preparation has lead to a diversification of options in the preparation of teachers in many jurisdictions (Darling-Hammond & Lieberman, 2012; Karras & Wolhuter, 2010). The re-emergence of both apprenticeship and training as models for the preparation of teachers in other jurisdictions, and particularly in those which Australian politicians look to for policy, is something that needs to be watched closely and well understood by teacher educators in the Australian context.

It is not, however, sufficient to merely heed the warnings of teacher educators about the consequences of politically driven regulation in other contexts. Australian teacher educators need to understand the influence and implications of political influences on teacher preparation in the Australian context. While Australian teacher education may not have come under the same level of threat as has been experienced in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, there has been an increasing level of regulation imposed on teacher education since it became the core mode of teacher preparation in the Australian context. Increasing activity by teacher educators in research and scholarship that considers the regulatory climate demonstrates that the implications of regulation have not gone unnoticed. Similarly, this study seeks to make a contribution to the growing body of knowledge about the relationship between educational practice and political policy in the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

As with most educational research, interest in the implications of political policies and agendas on teacher preparation is usually prompted by personal experience of those processes. In relation to this study, interest in the regulation of teacher preparation was prompted by two defining personal experiences. While the first happened in 2010 just prior to commencing this study, the second happened in 2012 but reflected back on 1990.

1990 was the year that I entered the teaching profession. Having completed high school in New Zealand in 1988 and then taken a gap year to orient myself to life in Queensland, I commenced a Diploma of Teaching (Primary) in 1990 at a small, private college in Brisbane. While I have maintained a close relationship with that institution since that time, my initial involvement was a consequence of necessity more than choice. The problem was that I had not taken Senior English on the basis of my academic performance in English up until that time. My English results had not been noteworthy and my entrance to university in New Zealand would have been significantly improved by focussing on my better subjects, namely Science and Mathematics. Given the necessity of Senior English as a core for entrance to a teaching course in Queensland, even in 1990, my options were limited and so I accepted a provisional position for the first semester. My continued enrolment was dependent upon
successfully demonstrating a capacity to write sufficiently well to complete the course. I survived the first semester and the rest, as they say, is history.

In 2012, at a time when there was a lot of activity about the new regulations for teacher preparation, it dawned on me that had I been seeking entry into teaching in the contemporary context I would have found it even more difficult. While the irony of my eventual specialisation in literacies and English pedagogies was not lost on me, I was much more interested in considering the implications that contemporary regulations had on the types of students considered eligible for teaching. This was particularly pertinent given the fact that the regulations were seeking to exclude students like me. In my senior year is high school I studied three Science and two Mathematics subjects and scored in the top five students for each of those subjects at one of New Zealand’s largest girls’ grammar schools. Interestingly, I am the only one of those girls that did not go into some form of medicine. While I clearly had some issues in English, the assumption made by the current regulation of teacher preparation that this single piece of information was sufficient to identify me as entirely unsuitable for teaching can and should be taken to be problematic. No doubt, I would have found an alternative route into teacher preparation, as I did in 1990, but it begs the question, How is making it difficult for students like me to gain entry improving the quality of teaching? More significantly though, my reflections around the issue of entry brought into focus some much broader questions; If the assumptions made about quality entrants to teacher preparation can be shown to be problematic, what about the rest of the regulations?, Who and what is framing the assumptions being made about quality in the regulation of teacher preparation?, and Have they really got it right?

Prior to these musings about the nature of the new national regulations, I had experienced a baptism of fire into the regulatory context of teacher preparation in Queensland. In late 2009 I had accepted a position as a course coordinator at the aforementioned small, private college and took up responsibility for its five Bachelor level teacher education programs. At the time the course development processes for these courses had just been finalised and I was to oversee their processing by both the Queensland Office of Higher Education (QOHE) and the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT) in 2010. While most of this experience passed without drama, there was one notable exception.

Given dual processes with two different regulators there was a need to tailor the paperwork provided for the two different purposes. Unfortunately, the course development processes had only prepared one set of paperwork for both regulators and had based it on the requirements set out by the QOHE. While everything required by the QCT was present in some form in the documentation, the lack of clear paperwork designed for the purposes of the professional regulator lead to one particularly painful panel meeting. As the newly appointed course coordinator I was required to attend a meeting of the stakeholder panel that had been convened to assess the eligibility of the courses for professional accreditation as an initial teacher education course. After several hours of detailed questioning I had learnt the importance of preparing paperwork with the regulator in mind. The outcome of the meeting was that the courses were not to be approved for accreditation until a second set of documents had been prepared to satisfy the requirements of the panel. After several months of reworking the paperwork and then repeating the panel process, four of the five courses were eventually approved for accreditation from the beginning of 2011.

While the final outcome of the process was successful, the activity of repeating work for the benefit of the panel without making substantive changes to the majority of the content was trying. At the time, this resulted in increasing frustration about the apparent power held by the regulator and their panel over my work as a teacher educator and the college’s role as a site for teacher preparation. The
question that underpinned the experience was, *What entitles this panel to act as the experts about what I actually do?* It was this question, spurred by this experience of the regulation of teacher preparation in the Queensland context, which motivated this study into the relationship of knowledge and power in the practices of teacher preparation. The first step of which was to come to an understanding of the scope and scale of regulation of teacher preparation in the contemporary context.

**The Regulation of Teacher Preparation in Queensland**

Teacher preparation in Queensland is highly regulated and, unlike the rest of Australia, has been for quite some time. There are two key regulatory regimes that impact teacher preparation. These are the professional regulation of the teaching profession and the academic regulation of higher education. The two regimes serve different purposes. The professional regulation of teacher preparation is designed to ensure that graduates of teacher preparation programs will achieve professional standards for teaching and are classroom-ready for any Australian school context (AITSL, 2011a). In Australia the professional regulation of teachers is overseen by a national regulatory authority, AITSL, but is administered by state-based regulators. In contrast, academic regulation considers graduate outcomes in relation to the development of the knowledge and skills expected of the relevant level of higher education (Australian Qualifications Framework Council [AQFC], 2013; *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*). Across Australia the academic regulations are administered nationally by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA).

In the case of both of these regulatory regimes, the relevant authority uses a review process to ensure that teacher preparation providers and courses comply with a set of regulatory standards. Tautological references to each other in the standards used by each regulator ensure that teacher preparation must comply with both sets of regulations. That is, the professional standards refer to an undergraduate qualification as a minimum requirement for a teacher preparation course (AITSL, 2011a; see Program Standard 1.3), and the academic standards refer to the meeting of professional standards as a necessary component of such an undergraduate qualification (*Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011*, Chapter 3, s1.2). As such, all teacher preparation in the contemporary context must fulfill the expectations of both of these regulatory processes and practices and find ways to negotiate the challenges of the sometimes conflicting nature of the two sets of regulations.

**Regulating the Profession**

The Queensland College of Teachers (QCT) regulates the teaching profession in Queensland. Since 2012, the QCT has regulated both the preparation and the registration of teachers on the basis of national standards developed and maintained by AITSL (2011a). There are two sets of national standards relevant to teacher preparation; professional and program standards. The professional standards articulate the professional expectations of teachers while the program standards identify the standards required of a program of initial teacher education. Each course offered by a particular institution is accredited separately. A panel process is used to review supplied documentation for the purpose of granting registration to a program on the basis of the standards. Following a period of initial accreditation and implementation of a program, a second evidence-based review process is undertaken to confirm that standards are being met. This process is used to determine eligibility for continued accreditation of the program.

**The professional regulator.**
The current regulator of the teaching profession, the QCT, was established by the *Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005* and commenced operating on the 1 January 2006. This legislation covers all aspects of the regulation of the profession through the registration of teachers and accreditation of programs for teacher preparation. As such, the legislation establishes both regulatory and professional oversight functions for the QCT. The establishment of the QCT was a response to the McMeniman (2004) Report, *Review of the Powers and Functions of the Board of Teacher Registration*. This report was prompted by and responded to contemporary research and national developments in the setting of professional standards for and the application of these to the regulation of the teaching profession across Australian states. In response to the discussion and debate surrounding standards and regulation, most Australian states, namely New South Wales, Northern Territory, Tasmania, Victoria, and Western Australia, established a regulatory authority for the teaching profession between 2000-2005 (McMeniman, 2004).

The QCT was not the first body charged with responsibility for regulating the teaching profession in Queensland. Rather, the QCT was historically situated in two earlier bodies, the Board of Teacher Registration (BTR) and the Board of Teacher Education (BTE). The BTE was established in legislation through the *Education Act Amendment Act 1970* (s.13), and commenced operating in 1971 with the dual purpose of overseeing the provision of teacher preparation and keeping a register of teachers in Queensland (McMeniman, 2004). Interestingly, the establishment of the BTE and its regulatory practices by the state government coincided with the federally driven granting of autonomy to teachers’ colleges through their separation from the state-based Departments of Education. In doing so, Queensland became the first state to adopt legislatively mandated regulatory practices for the teaching profession and was followed shortly thereafter by South Australia (McMeniman, 2004). The BTE was eventually replaced by the BTR in 1989. The BTR was established by the *Education (Teacher Registration) Act 1988*, commenced operations in 1989 and continued until it was superseded by the QCT in 2006 (*Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005*). While state-based regulatory bodies such as the QCT continue under state legislation, the professional regulations for teacher preparation have recently transitioned from a state-based to a national approach overseen by AITSL (AITSL, 2011a).

**The professional regulations.**

There are two sets of national professional regulations currently being used for the accreditation of teacher preparation in Queensland. These are the *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers* (APST) and the *National Program Standards* ¹ (AITSL, 2011a; AITSL, 2015). The APST were developed between 2009-2010 by the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEECDYA) and the National Standards Sub-group of the Australian Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs Senior Officials Committee (AEYSOC) (AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010). AITSL, which was registered as a public company limited by guarantee in January 2010, took over responsibility for the APST in July 2010 (AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010). They were finalised and then endorsed by MCEECDYA in December 2010 for introduction to schools from 2011 (AITSL, 2011b). The *National Program Standards* were developed by AITSL alongside the APST, though they were not finalised till 2012 for implementation in 2013 (AITSL, 2013b). As such, a company, whose

¹ Revised *National Program Standards* were released by AITSL on 11 December 2015. At the time, the final editorial processes were being completed for this thesis. As such, the analysis of the original *National Program Standards* by which this thesis was framed has been maintained throughout this thesis.
sole member is the federal Minister for Education, develops, administers and evaluates the national standards for the teaching profession. Legislative responsibility for mandating the implementation of these national standards remains with the state government and in each state additional requirements may be added to the national standards. In Queensland these are the *Additional Queensland Requirements* as published by the QCT (2015). While the addition of state-based requirements was not intended in establishment of a national standards, it illustrates some of the tension that underlies the relationships between the state-based and national regulators.

The two sets of national standards serve two different purposes in the accreditation of teacher preparation programs. The APST outline the professional standards required of teachers across four career stages; graduate, proficient, highly accomplished and lead teacher (AITSL, 2011a). There are seven APST that are organised around three domains of teaching. These are professional knowledge, professional practice and professional engagement (AITSL, 2011a). Graduates of an initial teacher education program must demonstrate attainment of the graduate career stage for all seven APST. The *National Program Standards* are designed to work in combination with the APST and outline standards relating to the quality of teacher preparation programs. There are seven *National Program Standards* covering program development, delivery, resourcing, evaluation, structure and content; entry requirements; partnerships with schools and graduate outcomes (AITSL, 2011a). An initial teacher education program must provide evidence against all program standards to be accredited as a registered program for teacher preparation.

As with the establishment of the QCT, the national professional standards were preceded by state-based standards and regulations in Queensland. Stretching back to 1972, both the BTE and the BTR developed guidelines and expectations for teacher preparation programs that were used in the registration or accreditation of programs for the purpose of attaining teacher registration in Queensland (Board of Teacher Education [BTE], 1979; Board of Teacher Registration [BTR], 1990, 2002). Then, between 2006 and 2012, the QCT regulated teacher preparation under a standards approach (QCT, 2011/2007). This approach incorporated the Professional Standards for Queensland Teachers (PSQT) that was supported by a set of program guidelines for the registration of teacher preparation programs. The ten PSQT covered professional knowledge, practice and values as organised around three key facets of teacher’s work (QCT, 2006). These were teaching and learning, relationships, and professional practice and renewal. An analysis of the correlation between the PSQT and the APST demonstrates that the scope of the professional standards used in Queensland for the registration of teacher preparation programs has been very consistent since 2007 (QCT n.d.). The main difference is the lack of differentiation of standards by career stage in the earlier PSQT. Similarly, the program guidelines, while not written as standards, considered the same program issues covered by the *National Program Standards*. This included the program framework, design and structure; entry requirements; expectations of higher education institutions; and professional experience (QCT, 2011/2007).

As is the practice in each state, the QCT is also responsible for administrating state-based requirements that are additional to the national standards. In Queensland these are the *Additional Queensland Requirements*, which were developed in response to the most recent review of teacher preparation conducted by Caldwell and Sutton (2010a/2010b). The *Additional Queensland Requirements* are designed to respond to identified needs in teacher preparation for the Queensland context. As such, they do not reflect a systematic analysis of either the teaching profession or teacher preparation programs. Rather, they provide a randomly organised list of specific requirements. Some of these requirements, such as the entry and professional experience requirements, are closely aligned with
one or more of the national standards (QCT, 2015/2012). However, other requirements, such as the specification of a minimum number of units in both assessment and special needs, are unique to the Queensland context.

**Professional regulatory processes.**

As with the professional regulations, AITSL is responsible for the development and dissemination of a national approach to the regulatory process that is administered by state-based authorities such as the QCT. The regulatory process involves teacher preparation providers submitting documentation that is then assessed by a panel on behalf of the regulatory body (AITSL, 2011a). Procedures for each aspect of this process have been developed for the purpose of facilitating a nationally consistent approach despite the dissemination of the process across the state-based regulators. These procedures cover the submission format and content, timelines, stages in the process, panel membership, panel training and meeting and assessment processes (AITSL, 2011a).

While institutions are encouraged to submit programs of the same type together, each initial teacher education program must undergo the entire process to be initially accredited and then again within five years for reaccreditation. At initial accreditation the institution must submit program documentation plus templated responses to each of the APST, *National Program Standards* and any additional state-based requirements (AITSL, 2013a; see also QCT, 2015/2012). For reaccreditation the templated response to the APST must also include evidence that graduates have successfully met each of the standards. The panel formed to assess a submission against the standards must have undertaken panel training, include at least one inter-state member and represent a range of ‘experience and expertise’, including registered teachers, teacher educators, employers, specialist personnel and other community groups (AITSL, 2011a). The panel process happens at a single face-to-face meeting, which includes a site visit for a reaccreditation (AITSL, 2011a). However, an iterative process of communication between the panel and the institution is incorporated in the process to allow for negotiation, clarification and reworking as needed.

Again, the application of AITSL’s nationally consistent regulatory processes was not a new process for either the QCT or teacher preparation providers in Queensland. The processes undertaken in assessing teacher preparation programs against the PQST from 2006-2012 reflected an almost identical process except for the inclusion of inter-state panel members and the provision of panel training (AITSL, 2011a; QCT, 2011/2007). Even these processes were not without precedent. As far back as 1972 the BTE was using an expert panel process that employed a range of educational stakeholders to make assessments of and recommendations about the accreditation of a teacher preparation for the purpose of registering graduates as beginning teachers (BTE, 1979).

**Regulating Higher Education**

Unlike the professional regulation of teacher preparation, which continues to mix both state and national agendas, the regulation of higher education is an entirely national affair. The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) currently undertakes the regulation of higher education for all states and territories (TEQSA, 2012). Their responsibility for higher education across Australia commenced in 2012 when they replaced the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) and state-based authorities, such as the QOHE. There are two national frameworks that are used by TEQSA in the regulation of higher education. These are the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) *(Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011)*, and the *Australian Qualifications Framework* (AQF) (AQFC, 2013). The HESF outlines standards for the providers of higher
education (*Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011*), while the AQF sets specific standards for the expectations for all post-secondary levels of qualification (AQFC, 2013). Both higher education institutions and their programs are assessed against these frameworks, though the regulatory processes are differentiated on the basis of the accrediting status of an institution. Self-accrediting institutions, including all Australian universities, are required to undertake compliance assessments, while non-self-accrediting institutions must undertake in accreditation or reaccreditation processes similar to those used for professional accreditation in teacher preparation (*Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011*, Chapter 2; *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*). This differentiation between self-accrediting public universities and non-self-accrediting private institutions has been a long-term feature of the regulation of higher education in Australia.

**The higher education regulator.**

In July 2011, TEQSA began operations as a national agency for the assurance of quality in higher education in Australia. From January 2012, TEQSA assumed responsibility for regulating higher education under the *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*. TEQSA is responsible for the regulation of all higher education and fulfils this function through the registration of providers, the accreditation of courses, a term synonymous with programs, and the sanctioning of non-compliant institutions. The principles of regulation, as established in the TEQSA Act, incorporate necessity, risk and proportionality (*Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*; TEQSA, 2014e). Together, these principles are used to justify the differentiated approach to both different types of higher education institutions and potentially to individual institutions.

The presence of a national regulator in higher education is a relatively recent phenomenon in the Australian context. The first national body commissioned for the regulation of higher education was the AUQA, which was established in 2001 (Shah, 2011). Prior to the introduction of AUQA, all universities operated autonomously as self-accrediting institutions. AUQA applied audit rather than regulatory processes (AUQA 2007; AUQA, 2008). These audit processes used the principle of fitness for purpose to interrogate quality on the basis of an organisation’s own objectives (AUQA, 2008; Shah, 2011). When AUQA commenced operating, their objectives required them to audit and report on self-accrediting institutions and the state-based authorities, such as the QOHE, responsible for accrediting courses for non-self-accrediting institutions (Shah, 2011). With the introduction of financial assistance for students at some non-self-accrediting institutions through the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*, the auditing responsibilities of AUQA were extended to include these additional institutions. While AUQA reported on its auditing processes using a structure of commendations and recommendations, they had no capacity to require action from or sanction an institution in relation to the recommendations made (AUQA 2007; AUQA, 2008). As such, TEQSA is the first regulator of higher education in the Australian context that has powers designed to ensure compliance (*Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*).

**The higher education regulations.**

The regulations used for higher education also changed significantly with the introduction of TEQSA. TEQSA was introduced into the regulatory landscape in response to the Bradley report, *Review of Australian Higher Education* (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales, 2008). This report called for a standards-based approach to the regulation of higher education. This resulted in the development of the HESF and the incorporation of the AQF as a part of that framework (*Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011*, Chapter 3, s1; AQFC, 2013). Given the legislative backing of
the *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*, the HESF and the AQF are two sets of standards against which all higher education providers and their courses must comply.

The *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2011*, was developed by an independent panel of experts administered by TEQSA (*Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011, s58.1*). These standards include regulations that set criteria for the categories and registration of providers, accreditation of courses and appropriate levels of qualification (*Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011*). These threshold standards are used for compliance purposes and are supplemented by non-threshold standards that are not part of the compliance process. The qualification standards included in the HESF refer directly to the AQF. The AQF uses a taxonomic approach to describe the increasing requirements of qualifications by level and type (AQFC, 2013). The requirements as set out for each level of the AQF are the minimum standards for the allocated qualification. The AQF was first developed in 1995 with the purpose of developing a national policy on qualifications across the education and training sectors (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs [MCEETYA], 1995). Since then there has been five revisions of the AQF with a major change made in 2011 (AQFC, n.d.-a). The latest version is the *Australian Qualifications Framework, Second Edition January 2013*. Like the HESF, the AQF was developed, monitored and maintained by an independent panel of members with relevant expertise set by the AQFC (n.d.-b). However, an announcement made in 2014 by the then Minister for Education, Christopher Pyne indicated that this independent council is to be disbanded and the future of the AQF is to be directed by the Minister and the Council of Australian Governments (Lane, 10 September 2014).

**Higher education regulatory processes.**

While all higher education providers are required to comply with the same two frameworks, the regulatory processes employed are clearly differentiated by the type of institution. All Australian universities established by legislation and listed as public higher education providers automatically have self-accrediting authority. For these providers, the institution’s internal academic leadership processes and practices take responsibility for regulating the application of both the HESF and the AQF (*Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011*). TEQSA then performs compliance assessments that review a sample of the provider’s practices and course accreditations. In contrast, all private providers of higher education commenced under TEQSA as non-self-accrediting institutions. This means that these providers are externally regulated by TEQSA via a process of submission and review for both provider registration and each course’s accreditation (TEQSA, 2014a; TEQSA, 2014b; TEQSA, 2014d). Whether submitting for provider registration or course accreditation, documentation covering all relevant aspects of the HESF and the AQF must be submitted. The information is required in a single submission that is assessed by a combination of administrative and expert personnel (TEQSA, 2014a; TEQSA, 2014b; TEQSA, 2014d). As such, it is different from professional regulatory processes in that it does not engage a panel and is not iterative. This differentiation between public and private higher education providers is justified on the basis of the core principles of regulation, in particular, the principle of risk (TEQSA, 2014e). There is, however, a process whereby a private higher education provider can establish a history of quality governance that would justify the granting of self-accrediting authority to the institution (TEQSA, 2014c).

The differentiation between self-accrediting and non-self-accrediting institutions has been a part of the history of regulatory processes. For public universities, the introduction of TEQSA and compliance processes with potential sanctions is the first time they have had to deal with external regulatory processes based on a set of externally determined standards. However, TEQSA’s regulatory processes
are similar to the state-based regulatory processes used with non-self-accrediting institutions prior to TEQSA (Higher Education (General provisions) Act 2003). In Queensland, the QOHE used a submission and iterative panel review process to accredit courses for non-self-accrediting institutions (AUQA, 2007; Higher Education (General provisions) Act 2003). As such, TEQSA’s regulatory processes are new processes for public providers who have not previously been regulated in this way but are familiar to private providers, at least in the Queensland context.

**THE GROWTH OF THE REGULATORY CLIMATE**

The national developments in professional and academic regulation have had a significant impact upon teacher preparation in Queensland. While on the surface it is easy to focus on the assumption that there has been a steady increase in the regulatory burden for institutions, this is not the most significant aspect of the regulatory changes. In fact, the regulatory burden on teacher preparation in the Queensland context has changed little since the introduction of both the professional and academic national regulatory protocols. Since the 1970s all providers of teacher preparation in Queensland have participated in professional accreditation processes, the most recent of which were very similar to the new processes and practices mandated by AITSL (QCT, 2011/2007; AITSL, 2011a). With regards to the academic regulatory processes, TEQSA’s institution-wide assessments of public universities continue the auditing commenced by AUQA and course accreditation processes for private providers continue those previously undertaken by the QOHE (AUQA, 2008; Higher Education (General provisions) Act 2003; TEQSA, n.d.). Rather, the most significant changes in the regulation of teacher preparation relate to the nature of the regulations and the regulatory processes.

The most significant development in the contemporary regulatory climate has been the adoption of a standards approach to both professional and academic regulations. This has fostered a compliance model of regulation by both the regulatory authorities and institutions and this has encouraged a tick-box approach to quality assurance. This is then coupled with the use of external expert and stakeholder groups in the development of the standards (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011; AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010; AQFC, n.d.-b), which has further alienated the standards from the vision, goals and purposes of individual providers. In the development of the national professional standards, the most significant change for Queensland providers has been the articulation of program requirements as a set of standards (AITSL, 2011a). Many of these NPS prescribe very specific requirements for teacher preparation courses, such as the amount of a course that must be allocated to certain content areas (AITSL, 2011a; see program standards 4.2-4.5). This means that certain practices or aspects of a teacher preparation course are dictated by the standards meaning that other practices or options are excluded. With regards to academic standards, the most significant change was the legislating of sanctioning powers for the regulator in assessing a provider’s compliance with threshold requirements (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011). Together, these changes in the regulatory climate serve to: externalise the setting of standards; modify the relationship between providers, stakeholders and regulators; change the focus from improvement to compliance; increase the stakes in meeting the requirements of regulatory processes; and reduce the space for innovation and institutional distinctiveness.

However, these national developments in the regulation of teacher preparation did not occur in a vacuum. Rather, they are the culmination of incremental increases in the expectations of teacher preparation prompted by almost continuous review processes that have fuelled political and public perceptions of problems with the quality of teachers (Dinham, 2013). That is, they have developed out of a context of increasing accountability coupled with decreasing confidence. While there is some
acknowledgement of the importance of professional growth over time, the public debate about teacher quality is almost exclusively connected with teacher preparation. It is assumed that teacher quality is linked directly and only to teacher preparation and that this can be assessed or measured by the classroom readiness of graduating teachers (Department of Education and Training (Austl.) [DET(Austl.)], 2014; Hall, 2013). Ironically, the resultant increasing of both the demands of and stakes in teacher preparation for higher education providers has served to isolate and alienate them from the professional contexts of schools and teachers they serve. That is, the political culture of developing increasingly targeted reviews and regulations has served to significantly undermine the educational processes and practices of teacher preparation and the relationships between the different institutions involved in the preparation and continuing education of teachers.

**Reviewing Teacher Preparation**

Regulatory developments in teacher preparation are linked with a culture of review that has been active in teacher preparation since the 1970s. That is, the demand for regulatory accountability for teacher preparation providers has been fuelled by almost continuous reviews of teacher preparation. In the 43 years since 1972 there have been over 110 reviews conducted into teacher preparation somewhere on the Australian continent (Dinham, 2013; SCEVT, 2007). The most recent development in the reviewing of teacher preparation was the formation of the national Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) in February 2014. The resulting report, *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (TEMAG, 2014) was released in February 2015. This group was commissioned to use an ‘evidence-based approach’ to identify ‘world’s best practice in teacher education’ with a focus on ‘pedagogical approaches’, ‘subject content’ and ‘professional experience’ (DET(Austl.), 2014). The processes of the review involved international benchmarking of practice and consultation with various experts, stakeholders and the public. This review also considered the use of both the APST and the NPS as ‘mechanisms to give effect to its recommendations’ (DET(Austl.), 2014). That is, the review was purposed with considering how to use regulatory processes to fulfil its recommendations.

As such, the culture of review is linked to the development of regulatory practices, yet, the source and usefulness of review outcomes, processes and practices can be shown to be problematic. Firstly, it is difficult to distinguish whether public and political concern prompts inquiry processes or if it happens the other way round. Secondly, the continuous pattern of both state-based and federal inquiry into the processes and practices of teacher preparation has resulted in countless untried recommendations. The recommendations made across the 100+ reviews already conducted would number in the thousands. Logistically, only a fraction of these recommendations have ever been instituted and even fewer have been empirically assessed. Thirdly, the complexity of teaching and of the processes and practices of teacher education further complicates the identification and evaluation of empirically substantiated practices for teacher preparation. The methodological approaches of reviews of teacher preparation, that focus on literature reviews, benchmarking, reference or expert groups and stakeholder feedback carried out in a strict timeframe, lack the sophistication required to develop the substantial and substantiated evidence-based outcomes (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales, 2008; Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a, 2010b; McMeniman, 2004; SCEVT, 2007; TEMAG, 2014). As such, the issue of the availability and collection of valid and reliable data that supports evidence-based recommendations impacts the effectiveness of review processes. There are significant dissonances between the data collection and analysis processes used by teacher educators in the work of researching their own practice and those used by reviewers conducting political reviews. These differences create challenges, in seeking agreement about empirically supported practices in teacher preparation, which are grounded in fundamental differences about what constitutes trustworthy, valid
and reliable evidence. As such, it can be surmised that political reviews are conducted on teacher preparation for and by political purposes and processes.

The Caldwell and Sutton Review

While the TEMAG (2014) review is the most current political review process in teacher preparation, its outcomes and their influence on practices in and regulation of teacher preparation are yet to be worked out. However, the impact of the last review of teacher preparation in the Queensland context can be assessed. The last review of teacher preparation in Queensland was the Review of Teacher Education and School Induction conducted by Caldwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b). This review was one project implemented under the Education Green Paper A Flying Start for Queensland Children (Department of Education and Training (Qld) [DET(Qld)], 2010a). The terms of reference listed that the report should provide a review of highly effective international and national practices in teacher preparation, and an overview that scanned and analysed the effectiveness of the current Queensland context in relation to teacher preparation courses, the work-readiness of graduates and induction processes against a prescribed list of issues (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a). The issues to be covered included entry to and course level and duration in teacher preparation; practical classroom knowledge and skills in literacy and numeracy, assessment, special needs, early childhood and parent and community engagement; school partnerships and practicum (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a). The review resulted in two reports: Review of Teacher Education and School Induction: First Report – Full Report, 18 August 2010 (Calwell & Sutton, 2010a), and Review of Teacher Education and School Induction: Second Report – Full Report, 29 October 2010 (Calwell & Sutton, 2010b). These reports made 65 recommendations about teacher preparation and school induction. Of these, the ones that have been implemented were used in the development of the additional Queensland regulatory requirements listed as the Additional Queensland Requirements (QCT, 2015/2012). That is, the additional requirements can be directly traced to the recommendations of the Caldwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review.

The review process.

The Caldwell and Sutton review was carried out in two stages; one for each of the two reports. The purpose of and processes used for each report differed, but they both resulted in a series of recommendations about teacher preparation and school induction. The methodological processes and timelines for the review were reflective of those typically used in a political review of teacher preparation. The methods used included a review of relevant literature, receipt and analysis of submissions, interviews, focus groups and surveys, all of which were completed in the eight months between February and October 2010 (Calwell & Sutton, 2010a, 2010b). A reference group supported the co-authors of the two reports. This group comprised 30 members representing various stakeholders in teacher preparation who met regularly throughout the period of the review (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a, 2010b).

The purpose of the first report was to report on issues in the Queensland context and benchmarking of effective international practices in teacher preparation for the purpose of guiding the development of the Education White Paper A Flying Start for Queensland Children (DET(Qld), 2010b). The data used in the preparation of this report included research, policy and practice literature; submissions from the reference group and other stakeholders; interviews with key stakeholders; responses to the Green Paper; and a survey of beginning teachers and their Principals. This data from the submissions, responses to the Green Paper and interviews were summarised in 32 major issues with and opportunities for teacher preparation and school induction in Queensland (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a).
These were used to focus the findings of the review which were listed as 18 benchmarks of effective practice and 21 recommendations covering: teaching as a graduate profession, proliferation of degrees, high standard of entry, clinical partnerships, model for induction, teaching Indigenous students, subjects of study, pre-requisites and professional standards (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a).

In contrast to the first report, which took a diverse scope, the second report focussed on an analysis of current practices in teacher preparation in relation to the issues identified in both the terms of reference and the first report and to consider implementation strategies (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a). Seven aspects of teacher preparation were identified for further interrogation. These were the six areas identified in the terms of reference; behaviour management, special educational needs, indigenous education, early childhood education, middle schooling and parent engagement, and a seventh issue that emerged over the period of the review process, namely professional standards (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). The method used to further analyse each of these areas involved a focus group interview with an expert panel. The expert panel was selected to ensure representation across jurisdictions and sectors in Queensland while also requiring relevant expertise or experience (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). The interviews were transcribed and analysed against the benchmarks listed in the first report. From this, key themes were identified and used in the development of recommendations. A further 45 recommendations were included in this second report across the seven aspects of teacher preparation (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b).

**Outcomes of the review.**

The outcomes of the Caldwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review were structured around a set of benchmarks of effective practice in teacher preparation that were used to make recommendations for the improvement of teacher preparation and school induction in Queensland. In total, 18 benchmarks and 65 recommendations were included across the two reports. The benchmarks, which were included in the first report and written as statements of effective practice, were substantiated from comparative reviews of practice across both national and international jurisdictions and then used in the analysis of current practices in Queensland across both reports (Calwell & Sutton, 2010a). The recommendations in both reports were then framed as proposals for improving teacher preparation and school induction in response to the issues evident between current practice and the benchmark statements.

Of the 65 recommendations made across the two reports, 50 relate specifically to preservice teacher education courses as provided by universities in Queensland (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a, 2010b). Interestingly, despite the presence of at least one major private provider of teacher preparation in the Queensland context, the entire report made reference solely to university providers. An analysis of the 50 recommendations relevant to teacher preparation identified four categories of recommendation. The categories were:

- **Innovative** – recommendations that identify initiatives that innovate on current practice in preservice teacher education;
- **Representative** – recommendations that identify current practice common to all preservice teacher education;
- **Prescriptive** – recommendations that identify specific current practices of some providers that should be required of all preservice teacher education; and
- **Regulatory** – recommendations that identify ways to further regulate preservice teacher education without reference to current practice.

The distribution of recommendations across these four categories serves to describe the nature of the recommendations being made about teacher preparation in the two reports.
Categorisation of Preservice Teacher Education Recommendations, below, graphs the 50 recommendations across the four categories. This shows that the most common category, representing 54%, was prescriptive recommendations that took a contemporary practice found in at least one context and assumed that it would be relevant to all Queensland teacher preparation contexts. Together, the prescriptive and representative recommendations, which made recommendations that were already a part of current practice, comprised 74% of the recommendations made. Given that the purpose of the review was to make recommendations for the improvement of teacher preparation, it is of concern that only one recommendation was identified as innovative. This was recommendation 5, ‘that every university that offers pre-service teacher education have a partnership with one or more schools that are the education equivalent of teaching hospitals’ (Caldwell and Sutton 2010a, p.iv). The discussion about this recommendation identifies that it emerged from the review of relevant literature and is based on the work of Linda Darling-Hammond (2010).
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A second graph, Figure 1.2 Categorisation of Recommendations across Caldwell and Sutton’s (2010) Reports below, illustrates the spread of the categories of recommendation across the two reports. While the first report emphasised the prescriptive with 72% of its recommendations in this category, the second report seemed to have mixed perspectives and purposes across the representative, prescriptive and regulatory categories. This variation is likely a consequence of the differences in the methodological approaches used in the reports.
The first report focussed on a review of effective practice in teacher preparation using various types of literature as its key data sources (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a). Given the terms of reference, the intention of the report was to identify practices that could be transferred to the Queensland context by prescribing them for all providers. The scope of these recommendations remained divergent and reflective of the extent of the research and policy literature used in the development of the report.

However, the second report had a much narrower methodological structure that relied solely on the work of focus group meetings with expert panels in relation to the areas set out in the terms of reference. Consequently, the recommendations are limited by the topics that were used in each of the focus groups, one group for each identified focus area, and the expertise of the panel. Given that the topics covered by the focus groups were those identified in the terms of reference, the scope of the recommendations included in the second report was predetermined before the review process had even commenced. The composition of the expert panels further compromised the process. Analysis of the composition of these panels, as shown in Figure 1.3 Representation of Expert Panels, below, indicates that they have been heavily weighted towards stakeholders and school personnel and away from professional experts and teacher educators working in the field (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). The capacity for these groups to hold knowledge of and validly consider current practice in teacher preparation was limited. Despite the claims made in the report that these groups were selected on the basis of their expert knowledge of the assigned focus area, the majority of the recommendations included in the second report demonstrated a lack of awareness of current practices in teacher preparation on the part of the panels.
Figure 1.3 Representation on Expert Panels

The extent of the problem associated with the knowledge and experience of the expert panels is further highlighted by an analysis of the reported outcomes of each focus group. For each panel, the transcript of the focus group was summarised into key themes (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). Across the seven groups, 93 statements relating to preservice teacher education were identified. Four of these thematic statements were commendations of teacher preparation, either generally or specifically about a particular institution. The vast majority (89 or 96%) were claims about the nature or content of preservice teacher education (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). Of these 89 claims, none were substantiated by either further data collection or cross matching with the research literature used in the first report. Furthermore, a survey of teacher educators or providers across Queensland would have demonstrated their invalidity. That is, the majority of the claims that emerged from the focus group transcripts did not reflect knowledge of current processes and practices of teacher preparation and were more closely related to commonly repeated mythologies about what does and does not happen in preservice teacher education than to actual practice.

At the conclusion of the review process the government moved to immediately implement 24 of the 65 recommendations (DET (Qld), 2010b). They were actioned by the QCT through the development and implementation of the additional accreditation requirements for Queensland (QCT, 2015/2012). Most of the recommendations selected were those relating to the focus areas in the terms of reference. The QCT was also charged with responsibility for establishing a Teacher Education Implementation Task Force to consider the implementation of the other 41 recommendations (DET (Qld), 2010b). While some work was undertaken, the implementation of national standards and accreditation processes in 2012 effectively swamped the implementation of the rest of the Calwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review.

Critiquing the review.

The Calwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review has impacted the processes and practices of contemporary teacher preparation through the implementation of the additional regulatory requirements set out for all Queensland providers in the AQR (QCT, 2015/2012). Yet, a critique of the processes used across the Calwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review has identified three key issues in the methodologies employed. These were the; development of prescriptive terms of reference, application of ineffective purposive sampling for identifying participants in the expert groups, and the use of unsubstantiated claims in the preparation of recommendations.
The terms of reference developed for the Caldwell and Sutton (2010a) review provided a prescribed set of issues to be considered in the analysis of the practices of teacher preparation. The implementation of the second stage of the review focussed on these areas of teacher preparation, which were identified by political means, rather than on the issues identified by comparative international analysis in the first report. They informed both the scope and processes of the second report that included two-thirds of the recommendations made by Caldwell and Sutton (2010b). As such, the scope of this report was limited to a pre-arranged political agenda and this calls into question the validity and significance of the recommendations as either examples of effective practice or productive developments in teacher preparation. In effect, the nature of the terms of reference established for the review facilitated the influence of political sway in the recommendations made and then implemented through the Additional Queensland Requirements (QCT, 2015/2012).

The use of the terms of reference to direct the second stage of the review was further confounded by the methods used to select the participants involved in the expert focus groups. The participants in each expert group were identified by recommendation of one or more members of the reference group and then invited to participate. As such, the groups were formed by purposive sampling (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2005). However, the report identified two potentially contradictory purposes used in the selection of the participants. Firstly, the participants were selected on the basis of some general expertise or experience in the relevant focus area, rather than in the application of the selected issue to teacher preparation (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). Secondly, the composition of the group also had to represent the scope of stakeholders in education (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). This resulted in focus groups that were heavily weighted towards stakeholders and other participants not primarily experienced in teacher preparation. While the experts selected may have had relevant expertise relating to the selected area in education more generally, it is questionable whether they had the expertise to comment effectively on the processes and practices of teacher preparation more specifically.

The consequences of the lack of targeted expertise in teacher preparation are evident in the presentation of the key themes and recommendations that emerged in the second report. For each focus group, the key themes identified from the transcript represented a list of claims that were presented as factual statements regarding the practices of teacher preparation in Queensland (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). While 4% of the statements reported positively about actual practice in one or more institutions, the other 96% of the statements were largely negative claims made on the basis of the experience of the expert groups (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). Given that the majority, 79% (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b), of these participants were not primary participants in preservice teacher preparation, the capacity of these groups to make valid and reliable statements about that preparation was compromised. That is, the lack of actual participation in teacher preparation by the selected experts meant that the statements represented beliefs held about rather than factual reporting of the processes and practices of teacher preparation. The development of recommendations on the basis of these unsupported claims proved problematic. The recommendations in the second report failed to provide any innovations on current practice (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b); they largely recommended that teacher preparation should do the things that it already does. Effectively, the lack of experiential knowledge of current practice resulted in 72% of the recommendations in the second report, the representative and prescriptive ones, being about current practices in teacher preparation. However, of greater concern was the other 28% of recommendations, the regulatory category, which made direct recommendations about the practices of teacher preparation (Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). Given the evidence that the expertise held by the participants failed to reflect the processes and practices of
preservice teacher preparation, the validity and fitness of the resultant regulatory recommendations must also be questioned.

In effect, the Caldwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) reports failed to provide genuinely innovative recommendations despite the intended focus on a review of highly effective international and national practices in teacher preparation. This was a consequence of the problems evident in the methodological processes used across all aspects of the review. The scope of the terms of reference was too ambitious for the time frame involved. Consequently, the reviewers were seriously impeded in relation to maintaining methodological rigor given the small amount of time allocated to the task. This resulted in processes that could be achieved within the given time frame without due consideration for the impact of methodological process on the validity and reliability of outcomes (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2005). This was then further exacerbated by the content of the terms of reference. The issues listed in the terms of reference were directive and leading (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2005). Given the close correlation between the issues in the terms of reference and the recommendations that lead to the additional requirements set out for the professional accreditation of preservice teacher education in Queensland, it might have been possible to save the time and expense of conducting a review by writing the additional regulatory requirements found on Template D (QCT, 2015/2012) instead of the terms of reference.

The problem with the lack of innovative recommendations in the outcomes of the review is that the resultant prescriptive and regulatory recommendations pose a direct threat to innovation. As with most political reviews, the commissioning, conducting and outworking of the review created an appearance of action in relation to teacher preparation. The government, the regulator and the educators can all be shown to be busy in the processes of seeking to improve the quality of teacher preparation. However, the impact of this type of busyness needs to be problematised in relation to innovation. In attempting to fix the perceived inadequacies of preservice teacher education, the methodological processes have worked to reduce the space for innovation in teacher preparation. Every point of regulation that establishes a pre-determined process, practice or mode of operation for teacher preparation either prevents or severely truncates innovation in that area. While the methods used across the review served to value expertise as a source of evidence for the development of or innovation in teacher preparation, the lack of consideration of what constitutes valid and reliable expertise means that the processes effectively quash innovation by the development of regulation. That is, innovation requires an open environment, but the increasing development of regulations, as evident in the outworking of the Caldwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review, works to control the processes and practice of teacher preparation and thereby narrows the space for innovation.

FOCUSING THE STUDY

The underlying principles of the regulation or control of both the professional and academic components of teacher preparation refer directly to quality. This is referred to as quality control, which is about risk minimisation (TEQSA, 2014e). The principles and objectives of national accreditation as outlined in the preamble of Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (AITSL, 2011a) refer directly to ‘improving teacher quality’ and ‘accountability of providers for their delivery of quality teacher education’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.3). Similarly, the vision for TEQSA as set out in the, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency: Strategic Plan 2011-2014, is ‘to maintain and enhance quality, diversity and innovation’ (TEQSA, n.d., p.3). This is further supported by the objects of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011, which outline the use of ‘a standards-based quality framework’ and ‘the provision of quality higher
education’. As such, the overtly stated purposes of both the professional and academic regulatory processes are linked to conceptions of quality. While the current regulatory climate in higher education has sought to focus on quality control, professional regulation of initial teacher education has blurred the edges between quality and process control.

The outworking of both the academic and the professional regulation of teacher preparation in the development and implementation of principles and standards varies quite markedly. Academic accreditation of teacher preparation follows that of all other higher education with regulations and processes closely linked to TEQSA’s approach to risk minimisation inherent in the principles of ‘regulatory necessity’, ‘reflecting risk’ and ‘proportionate regulation’ (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011; TEQSA n.d., p.4). However, the regulations and regulatory processes of professional accreditation do not maintain clear links with these same principles. Rather, the principles underlying professional regulation refer to, ‘improvement’, ‘outcomes’, ‘partnerships’, ‘evidence’ and ‘expertise’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.2). While they also reference ‘flexibility, diversity and innovation’, this requires an, ‘evidence-based case that an element or elements of their programs meet the intent’ of the various standards (AITSL, 2011a, p.2). In other words, it is necessary to provide evidence that an innovation that deviates from the standards in a particular area of the teacher preparation will still ensure that the standards are met. This sort of tautology is problematic on account of the fact that innovations by their nature cannot generally have a solid evidence-base prior to trial. This is further complicated when the standards themselves are detailed and prescriptive.

These differences in the underlying principles of control are worked out in the nature of the standards used for academic as opposed to professional accreditation. The two core sets of academic standards, namely the HESF (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3) and the AQF (ACFC, 2013), have been developed for application across all qualifications at level 5 or higher from a Diploma to a Doctorate. Given this generic application, the standards made very broad statements about what constitutes quality. As such, these standards focus on what aspects of the work of higher education are involved in the provision of quality courses without providing specific information about how that is to be achieved. For example, the threshold standards for ‘admission criteria’ require that these criteria be ‘appropriate for the Qualification Standards level’, taking into account ‘external benchmarks’ and the adequacy of students’ ‘prior knowledge and skills to undertake the course’ (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3, s3.1). In contrast, for professional accreditation the standards provide specific details about how quality is to be achieved. In relation to admission, in Standard 3.1 the National Program Standards sets a minimum entry requirement, namely that ‘applicants’ levels of personal literacy and numeracy should be broadly equivalent to those of the top 30 per cent of the population’ (AITS 2011a, p.12). In addition, the Additional Queensland Requirements require that entrants attain, ‘at least ‘Sound Achievement’ in the current QCAA [Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority] Authority Subject of Senior English; and at least ‘Sound Achievement’ in Mathematics (QCAA Mathematics A and /or B and /or C or equivalent subject from another jurisdiction); and for students entering undergraduate primary (including early childhood and middle years) programs, a ‘Sound Achievement’ in a QCAA Science subject or equivalent subject from another jurisdiction’ (QCT 2015/2012, p.1)

While the academic standards for admission identified what was to be achieved, the professional standards identified how that was to be achieved by assigning specific entry requirements. In doing so, the two types of standards conflict with each other in this area. While the threshold standard for admission in the HESF (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3, s3) requires external benchmarking, the professional standards, at both the national and
Queensland levels, have established arbitrary entry requirements without reference to any such external benchmarks. For standard 3.1 in the National Program Standards, the terms ‘literacy’, ‘numeracy’, top 30 per cent’ and ‘population’ were undefined in the development of the standard and as a consequence what that actually means in terms of entry requirements was also undefined. As such, the links between this entry requirement and evidence that it would ensure that students’ had attained appropriate prior knowledge and skills were also untested.

In effect, the professional accreditation entry requirements established to ensure quality entrants into teacher preparation courses do not satisfy the quality requirements in the equivalent admission criteria in the academic standards (AITSL, 2011a; Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3, s3). The prescriptive process-oriented professional standard fails as a measure of quality control. Ironically, AITSL’s later benchmarking of the ‘top 30 per cent of the population’ and school-based results further highlights the arbitrary nature of the development of professional accreditation requirements. The minimum subject results set for Queensland students in, Standard 3 Program Entrants: Year 12 Study Score Results as proxy indicators of personal literacy and numeracy (AITSL, 2013c), set the minimum requirement for English at ‘High Achievement’ and Mathematics A also at ‘High Achievement’ (AITSL, 2013c, p.5), which is a one full level above the assigned ‘Sound Achievement’ (QCT, 2015/2012, p.1) in these areas. The benchmarking undertaken by AITSL in relation to literacy and numeracy standards demonstrates categorically that the arbitrary entrance requirements set out in the Additional Queensland Requirements do not attain the minimum requirements of the HESF’s standard for quality control (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3, s3; QCT, 2015/2012). As such, neither the national nor the additional state-based requirements in Queensland attain a professional standard in relation to these admission criteria that reflect the quality requirements as set out in the academic standards.

While entry requirements are just one aspect of initial teacher education, similar issues can be identified across the national professional and program standards and the state-based additional requirements in Queensland. That is, when benchmarked against national academic standards, international practices and empirical research every one of these standards can be shown to have problems in relation to their relationship to quality teacher preparation. The nature of these standards and the means whereby they were developed must be problematised. In contrast to the generic role of the academic standards, these three sets of requirements are all specifically related to the narrow field of teacher preparation. Consequently, the inducement to specify standards that control the work or actions of teacher education and teacher educators has been strong. While the rhetoric of both AITSL and the QCT (AITSL, 2011a; Hall, 2013; Misson, 2014) has referenced links with both research and expertise in the setting of the standards, the problems associated with the links between these standards and benchmarks of quality serves to highlight issues in relation to the processes used to develop standards for professional accreditation.

For both AITSL and the QCT the terms ‘research’ and ‘expertise’ in the development of standards for teacher preparation are directly connected to stakeholders (AITSL, 2011a; QCT, 2011/2007). That is, the research that is referred to in the development of the national professional and program standards and the state-based additional requirements in Queensland was stakeholder research. Stakeholder research involves the collection of data using surveys, interviews or focus groups from a selection of participants that represent the full range of sectors that have a stake in a particular field. Participant selection is purposive in that it seeks out a cross-section that is representative of these stakeholders (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2005). The assumption is that these stakeholders hold expertise in the field and that this will contribute to the development of policies, practices and standards. The
processes used in the development of the APST and the National Program Standards by AITSL (2011b; AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010) and the Caldwell and Sutton (2010a, 2010b) review that resulted in the Additional Queensland Requirements (QCT, 2015/2012) both relied heavily on stakeholder research to establish professional standards for teacher preparation. Given the dissonance between the resultant standards and other national and international evidences of quality in teacher preparation, the use of stakeholders as experts in the outworking of both the professional regulatory climate and political reviews is problematic.

This does not mean, however, that stakeholders are not an important part of the development of policies, practices and standards for teacher preparation. Stakeholders and the sectors they represent provide the context for teachers and teacher preparation and are a significant source of information relevant to the improvement of and innovation in that preparation. In particular, they serve as a major component of the feedback loops that highlight what is and is not working. Stakeholders have first-hand experience of the issues and problems experienced by beginning teachers and can provide important external insight that helps to generate ideas and solve problems. But, their participation in research practices needs to be carefully developed to ensure the validity and usefulness of their contribution in terms of the nature of the expertise held by stakeholders and its connections to the purpose or problem of the research. That is, it is important to recognise that stakeholders only hold secondary knowledge of teacher preparation that is one step removed from the process and as such cannot contribute as first-hand experts in teacher preparation.

In effect, a stakeholder group should not be held up as experts in teacher preparation because that would establish an expectation that goes beyond the capabilities and expertise of the group. However, this is exactly what has developed in the current regulatory climate (AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010). Stakeholder feedback and ideas should be integrated into the research process in ways that ensure that an empirically valid process substantiates the issues and ideas that they put forward (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2005). However, this is not happening. Rather, stakeholders have been inappropriately lauded as experts in teacher preparation and used ineffectively in both the development and administration or regulation of policies, practices and standards (AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010; Caldwell & Sutton, 2010b). Their predominance as the experts in the current context of regulation and review likely explains the dissonance between the professional standards and academic benchmarks of quality in teacher preparation.

When the use of stakeholders in this way is reflected back on the earlier question, What makes this group of people the experts about what I do as a teacher educator?, it becomes apparent that this is the wrong question. It is not the stakeholders themselves that are the problem. Rather, it is the practices of the regulators and their use of stakeholders as experts that is generating the dissonances being experienced by teacher education and teacher educators. As such, the question could be better framed as, How did teacher preparation get into this position where stakeholders are used to control or dictate the work of teacher educators?, and What can be done about it? At the heart of these questions are concerns about the capacity of teacher education and teacher educators to thrive in or at least survive the current regulatory climate. All of which is underpinned by an unspoken fear that university-based teacher preparation might be doomed. That is, in fulfilling current requirements for professional accreditation, are teacher education and teacher educators doomed to provide a form of teacher preparation that fails to meet its potential for quality.

The current study has been framed to inquire into these questions about the provision of teacher preparation in the Queensland context. That is, it has been designed to investigate the development
and outworking of the current regulatory climate with the purpose of understanding how current processes and practices have emerged and to consider how these might be productively employed into the future. With this in mind, Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature pertaining to the development of teacher preparation and its regulation in the Australian context. In doing so, it draws connections between the issues inherent in the general questions about stakeholders and the control of teacher preparation to the research question, *How might emerging paradigms for teacher preparation respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?* Following this, Chapter 3 provides an explanation and analysis of the use of critical grounded theory in undertaking this project. This involves situating critical grounded theory within the canon of grounded theory methodologies; explicating the philosophical, theoretical and practical outworking of critical grounded theory; and then describing its application to the current study.

Chapters 4 through 6 then provide an analysis of the findings of the investigation. Chapter 4 reports on the analysis of the historical discourses selected as data for the completion of the historical phase of the study. This analysis used Clarke’s (2005) critical discourse analysis tools and methods to investigate two selected historical stories in relation to knowledge, power and change in teacher preparation from the perspective of teacher educators. Chapter 5 presents the resultant theorising of change and continuity that emerged out of the analysis of the selected stories. This is completed using Charmaz’s (2006) constructivist grounded theory methods. Then, Chapter 6 considers this theorising in light of the contemporary phase of the study. The phase incorporates an analysis of interviews conducted with contemporary international teacher educators. Again, Charmaz’s (2006) constructivist grounded theory methods are used to critique the theorising that has emerged from the analysis of the historical data in relation to the present and future context of teacher preparation. Finally, Chapter 7 seeks to conclude this investigation by considering the implications of the theorising that has emerged from both phases of the study to the future of teacher preparation and the regulation thereof.
CHAPTER 2: THE CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT OF TEACHER PREPARATION

This chapter serves to explore the context of this study, as introduced in Chapter 1, through a review of the academic and political literature relating to teacher preparation in Australia since its emergence in the 1860s. It provides an overview of the practices and policies of teacher preparation as played out in the Australian context up until the present time. It commences with a brief review of the approaches to teacher preparation across the contemporary international scene before focussing specifically on the pathway taken in the Australian context towards the tightly regulated universal model for teacher preparation that is applied across the entire country. The examination of this pathway begins with an explanation of the three models that dominate historical discussions about teacher preparation. The progressivist interpretation of these models is problematised, and the history of teacher preparation is then re-examined in relation to the providers of that preparation. This lens is used to draw out the role of power and control in teacher preparation through a paradigmatic analysis of contemporary regulation, illustrated through the story of the emergence of teacher registration in the Queensland context. This highlights the dissonance evident in the paradigms that are integral to various policy directives and the tensions that must be mediated by teacher educators in contemporary contexts.

The tension between ideology and evidence in the development of policy direction for teacher preparation is then considered. An exploration of the development of the professional identity of teacher educators within the academy is used to demonstrate the nature and scope of evidence that is available in relation to contemporary teacher preparation. This problematises the political rhetoric regarding a lack of empirical evidence that is used to justify ideological policy decision-making. Finally, the emergence of a binary dissonance between teacher educators and policy development highlights the role of power and control underpinning the story of teacher preparation. This re-examination of history calls into question progressivist histories of teacher preparation and opens up the landscape to a critical analysis of both practice and policy. In doing so, it provides the impetus for the key question for this study, How might emerging paradigms for teacher preparation respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?

AN OVERVIEW OF CONTEMPORARY TEACHER PREPARATION

In the contemporary Australian context teacher preparation is the exclusive domain of higher education providers, the majority of which are funded by the federal government. There are around 40 institutions, universities and private colleges, offering university-level qualifications in education. The move to wholly situate teacher preparation within the domain of tertiary education began in the 1970s when the federal government fiscally supported the granting of independence to teachers’ colleges (Fist, 1993; Fomin, Bessant, Wook, 1986; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Partington, 1976). The role of higher education in teacher preparation continues to be supported and protected by current federal policy initiatives. Recent professional and program standards developed for the Australian context uphold a higher education qualification as the minimum requirement for registration as a teacher in Australia (AITSL, 2011a; see Program Standard 1.3). This situation that privileges the role of higher education in teacher preparation is somewhat unusual when compared across both the historical Australian and contemporary global context, as outlined below.
Prior to the intervention of the federal government in the 1970s, state-based employers of teachers were also the main providers of the vast majority of teacher preparation in Australia. Historically, there have been two means of providing employer-sponsored preparation for teaching. The first was workplace training offered through various pupil teacher or monitor schemes in both state and denominational schools (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Hill, 1966; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Sweetman, 1939). This mode of preparation was phased out to make way for teachers’ training colleges operated by education departments and occasionally other employer groups (Byrne, 1986; Duncan, 1984; Hyams, 1979; Turner, 1943). Generally speaking, these teachers’ colleges were granted independence in the 1970s and have subsequently been integrated with the higher education sector (Fomin, Bessant, Wooock, 1986; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999). In some states universities have also participated for up to 100 years in educating graduates for teaching (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004; Macintyre & Selleck, 2003; Tabor, 1980; Turner, 1943; University of Sydney, 2013), though the numbers of teachers prepared through this pathway were small in comparison to the alternatives.

The contemporary privileging of the higher education sector in teacher preparation in the Australian context is also not reflected across the global context. International practices and policy initiatives represent a range of positions in relation to teacher preparation. In the European context, the Bologna process initiated by the signing of the Bologna Declaration in 1999 (Observatory Magna Charta Universitatum, n.d.), has focussed policy initiatives in many European countries on the development of teacher preparation at a postgraduate Master’s level (Karras & Wolhuter, 2010). This is an even higher expectation than that currently required in the Australian context. While countries such as Finland have already achieved this status for teachers (Niemi, 2010; Sahlberg, 2012), others are continuing to make progress in this direction (Dorf, 2010; Hammerness, van Tartwijk & Snoek, 2012; Jobst, 2010; Nanaki & Altet, 2010). Although recent discussions have served to problematise the emphasis on Masters level preservice preparation due to issues as the lack of teaching experience of preservice teachers and the impact of this on effective study at a Masters level.

In contrast, Western Anglophone countries generally have expectations of teacher preparation similar to that found in Australia, offering university courses of similar level and length (Alcorn, 2010; Gambhir, Broad, Evans & Gaskill, 2010; Hilton, 2010; Kysiłka, 2010; Wilkinson & Martin, 2010). However, many of these countries also offer employer-based or school-based teacher preparation routes alongside those offered within the higher education sector. The most well known and influential of these alternative pathways into teaching being School Direct in England (Department for Education, n.d.), and Teach for America across much of the United States (Teach for America, 2015), which has been globalised as Teach for All (Teach for All, 2015).

The situation across the rest of the globe is not as consistent as that found in the European signatories of the Bologna declaration and the Western Anglophone world. The practices across the other continents range from teacher preparation as the responsibility of the higher education sector to circumstances where the majority of teachers have never undertaken preparation (Karras & Wolhuter, 2010). In Singapore, teacher preparation is undertaken by just one higher education institution that offers a range of courses differentiated by school sector and the academic experience of the student, which is supported by policy initiatives aimed at the achievement of a graduate only work force in teaching (Goodwin, 2012; Tan, 2010). In contrast, The Democratic Republic of Congo also has different teacher preparation pathways for different school sectors, however, the standard required for teaching in primary schools is merely a specialised secondary education of between four to six years duration (Bigwana, 2010).
In other contexts, the main issue is a lack of sufficient teacher preparation. In Argentina, teacher preparation courses are offered by higher education, but access to these courses is based on the individual’s capacity to pay (Pini, Musanti, Gorostiaga, Feldfeber & Oliveira, 2010). That is, teachers in low-income neighbourhoods who tend to come from lower socio-economic backgrounds are precluded from participating in these teacher preparation courses. Consequently, much of the practice and policy of teacher education focuses on in-service opportunities for teachers already in the workforce (Pini et al., 2010). Finally, countries that have experienced recent political turmoil have the most precarious situations. Southern Sudan, which experienced 21 years of civil war ending in 2005, has had to re-build its education system from a starting point where only 1% of girls received any education at all in 2004 (Du Toit, 2010). Consequently, many teachers in Southern Sudan have low personal educational achievements and no preparation for the role. Teacher education for both preservice and in-service teachers presents an enormous challenge in contexts such as this one.

These and other stories about teacher education across the globe show that there is significant divergence in relation to practices and policies in teacher preparation. However, many of the goals, driving forces and issues evident in each context appear strikingly similar (Darling-Hammond & Lieberman, 2012; Furlong, Brennan & Cochran-Smith, 2009; Karras & Wolhuter, 2010). Consequently, this chapter explores teacher preparation in relation to the issues evident, the forces at play and how historical and current discourses work to shape the goals and purposes of policy and practice in the Australian context. This will provide further focus for the study by narrowing its purpose in order to articulate and justify the research question for this study. Prior to this analysis, however, it is necessary to map the history of teacher preparation in Australia in order to appreciate how the current context came to be.

**A SHORT HISTORY OF TEACHER PREPARATION IN AUSTRALIA**

The history of teacher preparation in Australia dates back to the 1850s when the emerging colonies inhabiting the Australian continent started to face the question of providing for the educational needs of the growing population of children and young people. Early solutions to the problem of providing teachers for the growing numbers of schools and classes involved either out-sourcing by finding or procuring teachers who had been trained overseas, or seeking volunteers who would undertake the role without any preparation (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). The first attempts at providing preparation for teachers saw the employment of outside experts, generally from Great Britain, to work with local students and teachers in normal or model schools (Hyams, 1979). From this modest beginning, teacher preparation has grown to become a core part of the role and function of higher education providers across the continent.

It is very tempting to assume that this transition from model school to university provides teacher preparation with a grand narrative of progress and improvement. Contemporary policy makers and promoters consistently advance a meta-narrative of ever-increasing progress brought about by the intervention of reviewers, policy-makers and accountability measures (AITSL 2011b, 2012, 2013b, 2014; AITSL & Teaching Australia, 2010; Hall, 2013). Such a grand narrative is based on two common-sense notions. Firstly, that the preparation provided through higher education has to be better than that provided through experience in a school-based setting. Secondly, that the development of teacher preparation has been on a progressively upwards trajectory throughout its history. History shows us, however, that both of these assumptions are problematic when viewed from inside teacher preparation.
There are two core groups of people who are internal to the process of teacher preparation; the educators involved in offering a course of preparation and the students undertaking these courses. Since these groups are pivotal to this discussion of teacher preparation it is important to be able to develop language that describes them in meaningful and representative ways that is also practical and non-distracting. It is therefore necessary to develop terms that can be used consistently across both historical and contemporary contexts.

In this thesis, the term ‘teacher educator’ will be used to describe all of the people involved in the education of teachers. While this term is often used in contemporary discourse to describe only the academic lecturing staff in higher education, this narrow definition of the term is not used consistently. Historically, a teacher educator is defined as anyone involved in demonstrating, mentoring, teaching or assessing at any stage of teachers’ professional careers. In relation to teacher preparation, this has included but is not limited to mentors, supervising teachers, inspectors, training masters, master teachers and lecturers (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004; Hill, 1966; McKenzie, 1981; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Sweetman, 1939; Tabor, 1980; Turney & Taylor 1996). When referring to these more specific roles these more precise terms will be used, and the term ‘teacher educator’ will be used in a generic sense.

In relation to the students of teacher preparation the development of an all-encompassing term suitable across both historic and contemporary contexts is more problematic. Some of the terms that have been applied across the history of teacher preparation include pupil teachers, monitors, student teachers, trainee teachers and preservice teachers (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982, Gardiner, 2004; Hill, 1966; McKenzie, 1981; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Sweetman, 1939; Tabor, 1980; Turney & Taylor 1996). For the most part, these terms have emerged out of a specific model for teacher preparation in response to problems associated with the label used in the immediate historical moment. For example, the term ‘pupil teacher’ was used in the context of school-based apprenticeships where the person being prepared for teaching was both a pupil and a teacher in a particular school (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). As preparation transitioned to training colleges the terms ‘student teachers’ or ‘trainee teachers’ emerged as more representative of the nature of the role taken by people preparing to teach (Garden, 1982; Hill, 1966, McKenzie, 1981; Tabor; 1980). Consequently, historical terms for these students are situated in a particular model and discourse about teacher preparation and cannot be applied more generally. Similarly, the contemporary term ‘preservice teacher’ is also problematic because of its situatedness in a context where all preparation happens prior-to-service, which has not always been the case. Therefore, a generic term to represent all of the people involved in preparing to teach in both historical and contemporary contexts is needed.

The term ‘propaedeutic teacher’ will be used in this thesis to describe all of the people involved in preparing to teach. The use of the term ‘teacher’ maintains continuity with the historical terms and recognises that people preparing to teach take on the role of teacher as part of that preparation. The qualifier ‘propaedeutic’ means, ‘relating to or of the nature of preliminary instruction’ or ‘introductory to some art or science’ (Delbridge et al., 2001, p. 1520). When used together the term ‘propaedeutic teacher’ signifies anyone active in preliminary or introductory learning about the art and/or science of teaching. As such, it can meaningfully include people preparing to teach across all models for teacher preparation.

To date there have been three core models of teacher preparation developed across the Australian context. These are, in chronological order of appearance, the apprenticeship model, the training
model and the education model. It should be noted, however, that these models do not have entirely separate identities and have not smoothly replaced each other. For the vast majority of the 160-year history of teacher preparation these models have worked both with and within each other (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982, Gardiner, 2004; Hill, 1966; McKenzie, 1981; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Sweetman, 1939; Tabor, 1980; Turney & Taylor 1996). Each model has had periods of dominance that have waxed and waned as a consequence of political measures prompted by economic and sociocultural conditions. This means that the history of teacher preparation is one of backwards and forwards movements between the models, rather than an upwardly progressive trajectory.

Furthermore, the models cannot be entirely separated from each other as each one necessarily involves aspects and practices common to at least two of them. For example, contemporary teacher education situated in higher education institutions must involve propaedeutic teachers in school-based experiences that reflect the practices of the apprenticeship model and they study a significant number of units focussed on the content and practicalities of teaching as in the training model (AITSL 2011a; see Program Standards 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.6). It is important to remain cognisant of this history of changes and continuities when discussing the models as separate entities.

THE APPRENTICESHIP MODEL

The apprenticeship model of teacher preparation first commenced in the 1870s. While most colonies or states had established training colleges by the 1910s, the apprenticeship model maintained a strong presence alongside these colleges for several more decades (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). The last pupil teachers undertaking an apprenticeship style of teacher preparation commenced in Queensland in the 1950s (Anderson, 1960). Over the various states and the period of its history the nature of the preparation provided varied significantly. However, there were a number of factors that were common to most of the apprenticeship schemes.

Teacher preparation under the apprenticeship model involved the propaedeutic teacher in an apprenticeship under the guidance of an experienced teacher called a training master or master teacher (Aspland, 2010; see also Anderson, 1960; Hill, 1966; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). The propaedeutic teachers were usually called pupil teachers and were employed on minimal wages by the department or denomination for which they worked. They usually took full responsibility for a class at a level below, or sometimes equivalent to, their own educational attainment. At the same time they were responsible for continuing their own education through evening and Saturday classes. Progress towards a higher teacher classification involved the successful completion of examinations and inspections of their teaching (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). The examinations were set by the department and covered the content of various subjects at the different levels of schooling and inspections were undertaken by department inspectors and alongside observations of teaching focussed on other aspects of classroom life such as cleanliness, classroom management or control, and board-work (Hyams, 1979). Pupil teachers who were successful were awarded a higher class of teacher certification and better wages and their masters usually received a monetary bonus for successfully supporting a pupil teacher.

From the beginning the majority of pupil teachers were young women who were attracted to the security of employment offered by teaching (Anderson, 1960; Hill, 1966). The entry requirement for an apprenticeship was the equivalent of a basic primary education, though this improved over time as secondary education became more readily available. While many pupil teachers successfully completed the requirements of an apprenticeship; the high workload expectations, the interruption
of marriage for female teachers and the vast differences in the support provided in various contexts meant that many teachers never attained a higher level of certification (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939).

The level of support provided to pupil teachers varied dramatically, largely as a result of issues related to the tyranny of distance. Colonies, like New South Wales and Victoria, with a smaller physical scale and more compact urban areas established model or normal schools where masters usually sourced from the metropole, the British Isles, conducted evening classes for pupil teachers from across the district (Hill, 1966; Sweetman, 1939). This overseas expertise bought the latest work in education to the colonies and served to develop local knowledge about education and teaching. At the other end of the spectrum, pupil teachers in rural areas and in colonies with small populations spread over large areas, like Queensland, were dependent on local master teachers who had their own classes and often other responsibilities as well (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955). As a result, pupil teachers in some contexts received little or no support and their progress in relation to certification and the demands of upwards of 60 younger pupils precluded them from effectively maintaining their own educational advancement.

The apprenticeship model of teacher preparation endured for such a long time because it was an efficient and economical solution to continual teacher shortages experienced by education departments trying to meet the needs of populations growing as a result of gold rushes, immigration policies and baby booms. Pupil teachers were an inexpensive workforce immediately available for classroom work; and being responsible for their own learning would potentially remain inexpensive despite years of service and improvements in their teaching (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955). This model assumed that the practice of teaching established in the past and continued in the present was sufficient for the future of education. The ideological assumption underpinning the model was that teaching is a craft that can be learnt through careful observation and inculcation through repeated practice where mastery is built up over time to independent proficiency. Its underlying metaphor was of the teacher as crafts-person. Ultimately, this reductionist focus on the craftsmanship of teaching contributed to the demise of the apprenticeship model of teacher preparation as outlined forthwith.

The loudest and most consistent opponents of the pupil teacher scheme were undoubtedly the teachers’ unions. They argued that the pupil teacher system was tantamount to slave labour (Garden 1982; Mossenson, 1955). The education departments were criticised for exploiting underpaid pupil teachers by requiring them to carry out the same responsibilities as already certified teachers while failing to provide adequate preparation for their progress to higher levels of certification and pay. Furthermore, it was argued that this was also impacting the development of the education system more generally. The low educational attainment of teachers placed limitations on the educational advancement of the state and its students (Anderson, 1960; Turner, 1943), and the focus on the repetition of past practice minimised opportunities for innovations in education and the latest ideas from overseas to be developed and applied in schools. As a result of these continued criticisms, the apprenticeship model eventually gave way to a more centralised and institutional training model of teacher preparation, though the transition took decades to be completed.

THE TRAINING MODEL

The first institutions developed for the preparation of teachers were the model or normal schools established to support the pupil teacher system in some states. Most, however, were short-lived and failed to cope with the numbers of pupil teachers requiring support and the geographic distance between the majority of pupil teachers and the model school (Hill, 1966; Sweetman, 1939). Alongside
the voice of the unions, those working as teacher educators were in support of the development of centralised institutions that provided courses that trained teachers before they were sent out to take on the full responsibilities of teaching. The first of these training colleges was the National Training Schools established in Melbourne in 1855 (Sweetman, 1939). By 1914, with the establishment of a teachers’ college in Queensland, an equivalent college had been established in every state (Anderson, 1960; Hill, 1966; McGuire, 1999; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969). The end of the era of these state-based training colleges operating as a branch of the education department came in 1972 when these colleges came under a funding arrangement with the federal government that saw them become part of the federally-managed tertiary education sector (Fist, 1993; Fomin, Bessant, Woock, 1986; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Roche, 2003). However, this change did not immediately effect the transition from a training model of teacher preparation to the education model in the same way that the establishment of the training colleges did not result in the immediate demise of the system of apprenticeships.

In the beginning, the training colleges provided for two different types of propaedeutic teachers; pupil teachers or monitors who had already served an initial ‘apprenticeship’ and student teachers who entered without teaching experience (Anderson, 1960; Garden, 1982; McKenzie, 1981). Over the period of the training colleges, they catered for school leavers, university students, university graduates and other specialised groups, such as cohorts of ex-servicemen and religious orders (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982, McKenzie, 1981; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Sweetman, 1939; Tabor, 1980; Turney & Taylor 1996). Eventually, the supply of pupil teachers needing to upgrade their teacher’s certification waned and the college courses became entirely preparatory rather than complementary to a period of apprenticeship. Interestingly, at the time of this change the teacher educators involved in the colleges were supportive of complementary preparation processes that involved propaedeutic teachers in a period of school-based apprenticeship prior to commencing a training course (Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939). They argued that the experience gained through the period of apprenticeship assisted student teachers by providing time and experience that lead to maturity and facilitated the application of the content of the training course (Sweetman, 1939). It was also viewed as a useful means of ensuring that the students in courses were suited to teaching and thereby maximised retention rates. In the end, the unions won the argument about the inappropriateness of using an untrained workforce on minimal wages to deal with a shortfall in teachers and teacher training became a prior-to-service activity (Anderson, 1960; Mossenson, 1955).

Throughout their history, the courses offered at the training colleges covered the content of the curriculum, methods of teaching, and the provision of experience through demonstration lessons and short episodes of school-based practice (Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; McKenzie, 1981). Across the time of the training colleges the courses offered developed in several different ways. Firstly, in addition to this standard curriculum, the college structures emphasised the moral and social development of students relevant to the socio-cultural context of the times. In the early years, many of the colleges encouraged or required boarding so that strict oversight of students’ moral and social development could be maintained through tight control of all aspects of their daily lives. Programs of co-curricular or extra-curricular sporting and cultural events and activities were also part and parcel of the experience of teachers’ colleges. By the 1970s, narrow views of acceptable morality had been revolutionised giving way to more open and liberal perspectives and the moralistic character requirements for entry to teaching gave way to requirements in relation to academic achievement (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982). In line with this, the academic and professional aspects of the training
provided to propaedeutic teachers was emphasised and the cultural, sporting and social activities became optional additions.

Secondly, the length of the courses offered grew from just six-months duration to three-year courses in response to the needs of the educational community. The growth and development of schools offering secondary education modified the nature of the educational experience of the propaedeutic teachers from a craftsman’s apprenticeship for teaching to an academic preparation involving a secondary education that led to a secondary school certificate or matriculation in some cases (Anderson, 1960; Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2011). In line with this, the raising of the school leaving age and the need to provide secondary education for a growing population increased the academic demands made on the teaching workforce. The lengthening of courses was generally made as a response to calls for an academically competent teaching workforce and the perceived benefits of further study for the propaedeutic teachers involved (Anderson, 1960; Hyams, 1979; Garden, 1982). That is, the growth in the academic and professional demands made on the propaedeutic teacher once they entered the workforce coupled with the lack of previous experience in school contexts was used to promote and justify the need for increasingly longer courses in teacher preparation. It should be noted, however, that regressive policy decisions about the length of courses were made in all states in response to staffing shortages experienced at various times (Hyams, 1979; Turner, 1943). In these situations some, if not all, propaedeutic teachers were offered courses shorter than those offered in the period immediately prior to the crisis in teacher supply. During these periods the teacher educators of the time appear to have been stoic in their provision of the best training possible in the timeframe available while actively promoting a return to the longer courses of times past.

Thirdly, the content of the courses developed in response to educational initiatives in curriculum and pedagogy. Over the period of the predominance of the teachers’ colleges major changes were initiated in the structures, curriculum and pedagogies employed in schools. During this time, post-primary education became compulsory for all students, secondary education diversified to include technical, commercial and academic pathways, core school subjects underwent dramatic changes in line with broader social and industrial developments, and curriculum and assessment transitioned from centralised administration towards school-based development. As employees of the education departments affecting these changes, teacher educators and the courses they provided were heavily influenced by the need to provide practical training that catered for the developments initiated by these departments (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; McKenzie, 1981). That is not to say, however, that these teacher educators were without their own initiative and will in relation to the curriculum and professional experience of teacher preparation.

Fourthly, the source and personal educational achievements of teacher educators progressed over time. During their early history, teachers’ colleges were generally reliant on overseas sources for teacher educators; particularly the metropole (Hyams, 1979). As training and higher education opportunities grew across the Australian continent, locally educated individuals became available and by the close of the era of the teachers’ colleges the vast majority of their staff were locally trained and some received opportunities to complete in higher education. While early teacher educators brought with them international ideas and initiatives in education, the practice of taking overseas study tours or undertaking an overseas qualification in order to improve one’s personal academic standing and knowledge of education was not unusual for local teacher educators (Anchen, 1956; Mossenson, 1955). In most states, the training provided not only catered for the needs of local schools but also involved propaedeutic teachers in studying the latest educational ideas and innovations from
overseas. In some cases this even extended to the provision of opportunities to participate in experimental research and study of these innovations (Garden, 1982).

Finally, the nature of the assessment and evaluation of teacher preparation courses and their students underwent significant changes. The transition from apprenticeship to training did not immediately effect a change in the way that students and courses were assessed. The use of centrally administered examinations and inspection visits by departmental assessors remained for quite some time (Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; McKenzie, 1981). This meant that the college staff, while preparing and teaching a teacher preparation course were not responsible for the assessment of the course. While valiant efforts were made to prepare students for the required examinations, the correlation between the course and the examination was not always consistent and the practice of the separation of curriculum from assessment was called into question (Anderson, 1960; Garden, 1982).

It was also argued that the relevance of the examinations themselves to the needs of teacher preparation was tenuous. Ultimately, the responsibility for assessment was transferred to the teachers’ colleges and teacher educators were required to prepare, teach and assess teacher preparation courses. This saw the development of a broader range of assessment practices inspired by international ideas and innovations that were often labelled as the ‘new education’ (Anchen, 1956; Aspland, 2010; Mackaness, 1928).

The development of more comprehensive and innovative teacher preparation throughout the era of the departmental teachers’ training colleges is reflective of the broader emergence of education and teaching out of the shadows of conservatism, centralism and exigencism. During this time teacher preparation sought to throw off the idea of teaching as a craft, learnt through observation and repetition, in order to take up a more systematic and scientific approach to teaching. The conception of teaching as a science emerged where quality teaching was dependent upon the acquisition of content, skills and techniques that could be studied, analysed and practised separately and then applied and refined in practical contexts (Aspland, 2010; Teaching Skills Development Project & Turney, 1973). The resulting focus on academically acquired knowledge and skills also contributed to the downplaying of morals and values as prerequisites for teaching. By the end of the era of the training model the metaphor of the teacher as technician had emerged to dominate the practices of teacher preparation.

By the end of the 1960s, the teachers’ training colleges might have been lulled into a sense of confidence and security. They had experienced a period of rapid expansion in both human resources and physical infrastructure; state governments had finally contributed significant funding towards the upgrading of the provision of teacher preparation and their continuance seemed assured (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982). Across the states the training provided by the colleges was the longest and most thorough it had been across the history of teacher preparation and the steady growth in secondary education had progressively improved the academic standing of prospective students. However, the extreme crises in teacher provision had largely abated, leaving only smaller areas of crisis, such as the need for mathematics and science teachers (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004). Alongside the amalgamation of rural schools in many states, the abating of crises consolidated the supply of teachers and made way progressively for a shift of focus towards the quality of teachers.

The transition from focussing on teacher quantity to one of teacher quality was a major contributing factor to the end of the era of the state-based, departmentally run teachers’ training colleges. In the discourses that ensued, such as the Martin Report (1965), the way the colleges were operated was portrayed as a major factor preventing progress in relation to the development of the teaching
workforce. The main issue was departmental control, which resulted in a lack of independence for the college and its staff. This close hierarchical relationship between departments and colleges meant that the colleges did not have full and independent responsibility for staffing, budgets or course content (Garden, 1982; Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Partington, 1976). Consequently, teacher educators were generally sourced from the ranks of the teaching workforce on the basis of practical skill with little or no higher education above that of their students (Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; McKenzie, 1981). Pursuing funding for the needs of the colleges consumed a great deal of time and effort on the part of principals and often monies were not necessarily available for the most pressing needs or the most promising innovations (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982). Efforts to improve and develop courses were tightly controlled by departmental officers who often had little experience in the processes and practices of teacher preparation. When this situation was compared to the level of independence experienced by universities of that time, it was argued that the lack of independence was an impediment to the development of teacher preparation as a legitimate part of the tertiary education sector and of teaching as a profession (Dyson, 2005; Martin, 1965). That is, the focus on the practical and economic needs of the department supported a partisan approach to teacher preparation that lacked the rigor of a more thorough tertiary education that was required if the teaching workforce was going to become an academically credible and professional workforce.

THE EDUCATION MODEL

In 1972 the federal government brought to an end the state-based control of teachers’ training colleges with the promise of federal funding for the granting of independence (States Grants (Teachers Colleges) Act 1970). The overnight changes made to the governance of the teachers’ colleges did not automatically usher in a new model for teacher preparation, neither was it the first instance of the teacher preparation as the domain of higher education. The first recorded suggestion that teacher preparation could or should be undertaken within a university was made by the Denominational Schools Board in Victoria in 1853 (Sweetman, 1939). As has already been described, the shortage of teachers and the lack of local matriculants made the goal of a university-level qualification as a minimum requirement for teaching a mere aspiration. While this aspirational goal took almost 100 years to be realised, the provision of a university qualification for some propaedeutic teachers was realised much sooner.

The first university courses in education commenced at the University of Melbourne in 1903 and equivalent courses were available in all states by 1938 when a Diploma commenced at the University of Queensland (Anderson, 1960; Garden, 1982). These initial courses were usually a Diploma in Education taken as a one-year course at the conclusion of a prior degree (Hyams, 1979), though a combined degree at Bachelor level was also available in some states (Garden, 1982). In many cases though, the preparation for teaching offered to university students was not markedly different from that provided to propaedeutic teachers in training colleges due to the relationships that were established between the universities and the teachers’ colleges (Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004). Very often, the same teacher educators would be working in both institutions and for efficiency the classes would sometimes be combined. It would, however, be erroneous to assume that the main benefits of a university-based education for these propaedeutic teachers involved the development of their general education and subject-specific knowledge of content rather than in the practices and processes of teaching.
Close relationships between the universities and the colleges were evident early in their histories. The development of the dual position of Principal of a teachers’ college and Chair of Education in the university aided the integration of university-based ideals about teaching, learning and research into the practices of some of the teachers’ colleges (Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004). However, many of these ideals were eroded over time as the universities and colleges were increasingly separated as they developed over time. The higher education qualifications held by staff of the teachers’ colleges often deteriorated over time such that the average level of qualification on integration into the advanced education sector in 1972 was on par with or significantly lower than that of the staff of teachers’ college during earlier periods (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982). Similar effects were seen in the downgrading or removal of courses such as those in early childhood that had grown out of the application of the international innovations of Pestalozzi and Froebel, and the abandoning of successful educationally initiated innovations on economic grounds (Garden, 1982).

Many of the early teacher educators working in model schools and training colleges were supportive of and working towards the development of university-based teacher preparation. Their aspirations were, however, a long time in coming. The first state to initiate a commitment to university-based preparation for all teachers was Tasmania in the 1940s (Fist, 1993). After several years of negotiation, teacher preparation transferred from the Philip Smith College to the University of Tasmania at the beginning of 1948 (Fist, 1993; Nichol, 1969). Ironically, the required lengthening of the course created an immediate shortfall in the number of teachers and the department set up an Emergency Training Centre in the very same year. Despite the continuing protestations of the Teachers’ Federation and the reiterating of a commitment to a university-based teacher preparation throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the Emergency Training Centre continued to operate and eventually was renamed the Launceston Teachers’ College (Fist, 1993). Between 1948 and 1972 teacher preparation in Tasmania was offered at two levels, as an exigent preparation offered through a department-sponsored college and as a university course.

While 1972 saw the advent of autonomy for teachers’ colleges across all the states, it was only the beginning of the process of integrating teacher preparation into higher education. The federal government established a two-tiered system of tertiary education with universities separated both administratively and academically from vocationally-oriented institutions (Dyson, 2005; Partington, 1976; Roche, 2003). Initially the teachers’ colleges were associated with vocational tertiary education provided by colleges of advanced education. Eventually, teacher preparation was integrated into the higher education sector as a fully-fledged university course offered by faculties in both newly established and the sandstone universities (Gardiner, 2004; Robison, 2010).

The first steps in this process of integrating teacher preparation with tertiary education were disruptive. The years of hierarchical leadership from the various state departments of education had undermined the development of teacher educators in the colleges and this coupled with the razor-gang approach to rationalising the workforce of the newly established and amalgamated colleges of advanced education led to staffing unrest (Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986; Partington, 1976). In the face of the uncertainty of the times, the courses offered by the colleges did not undergo immediate restructuring. As new and existing staff settled into their roles and support was offered for their professional and academic advancement (Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Roche, 2003), the nature of the courses began to change and principles of higher education, such as the importance of research in teaching and learning, were increasingly evident.
Changes continued to be made in the tertiary education sector and these ultimately lead to the transitioning of the colleges of advanced education, by acts of federal parliament, into university status (Dyson, 2005; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Roche, 2003). Throughout the 1980s the establishment of these new universities saw the transition of undergraduate teacher preparation from a Diploma level course to a Bachelors degree as a minimum. Postgraduate Diplomas continued to be offered by the established universities and also made their way into the programs of the newer universities. At the same time, private higher education providers emerged in a number of states and they too provided teacher preparation at Bachelors level and higher.

University-based teacher preparation courses offer general education in relevant areas of the curriculum for undergraduates alongside studies in the discipline of education, including curriculum and pedagogy, and the development of professional capabilities through practice in classrooms and other relevant contexts. The focus of these courses is dualistic in that they seek to develop the theoretical foundations for the discipline of education in line with the goals of a degree course or higher (AQFC, 2013), while trying to maintain a close relationship with professional practice (AITSL, 2011a). As such, propaedeutic teachers are required to demonstrate the knowledge and skills of a university graduate commensurate with the level of their qualification as well as professional preparedness to assume full responsibilities as a teacher.

The education model of teacher preparation that was envisioned by teacher educators as early as the 1890s and finally emerged in the 1970s and 1980s takes the teaching profession beyond the ideologies of the teacher as craftsman or technician. Across university faculties the metaphor of the teacher as scholar has come to govern thinking about the nature of teachers and teaching (Aspland, 2010). Within this ideological stance the teacher should have a sound grasp of the underlying philosophy and theory of curricular and pedagogical practice based on the processes and needs of learning and learners in order to apply them effectively in the practical contexts of schools and classrooms. The assumption is that proficient practice within a classroom will flow from reasoned thinking based in an ability to use and undertake educational research that will lead to practical action that is based on evidence rather than common sense, ideological preference or historical precedence. Ultimately, the metaphor of the teacher as scholar recognises that the future of educational innovation and responses to the educational needs of communities will only be possible with an educated teaching workforce (Heath, 2011; Ingvarson, Reid, Buckley, Kleinhenz & Masters, 2014). The attributes of a university graduate are seen to be foundational to successful classroom teaching and learning and the continued development of education for all Australians.

Since the establishment of the first three-year Bachelor of Teaching degrees in the 1970s and 1980s the minimum standard for registration as a teacher in Australia has been raised to at least four years of tertiary study at Bachelors level or higher. This led to the development of four-year Bachelor of Education degrees for undergraduate students across the 1990s while the minimum for postgraduate students remained at one-year in addition to an initial three-year Bachelors degree in a relevant curriculum area. Most recently, the minimum standard for postgraduate qualifications has been raised to two-years of studies in education (AITSL, 2011a; see program standard 1.3), and higher education providers are currently dealing with the issue of what sort of two-year qualification is appropriate for teacher preparation.

While the rhetoric of autonomy for institutions was a marker of the move towards higher education, the upward pressure on the length of the courses offered by universities is an example of the continued influence of political bodies on the practices and processes of teacher preparation. From long before
the federal intervention of 1972 there have been discussions about and criticism of a perceived theory-practice divide in teacher preparation offered through university pathways where the theory espoused fails to apply to the realities of classroom experience (Gardiner, 2004; Sweetman, 1939). Issues of supply and demand have also proved problematic as student preferences and the economic needs of university faculties for student numbers have rarely matched the employment needs of departments and schools (Roche, 2003). The perception of divisions between theory and practice and supply and demand quickly became problematic for university-based teacher preparation.

Prior to the move to higher education the close relationship between education departments and the teachers’ colleges was perceived to be a limiting factor in the development of teachers, the teaching profession and, by direct association, education within the Australian context (Martin, 1965). Immediately following the move, the discourse changed such that the separation of university faculties from the coalface of teaching was perceived as a threat to the quality and preparedness of graduates (Gardiner, 2004; Reid, 2011). Consequently, teacher preparation has undergone unprecedented levels of political review compared to other professional preparations undertaken at university and these reviews have consistently called into question the quality of the preparedness of graduates (see for example Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a, 2010b; TEMAG, 2014). This serves to highlight the dissonance evident between the actions of employer groups who continue to expect that graduating teachers should know and be able to do everything necessary to immediately assume full teaching responsibilities and the capacity of a teacher preparation course to deliver thorough knowledge and practice of content, curriculum and pedagogy within a global knowledge economy that continues to see exponential growth.

In order to establish and build confidence in the preparedness of graduates the various state and territory governments moved to regulate the teaching profession through the registration of teachers and the accreditation of teacher preparation courses. The nature and level of regulation experienced by teacher preparation courses has varied significantly across the various jurisdictions since 1972, though the general principles have been similar. A regulatory body established by an act of state parliament undertakes the regulation of the teaching profession and teacher preparation in each state. A board or council comprising teachers and various representatives of educational stakeholders usually governs these regulatory bodies, with generally at least one teacher educator included. They are responsible for assuring political and public confidence in the quality of teacher preparation, teachers and teaching. The bulk of the work undertaken involves the implementation of regulatory legislation and policy initiatives and is carried out by employees of the regulatory body with reference to the board and various committees. The most recent development in the regulation of teachers and teacher preparation has seen the establishment of national standards and procedures (AITSL, 2011a).

While the registration and regulation of the teaching profession as undertaken by the various regulatory bodies serves the important purpose of ensuring that all teachers undertake appropriate academic qualifications and are suitable for working with children, it has also served to curb the independence and academic freedom of teacher educators and higher education institutions involved in teacher preparation. Under the accreditation processes established across the various states and ultimately through the national body, AITSL, a higher education provider must meet a raft of requirements that place limitations on the content, structuring, staffing and assessment of teacher preparation courses (AITSL, 2011a). Much of the work done in establishing these standards has involved stakeholder research, which has involved representatives of the same groups that make up the various boards and councils. Ironically, the two groups that are under-represented are those internal to the process of teacher preparation, namely teacher educators and propaedeutic teachers.
Thus, the regulation of teacher preparation has been undertaken with minimal reference to the key participants in the process and the potential of the metaphor of ‘teacher as scholar’ may have never been fully realised.

**QUESTIONS THAT EMERGE FROM THE HISTORY OF TEACHER PREPARATION**

This brief review of the history of teacher preparation has demonstrated that it has had a long and varied story with many ebbs and flows, twists and turns. Rather than a neat upward trajectory, the pathway from model school to university-based teacher preparation has experienced changes and continuities that have moved backwards and forwards between and across the models. In tracking this process, what is noticeable in its absence is any discussion of evidence that the changes made at any particular time would improve the quality of teacher preparation. As such, the following questions about the historical models of teacher preparation emerged as potential points of focus for this investigation into teacher preparation:

- Were these models appropriate for their time? How do we know?
- How did these models fulfil their purpose in their time?
- How might these models having continuing relevance in the contemporary context?
- Has teacher preparation been improved as a result of the changes that have been made?
- Why were changes made and were they justifiable at the time?
- What factors influenced changes and continuities at significant junctions?
- Is the contemporary model the most appropriate?
- Could the models be usefully recombined to greater effect than the current model allows?
- How might these models be engaged productively for the future of teacher preparation?

**TEACHER PREPARATION PROVIDERS IN THE AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT**

The preceding discussion of the models for teacher preparation used a paradigmatic lens on teacher preparation. However, the emergent and fluid nature of the models or paradigms over time significantly limits any capacity to undertake research in or make critical judgements about the usefulness and outcomes of these models, either individually or in combinations with each other. The same is not necessarily true of an analysis of the providers involved in teacher preparation.

Historically, there have been two key types of providers of teacher preparation in the Australian context, employer-based providers and independent providers. Employer-based providers are those that are financed and managed by a key employing authority that will be providing employment to the propaedeutic teachers at the conclusion of their preparation. Within the Australian context the main employer-based providers of teacher preparation have been the education departments in each state. In each of the Australian colonies, teacher preparation commenced prior to federation and the states maintained teacher preparation as part of their constitutional responsibility for education after federation (Hyams, 1979). Alongside the state government departments, various denominational and educational organisations involved in providing education have also offered teacher preparation at various times. In particular, Catholic educational bodies have been involved in teacher preparation across a number of Australian colonies and states throughout the history of teacher preparation (Byrne, 1986; Duncan, 1984; Turner, 1943). In contrast, independent providers of teacher preparation are institutions that are financed and operated independently of an employing authority. For the most part, these institutions have been the universities, though other tertiary education providers have and continue to be present in the Australian context.
Considering the history of teacher preparation through the lens of the provider facilitates taking an alternative view of the landscape. Up until the 1970s both types of providers were evident in the Australian context and in some states there were significant relationships established between them (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Garden, 1982; Nichol, 1969; Gardiner, 2004). However, the fortunes of the different types of providers and the relationships they had established, were determined by one significant and dramatic change in the provision of teacher preparation. This being the swift and complete shift in 1972 from predominantly employer-based to entirely independent tertiary institution provision. As the history of teacher preparation has shown, this change was precipitated by federal intervention with monetary incentive (Dyson, 2005; Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986; Partington, 1976), a situation that necessitates consideration of the influence of power and control on the history of teacher preparation.

**Employer-Based Provision of Teacher Preparation**

The era of employer-based provision of teacher preparation in the Australian context spanned from the development of the apprenticeship model in the 1870s through to the enforcement of the independence of teachers’ colleges in 1972. As explained in the history of teacher preparation described earlier; education, teaching and teacher preparation during this period was managed by conservatism, centralism and exigencism predicated upon the social and economic conditions of the states at any given time. As such, employer-based teacher preparation was able to facilitate quick and efficient responses to departmental needs.

Throughout the period it can be shown that the preparation provided to propaedeutic teachers by employer-based providers varied as a consequence of both economic restrictions and issues of supply and demand. The depressions of the 1890s and the 1930s both lead to significant scaling back of or, in some situations, the complete ceasing of teacher preparation (Hyams, 1979; see also Anderson, 1960; Nichol, 1969; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939; Turner, 1943). In most cases, political influences called into question the costs of and need for teacher preparation as a means of justifying the decision to restrict teacher preparation. Similarly, periods of significant population growth, such as during the gold rushes or the baby boomer period after World War II, also resulted in the truncating of the preparation provided to teachers (Hyams, 1979; Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004). In the context of both financing preparation and supplying teachers, political and bureaucratic control was being exercised directly upon employer-based provision of teacher preparation.

Political and bureaucratic control of education was facilitated by employer-based provision of teacher preparation. Firstly, political and bureaucratic leaders in the education departments controlled the content and assessment of teacher preparation, and as a consequence the nature of education offered throughout the states. Throughout the period of the apprenticeship model, assessments that lead to the classification of teachers were determined and offered by the relevant education departments (Anderson 1960; Nichols, 1969). Master teachers of the time were responsible for preparing propaedeutic teachers for the relevant examinations and inspections and this controlled the nature and content of the education offered. Once training colleges commenced the work of teacher preparation, records show that departmental requirements in relation to the content of teacher preparation courses served to determine the curriculum offered by the colleges (Hyams, 1979; Garden, 1982), and the assessment of propaedeutic teachers continued to be determined by examinations and inspections set by education departments. As time progressed, the teachers’ colleges were eventually afforded some responsibility for setting content and assessment, particularly in contexts where key teacher educators had established productive relationships with departmental leaders.
Secondly, education departments controlled the professional and sometimes personal life of both teachers and teacher educators. Decisions about the nature of the preparation offered to propaedeutic teachers, their appointments to schools and progress in terms of teacher classification were all determined by the education department (Anderson, 1960; Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982). Teacher educators also experienced similar control. During the height of the apprenticeship model, master teachers’ posts were determined by departmental need and their remuneration was controlled by the success of their pupil teachers in departmental examinations and inspections (Anderson, 1960; Sweetman, 1939). The situation did not change with the establishment of the teachers’ colleges. The department continued to control appointments within the colleges, and apart from a small number of permanent positions, teachers were posted into and out of the teachers’ colleges at the behest of the department. The department also determined advancement for teacher educators, both within the colleges and in relation to the classification of teachers. Teacher educators, propaedeutic teachers and classified teachers were never in control of either their work as educators or their destinies (Anderson, 1960; Hyams, 1979; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Sweetman, 1939). As such, they lacked both power and voice in relation to the nature and course of education in the Australian context while employer-based providers dominated teacher preparation.

Employer-based provision of teacher preparation focussed on the needs of the department rather than of the teachers in their employment. It was driven by issues of quantity and location in relation to teacher supply and economic efficiency in providing teacher preparation. Eventually though, the social and economic conditions that had precipitated needs-based decision-making began to give way to growing dissatisfaction at the quality of education and by consequence the quality of teacher preparation. Both the political and educational critique of the potential for teachers and other educators to innovate and improve the education being offered in the states was founded on the premise that quality could not be achieved while economic efficiency and workforce needs were the driving forces in teacher preparation. As such, the political and educational forces had moved from a position of exigencism in relation to cost and quantity to a focus on the need for quality in education.

**INDEPENDENT PROVISION OF TEACHER PREPARATION**

Teacher preparation that was independent of employers was evident in the history of teacher preparation from very early in the story. The main independent providers of teacher preparation were the universities established in each state during the first couple of decades of the 20th century (Hyams, 1979). In most states the vast majority of propaedeutic teacher enrolled at the university were those preparing to be secondary teachers (Garden, 1982; Mossenson, 1955; Turner, 1943). They generally worked either in collaboration with or alongside the employer-based teachers’ colleges in the provision of teacher preparation right up until the granting of autonomy to the teachers’ colleges in 1972 (Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004). At that point, the previously employer-based colleges transitioned to independent tertiary providers of teacher preparation and their development towards university status was put in motion (Martin, 1965; Dawkins 1988; Dyson, 2005).

The development of the teachers’ colleges into firstly tertiary institutions and ultimately universities was intended to improve the quality of the teacher preparation provided to propaedeutic teachers. This improvement in quality was viewed as the natural consequence of the granting of autonomy and independence to the colleges as it would afford the institutions and their workforce the academic freedom needed to fully develop the discipline of education (Dyson, 2005; Martin, 1965; Partington, 1976). That is, the significance of the ideals of higher education and its potential influence on the work of research and innovation were viewed as necessary for the development of education. Furthermore,
the importance of the need for highly educated teaching professionals capable of thinking and working independently on the development of quality education necessitated the shift from a focus on departmental needs to a focus on the needs of the teachers themselves.

**QUESTIONS THAT EMERGE IN RELATION TO TEACHER PREPARATION PROVIDERS**

While both types of providers worked alongside each other for a very long period of time, the swift transition to entirely autonomous provision by political behest had a significant impact on the history of teacher preparation. Despite the political rhetoric of the time, which focussed attention on the need for autonomy as the key to improving the quality of teacher preparation, there is little evidence to support the idea that the teacher preparation being offered in departmentally run teachers’ colleges at the time was ineffective. As such, issues of power and control emerged as significant in understanding the history of teacher preparation. The following questions about the providers of teacher preparation emerged as potential points of focus for this investigation into teacher preparation:

- Were the different providers effective in their time? How do we know?
- How did the different providers fulfil their purpose in their time?
- How might these providers having continuing relevance in the contemporary context?
- Has teacher preparation been improved as a result of the changes that have been made?
- Are the contemporary providers the most appropriate or effective?
- How might the different providers be engaged productively for the future of teacher preparation?

**TEACHER PREPARATION MODELS IN CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT**

The historical discussion of the three models and two providers of teacher preparation brings this story into the 21st century. Within the literature, the history of teacher preparation is sometimes characterised as a progressive development from one model to another as if they are alternative or competing approaches or paradigms that can be usefully applied to describing the improvement of teacher preparation over time (Aspland, 2011; Hyams, 1979). However, others have observed the lack of a clear upward trajectory and evidence of improvement (Reid 2011), which calls into question the notion of paradigmatic progress in teacher preparation.

The term *paradigm*, taken from Latin and first used in the 15th century (Paradigm, 2015), came into vogue in the 1960s when Kuhn (1970/1962) published his text, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. For Kuhn (1970, p. 10), a paradigm is a theoretical framework for a particular field of science that has been accepted, in the past or present, by the relevant scientific community as the most appropriate platform for continued scientific endeavours in the specific field. The significance of this construct lay in its explanation of the conceptual development or advancement of science. Traditional histories of scientific fields assumed that the slow accumulation of discoveries progressively refined a field, whereas Kuhn’s (1970) paradigmatic histories described development as a revolutionary transformation between two competing paradigms. For Kuhn (1970), this transformation is initiated by a crisis that leads to a competition between alternative paradigms and concludes with the conversion of commitments from one previously dominant paradigm to a new dominant paradigm.

However, Kuhn’s use of the concept of paradigm to explain scientific development cannot be directly applied to understanding or explaining the transitions between the various models of teacher preparation. Despite early criticisms of his lack of clarity in relation to the term *paradigm* (Masterman,
1970), Kuhn did use naturalistic assumptions about scientific progress and existentialist assumptions about objectivity to underpin a narrow definition of both science and paradigm (Marcum, 2005). He argued that all fields or activities that had not settled on a single paradigm were pre-paradigmatic or immature (Kuhn, 1970). As such, any area of social research that investigates complex social phenomena where alternative frames of reference co-habit, are excluded from Kuhn’s definition of a paradigm (Kuhn, 1970). Interestingly, others in the social sciences agree, arguing that the ‘clash of competing theories’ rather than ‘paradigmatic upheavals’ should be used when describing the social sciences historically (Dogan, 2001). An important consequence of this is the fact that a paradigm, by Kuhnian definition, is not possible outside of the narrow field of the natural sciences. Using a strict Kuhnian definition, the different models of teacher preparation should never be described as paradigmatic.

Ironically, as a result of Kuhn’s work, and possibly his early lack of clarity in defining the term, the word paradigm and the connected paradigm shift have crept into common parlance across a wide range of fields, disciplines and media. These more common uses of the term paradigm have been defined as, ‘a basic set of beliefs that guide actions’ (Guba, 1990, p. 17). In this sense, a paradigm is a perspective about a particular phenomenon that results in particular thinking and actions in relation to that phenomenon. This definition is not dissimilar to that of the philosophical term weltanschauung (Naugle, 2002), or the sociological terms habitus (Bourdieu, 2010, 1977).

Weltanschauung means literally, ‘a view of the world’ (Naugle, 2002, p.63). The term has been borrowed from German philosophy, translated as worldview and used to express the idea that a person’s experience of reality is mediated by the individual’s internal constructs about the nature of that reality (Naugle, 2002). On the other hand, habitus is defined as the way in which individuals ‘develop attitudes and dispositions’ that dispose them to ‘certain activities and perspectives’ that express these underlying values (Webb, Schirato & Danaher, 2002, Glossary, para. 23). Correlations between the terms worldview and habitus and the now common usage of the word paradigm include the focus on the significance of presuppositions, attitudes, values or beliefs to the thinking and action of the individual, as well as the recognition that these presuppositions are simultaneously held by the individual and constructed socially through lived experience (Bourdieu, 2010; Naugle, 2002; Sire, 2009; Webb, Schirato & Danaher, 2002). However, one important point of distinction sets the three terms apart.

The literature about worldviews is consistent in its focus on foundational or philosophical questions and life issues (see for example Marshall, Griffioen & Mow, 1989; Naugle, 2002; Sire, 2009; Sunshine, 2009). As such, worldview is about how foundational thinking shapes action. Bourdieu’s (1977, 2010) habitus, on the other hand, is situated within the frame of the social, cultural and historical fields that produce the ‘conditions of existence’ that subsequently ‘produce different habitus’ (Bourdieu, 2010, p. 166). While weltanschauung takes as its starting point the habits of mind on the outworking of lived experience (Naugle, 2002; Sire, 2009), habitus considers the primacy of the entirety of the social world in constructing those practices (Bourdieu, 1977, 2010; Stahl, 2013; Webb, Schirato & Danaher, 2002). While the terms worldview and habitus encompass the whole of reality, the term paradigm considers specific components of that reality. The term paradigm is usually used to describe a pattern, model, example or framework used to think about a particular field, discipline or construct (Delbridge et al. 2001; Paradigm, 2015). As such, an individual has a singular worldview or habitus, inconsistent though it may be (Bourdieu, 2010; Sire, 2009), but may act out of different paradigms in different social contexts (Guba, 1990). As such, paradigms are context specific.
While Kuhn’s (1970/1962) definition of the term paradigm is interesting, the restrictions that limit its relevance to the natural sciences means that this conception of paradigms cannot be thought to be universally relevant. However, a redefining of the term founded on common usage and built upon both weltanschauung and habitus is possible. From this frame of reference, a paradigm is defined as a set of conditions of and beliefs about a particular phenomenon that determines how that phenomenon is thought about, engaged with and acted upon. It is a socially constructed framework or model used, both consciously and subconsciously, by individuals and groups to guide thinking and actions in relation to a particular phenomenon. Where different points of view exist about a particular phenomenon, different paradigms exist.

Furthermore, the re-definition of paradigms frames alternative points of view such that they cannot be seen to be mutually exclusive. For any social phenomenon, different paradigms will and do occur concurrently. While Kuhn’s (1970/1962) paradigms required a crisis to initiate revolutionary transformation from one paradigm to another, this conception of a paradigm recognises that clashes between alternative points of view will be reflected in shifting support for and application of alternative paradigms or theory versions (Chen, 2000). Over time this could be constructed as development or improvement, though this is problematic. Within the social sciences at least, a paradigm’s dominance at any given time cannot be viewed as sufficient evidence of its superiority (Dogan, 2001), other empirical evidence is necessary.

This conception of a paradigm can be applied to the three models of teacher preparation. From this frame of reference, the three different models for teacher preparation can be seen to be competing paradigms of the social process of teacher preparation. While these models or paradigms might be described as three progressively sophisticated approaches to teacher preparation that have improved the nature and quality of that preparation over time, the story, as told earlier, shows that all three models have been involved in a complex web of inter-relationships that have seen them rise and fall on numerous occasions (Aspland, 2010; Hyams, 1979). Thus, at any one time in the history of teacher preparation in Australia at least two of the three paradigms have been actively contributing to the practices of teacher preparation. Furthermore, the influence of political power alongside empirical evidence on the fortunes of the three paradigms means that the apparent paradigm shifts from one model to another might be a moot point. The reality is that the models have and continue to be used together in varying combinations; they are alternative rather than progressive paradigms. Even in the contemporary Australian context, where higher education providers have had sole responsibility for the provision of teacher preparation for over 40 years, the dominance of the education model or paradigm is neither complete nor final. As a result of the regulatory practices of accreditation and registration processes, all three models of teacher preparation continue to operate as alternative paradigms that influence the contemporary context.

THE REGULATION OF TEACHER PREPARATION IN AUSTRALIA

In 2012 two national bodies took up regulatory responsibilities for teacher education across Australia. The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) was established as the national regulator of the higher education sector (TEQSA, 2012a), and the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) took responsibility for the accreditation of programs that lead to registration as a teacher (AITSL, 2011a). As a consequence of the requirements of these two bodies, all contemporary teacher preparation undertaken in higher education contexts is required to include practices that reflect all of the models evident in the historical context. In particular, the Australian...
Firstly, the inclusion of professional placements in school contexts where propaedeutic teachers are afforded opportunities to observe and practice alongside an experienced teacher who then assesses their performance is reflective of the apprenticeship model. The requirements that describe these professional placements are found in Program Standard 5: School Partnerships (AITSL, 2011a). Standard 5.2 requires that, ‘The professional experience component of each program must include no fewer than 80 days of well-structured, supervised and assessed teaching practice in schools in undergraduate and double-degree teacher education programs and no fewer than 60 days in graduate entry programs’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.14). The teachers involved in the supervision of propaedeutic teachers are described in Standard 5.5, which states that they must be ‘suitably qualified and registered’ and ‘have expertise’ in the supervision of teaching practice (AITSL, 2011a, p.15). This role is further elaborated in Standard 5.6, which requires the supervising teacher to have a ‘designated role’ in the ‘assessment of the program’s students’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.15). As such, these supervising teachers need to be capable of modelling good practice, supervising and assisting propaedeutic teachers while they are practising, and assessing their performance, thus reflecting the practices of the apprenticeship model.

Secondly, propaedeutic teachers are required to undertake systematic studies of the content, skills and practices of teaching and learning, which are reflective of the training model. This requirement is expressed through both the professional and program standards. The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers have been separated into three sections, Professional Knowledge, Professional Practice and Professional Engagement (AITSL, 2011a). At the graduate level, the first two of these sections, Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice, list the content base and practical skills required of graduates of an initial teacher preparation program. This list includes: knowledge of students, teaching, learning, and the content of the curriculum; and techniques for the planning and implementation of teaching, organisation of the classroom, and the management of classroom activities and student behaviour (AITSL, 2011a, pp.6-8). This strong focus on the development of knowledge and practices required for the classroom is also evident in the program standards, particularly Standard 4: Program Structure and Content, and Standard 6: Program Delivery and Resourcing (AITSL, 2011a). Standard 4.1 requires a systematic approach such that, ‘program structures must be sequenced coherently to reflect effective connections between theory and practice’ (AITSL, 2011a, p. 13). This is then elaborated across the remaining standards (4.2-4.7) in relation to the, ‘discipline-specific curriculum and pedagogical studies’ and ‘general education studies’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.13; see APST 4.2), required across programs targeting various schools sectors or specialised programs. Of particular note is the requirement for primary programs to, ‘include study in each of the learning areas’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.13; see APST 4.3), and for secondary programs to include a, ‘sound depth and breadth of knowledge appropriate for the teaching area/s’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.14; see APST 4.5). This reiterates the focus on the knowledge of content that is evident in the professional standards.

Standard 6 then sets out requirements that reinforce the need for the higher education context to model school contexts. This includes requirements for: staff with ‘contemporary school teaching experience’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.15; APST 6.2); the use of ‘effective teaching and assessment strategies (linked to intended learning outcomes)’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.15; see APST 6.1); and ‘contemporary facilities and resources, including information and communication technologies, which students can expect to be available in schools’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.15; see APST 6.3). Each of these components of the
professional and program standards maintain the practical focus of the training model that recognises teaching as a science that is supported by the systematic study of content, skills and techniques.

Thirdly, the National Program Standards require that teacher preparation courses qualify propaedeutic teachers with a minimum of four-years of higher education at a Bachelor’s level or higher. This requirement is established by Standard 1.3, which states that course must, ‘meet the requirements of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) so that, on satisfactory completion, the graduate has a four-year or longer full-time equivalent higher education qualification’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.12). This is then reflected across other program standards. Standard 2.2 and 2.3 refer to the ‘relevant accreditation requirements’ (AITSL, 2011a, p. 12). Standard 3 describes the requirements relevant to the selection of propaedeutic teachers, ‘capacity to engage effectively with a rigorous higher education program’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.12). Standard 6.4 requires that, ‘facilities conform to the general expectation for a contemporary higher education learning environment’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.15); and Standard 7.1 requires the use of higher education data and practices in relation to, ‘program improvement and periodic formal evaluation’ (AITSL, 2011a, p.15). Interestingly, direct references to the standards and expectations of higher education are not evident in the two program standards (Standards 4 and 5) that relate to the content and delivery of teacher preparation. As such, the National Program Standards reflect a commitment to higher education as a requirement for registration as a teacher, but they do not necessarily reflect the educational ideals of the teacher education model.

As such, contemporary teacher preparation courses regulated by AITSL must engage propaedeutic teachers across the models rather than in any single model of teacher preparation. In the combining of the models emphasis is placed on the coverage of content and achievement of standards that is reflective of the skills and performance oriented approach that dominated the training model. This must then be practiced in classroom contexts under direct supervision as in the apprenticeship model. While this preparation must be provided at an academic level comparable with that required in the education model, the educational goals, processes and practices of higher education and therefore of the education model of teacher preparation are not emphasised in either the professional or program standards. In order to achieve registration, teacher preparation courses, operating within the educational paradigm of a higher education institution, must be able to demonstrate strong ties with the practices of the training and apprenticeship paradigms.

The Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) establishes four sets of threshold standards for the provision of education in all higher education institutions (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011; Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011). The third set of standards, the Provider Course Accreditation Standards, relate to the development and accreditation of higher education courses. These standards set out the minimum requirements for all higher education courses leading to awards outlined in the AQF levels 5-10 (AQFC, 2013). AITSL’s (2011a) program standard 1.3, which requires a Bachelor’s degree or higher, establishes a minimum requirement for teacher preparation at AQF level 7. Therefore, all teacher preparation courses must also attain the threshold requirements of the Provider Course Accreditation Standards as regulated by TEQSA.

In contrast with the regulatory requirements of AITSL, the TEQSA standards reflect a reversal in the emphasis given to the three models for teacher preparation. The Provider Course Accreditation Standards include six standards, each of which refers specifically to the Qualification Standards of the AQF. These Qualification Standards outline the generic learning outcomes required in relation to the
development of knowledge, skills and the application of knowledge and skills (AQFC, 2013). That is, the design, resourcing, admission, teaching and learning, assessment and monitoring of a course that leads to a higher education qualification must ensure that graduates will achieve these threshold generic learning outcomes (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3).

The generic learning outcomes of a Bachelor degree at AQF level 7 have been established as the minimum requirement for teacher preparation by the National Program Standards. These describe a range of requirements in relation to the development of knowledge and skills, and their application. Firstly, AQF level 7 graduates must develop a body of knowledge that provides ‘depth in the underlying principles and concepts’ of their discipline (AQFC, 2013, p. 48). In this way the knowledge gained must be both ‘theoretical and technical’ in order to facilitate its application to ‘professional work’ and ‘lifelong learning’ (AQFC, 2013, pp. 47-48). Secondly, graduates must develop cognitive, technical, creative and communication skills (AQFC, 2013, p. 48), in order to work independently with their knowledge, communicate with others and solve problems in both professional and academic contexts. Thirdly, graduates must be able to ‘adapt their knowledge and skills’ for a range of contexts and in doing so demonstrate both ‘self-directed work and learning’ and ‘collaboration’ within provided ‘broad parameters’ (AQFC, 2013, pp. 47-48).

Each of these components of the generic learning outcomes is supportive of the higher education ideals of the education model of teacher preparation. These requirements support the development of the underlying philosophy and theory of curricular and pedagogical practice that facilitates evidentiary classroom practice based in systematic and reasoned ‘planning, problem solving and decision making’ (AQFC, 2013, p. 48). As such, the Qualification Standards that are used in the accreditation of courses through the Provider Course Accreditation Standards provide a set of standards that require teacher preparation to achieve the goals and ideals of the education model.

On the other hand, the Provider Course Accreditation Standards make only minor references to processes, practices and requirements that might reflect either the apprenticeship or training models of teacher preparation. One possible reference is found in Standard 4.5, which states that the higher education provider must ‘assure the quality’ of work-based learning and its supervision (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3, s.4.5). However, significant details are provided about what is considered important to quality work-integrated learning in the Application guide: Accreditation of a higher education course of study (AQF qualification) (TEQSA, 2012b). These guidelines cover issues of quality relating to occupational health and safety, anti-discrimination, insurance, communication and the preparation or training of supervisors. While these requirements could be viewed as connected to the principles of the apprenticeship model, these guidelines neither assume nor require work-integrated learning where expert supervisors model, observe and assess student performance. While the TEQSA standards do not preclude either the apprenticeship or training model, neither is directly required by any of the standards.

The strongest support for the training and apprenticeship models of teacher preparation in the Provider Course Accreditation Standards is Standard 1.2, which requires the higher education provider to ‘take account of external standards and requirements’ (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011, Chapter 3, s.1.2). This standard requires that a higher education provider must fulfil the requirements of any professional accreditation or registration organisations in the development and delivery of courses. For teacher preparation this means that the requirements of the professional and program standards form part of the academic higher education standards. While
the higher education standards might directly refer to and establish minimum requirements in line with the practices and principles of the educational paradigm for teacher preparation, this reference to external professional accreditation, by default, makes connections back to the apprenticeship and training paradigms that are foundational to professional and program standards (AITSL, 2011a).

Effectively, the tautological references to each other in the AITSL (2011a) and higher education (Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards) 2011) documentation ensure that all teacher preparation providers must operate across all three paradigms to gain registration and accreditation of their courses. This mixing of the models poses problems when seeking to respond to the questions raised earlier about their effectiveness. The presence of all three models in contemporary teacher preparation courses creates difficulties in identifying causal relationships between models and outcomes. Furthermore, the level of detail provided by AITSL, which drills down to the number of units required for various components of the program (Standard 4) and the number of days spent in various activities (Standard 5), ensures that the ‘volume of learning’ expected by the AQF Qualification Standards (AQFC, 2013) leaves little scope for innovation in relation to teacher preparation.

Contemporary regulatory requirements make any consideration of the efficacy of the various models effectively redundant. At one level the regulations require that each of the models is incorporated into a teacher preparation program and in this way the effectiveness of the included components of each model has been assumed. More significantly though, the nature of the regulatory environment that predetermines the nature and development of teacher preparation courses inhibits the influence of teacher educators on their work in the field. This environment of regulation calls into question academic freedom, educational research and innovation, and accountability. As such, teacher preparation providers are held responsible for the outcomes of courses over which their teacher educators have very little control. What is significant in understanding and critiquing the nature and effectiveness of teacher preparation over time is not so much coming to an understanding of the use and development of the different models or paradigms as it is comprehending the development of the environment of political and bureaucratic regulation that has placed restrictions on the practices, research and innovation of teacher preparation providers.

THE ORIGINS OF THE REGULATORY CLIMATE

The pathway to the current era of nationally mandated hyper-regulation can be traced back to the 1970s, though the key developments in the area have emerged since the turn of the millennium. In the historical moment immediately prior to the current era, the regulatory arrangements for teachers and teacher preparation were state-based initiatives. The establishment of state-based regulatory authorities began in 1971 with the establishment of the Board of Teacher Education (BTE) in Queensland (Education Act Amendment Act 1970, s.13), and the South Australian Teachers Registration Board shortly thereafter (Education Act 1972, s.15).

Of all the states, Queensland had the longest history in the development of a regulatory climate in relation to both the registration of teachers and the regulation of teacher preparation prior to the establishment of current national initiatives. The registration of teachers commenced voluntarily in 1973 and was compulsory by 1975 (McMeniman, 2004). The BTE also had, ‘responsibility for accreditation of teacher education awards and to determine minimum requirements therefor’ (Education Act Amendment Act 1970, s.13). After autonomy had been granted to Teachers’ Colleges in 1972 this was amended to read, ‘responsibility for accreditation of teacher education courses for the purpose of registration’ (Education Act Amendment Act 1973, s.5).
After the BTE was replaced by the Board of Teacher Registration (BTR) in 1989 (*Education (Teacher Registration) Act 1988*), this responsibility was further strengthened with the first program approval processes set in place by 1990. The first iteration was titled, *Guidelines for the Acceptability of Teacher Education Programs for Teacher Registration Purposes* (BTR, 1990). Later re-developments of program accreditation guidelines changed the focus to professional standards through the *Professional Standards for Graduates and Guidelines for Pre-service Teacher Education Programs* (BTR, 2002). These guidelines established a review process for higher education programs by stakeholder panels (BTR, 2002; McMeniman, 2004). In response to the development of *A National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching* (Teacher Quality and Educational Leadership Taskforce [TQELT], 2003) and the *Review of the Powers and Functions of the Board of Teacher Registration* (McMeniman, 2004), the BTR was replaced by the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT) in 2006 (*Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005*).

By 2007 the QCT had published the *Professional Standards for Queensland Teachers* (QCT, 2006), and the *Program Approval Guidelines for Preservice Teacher Education* (QCT, 2011/2007). These standards and guidelines reflected the *Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005*, which required that the QCT should ‘develop professional standards’ (s.235.1), by consultation with the ‘chief executive and the representative entities’ (s.235.3), and that preservice teacher education courses may only be approved if the QCT is satisfied that, ‘a person who completes the program will attain the abilities, knowledge and skills required under the professional standards’ (s.236.2b). This was the first time that the standards, guidelines and approval for teacher preparation by higher education providers were legislated to be developed and administered externally by nominated members of representative entities that included unions, employing authorities and parents’ associations alongside teacher education providers. As such, Queensland forged the way in relation to the external regulation of teaching and teacher preparation.

Unlike Queensland and South Australia, the other states and territories did not establish regulatory authorities till much later, between 2000 and 2005 (McMeniman, 2004). Despite the proliferation of state-based developments in the early 2000s, the move towards a national approach to the articulation of quality teaching for learning was evident by the 1990s (National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning [NPQTL], 1996; Australian Council of Deans of Education [ACDE], 1998; Senate Report, 1998), and was a key driver in the development in 2003 of *A National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching* (TQELT, 2003).

At the time, these developments were framed by the discourses of competencies, standards (TQELT, 2003) and the professionalisation of teaching (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003; McMeniman, 2004; Ramsey, 2000). Early work, such as the *National Competency Framework for Beginning Teachers* (NPQTL, 1996), focussed on competency-based standards that sought to articulate what effective teachers know and can do, thus ‘conceptualising teaching in terms of duties’ as a set of observable outcomes (Louden, 2000). The competency discourse was, however, criticised for the ‘potential of competencies to fragment, technicise, and decontextualise teachers’ work’ (TQELT, 2003, p.2). The discourse of standards was juxtaposed against this discourse of competency. The standards discourse described a ‘broader concept than competencies’ (TQELT, 2003, p.2), that reflect the ‘roles, skills, abilities, attitudes, knowledge and understanding required’ of teachers (Reynolds, 1999, p.248). As such, standards were supposed to incorporate the ‘personal qualities or values required to be a successful teacher’ (Reynolds, 1999, p.251), and to consider ‘teachers’ processes, purposes and efforts’ (TQELT, 2003, p.2).
The discourse of professionalisation and professionalism is also significant to the application of competencies and standards for teachers and teaching. The *Quality Matters, Revitalising Teaching: Critical Times, Critical Choices* report of the review of teacher education in New South Wales (Ramsey, 2000), is a key political document that highlights the significance of the discourse of teacher professionalism in the process of the development of regulation. In this report Ramsey (2000) sets up a comparative study across a number of professions in relation to the establishment of quality in a profession through standards, registration and regulation. Ramsey (2000) adopted the Australian Council of Professions (ACP) definition which establishes a profession as a ‘disciplined group of individuals’ who possess ‘special knowledge and skills in a widely recognised body of learning’ (Southwick, 1997), and who adhere to a ‘code of ethics’ with a ‘commitment to client service’ (Ramsey, 2000, p.95). One of the keys identified in establishing a profession was the importance of these codes of ethical practice being enforced by the profession for the profession through self-regulation that is then recognised by the community (Ramsey, 2000; Southwick, 1997).

When compared with this definition and its outworking across a range of professions, Ramsey’s review of the teaching profession in New South Wales served to highlight the fact that, ‘Teaching is unique when compared with the other professions studied, having no professional registration authority, no mandated system of continuing professional development and no professional oversight of teaching standards or practice’ (Ramsey, 2000, p.99). Similar criticisms could have been levelled at the teaching profession in most other states at the time, the one possible exemption being Queensland.

Ramsey’s discussion of the establishment of teaching as a profession vacillated between a recognition of the significance of self-regulation where the professional structure is ‘owned by its members’ (Ramsey, 2000, p.14), and the role of the government in establishing an ‘Institute of Teachers’ whose primary purpose is to enhance the level of professionalism of teachers’ (Ramsey, 2000, p.215). His justification for placing the responsibility for the establishment of the profession with the government being the fact that, ‘teachers either could not or would not be able to do so without help’ (Ramsey, 2000, p.14). Thus, the interpretation of the professionalism of teachers that is evident in Ramsey’s report closely aligned with Freidson’s (1994) ‘common-sense’ conception, which Freidson rejected as an inadequate approach to professionalism. This emphasised a passive approach that fulfilled ‘political and ceremonial needs’ through the identification and privileging of the special characteristics of the life and work of a profession (Freidson, 1994, p.70). This is contrasted with a ‘proactive and responsible’ approach to teacher professionalism (Sachs, 2000, p.78) that reflects Freidson’s ideological approach to professionalism (Freidson, 1994). Sachs’ approach to the professionalism of teaching calls for self-conscious elaboration and systematisation in order to develop the profession through the outworking of the principles of, ‘learning, participation, collaboration, cooperation and activism’ (Sachs, 2000, p.82).

At the turn of the millennium the three discourses of competency, standards and professionalism in teaching highlighted the need for responsibility, relevance, flexibility and innovation for the profession (Department of Education, Science and Training [DEST], 2003; Sachs, 2000), that was not tied to ‘proceduralised and prescriptive frameworks’ (Reynolds, 1998, p.258). At the same time, other aspects of these same discourses gave warnings about the teaching profession’s apparent inability to self-regulate (Ramsey, 2000) and the consequential increase in scrutiny of teaching and teacher preparation into the future (DEST, 2013). Ultimately, the outworking of these discourses in the national regulatory climate and practices established in 2013 have served to construct external rather than internal regulation of the profession founded on a narrow set of outcomes-based competency standards that describe what teachers need to know and be able to do in order to fulfil their duties.
Ironically, prophetic cautions about the shortcomings of competency-based projects for regulating the profession (Louden & Wallace, 1993), the dangers of neglecting the role of complexity, personal judgement and values in teaching practice (Reynolds, 1999), and the deprofessionalisation of teaching (Whitty, 1994) have come to pass in the contemporary regulation of teacher preparation.

**QUESTIONS THAT EMERGE IN CONSIDERING THE CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT**

Contemporary teacher preparation has for the last four decades been the exclusive responsibility of higher education providers. While this could lead to the conclusion that the education model of teacher preparation has had sufficient time to be fully developed and to demonstrate its quality and value, the presence of regulatory processes that work to preclude the outworking of the education model in the contemporary context calls this into question. The public and political debate about the professional status of teachers and teaching has had a direct and significant impact on the work of teacher educators. As such, the following questions about the regulation of teacher preparation emerge as potential points of focus for this investigation into teacher preparation:

- What factors have influenced the development of regulation since the granting of autonomy in the 1970s?
- Why were these regulations developed and were they justifiable?
- Has teacher preparation been improved as a result of the development of regulations?
- Do the current regulations represent best practice? How do we know?
- Could the regulatory climate be reworked to greater effect than the current model allows?
- How might these regulations be engaged productively for the future of teacher preparation?
- How does the regulatory climate impact the work of teacher educators?

**THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF TEACHER EDUCATORS**

Within the Australian context, the professional work and identity of the tertiary teacher educator emerged alongside the move towards autonomous teacher preparation. While teacher educators had been working in university contexts since the turn of the 20th century, the situating of teacher educators solely within tertiary contexts began in 1972 with the granting of autonomy to teachers’ colleges as part of a binary system of tertiary education (Dyson, 2005; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Martin, 1965; Roche, 2003). It then developed through the re-imagining of these teachers’ colleges over the 1970s as vocational colleges of advanced education across a greater number of occupational areas (Dyson, 2005; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Roche, 2003), their amalgamation into much larger colleges as part of the ‘razor gang’ reforms of 1982 (Roche, 2003) and finally their segue into university status under Dawkins’ unified national system reforms of 1992 (Dawkins, 1988; Roche, 2003). Throughout this time, the political and academic discourses around competencies, standards and the professionalisation of teaching and the school reform agenda were having an impact on the life and work of teachers and as a consequence the work of teacher preparation.

Interestingly, the professional roles, contexts and status of teacher educators were one step removed from the core constructs of this agenda and so this influence did not necessarily have a direct impact on identity. The move to autonomous tertiary teacher preparation did, however, have a significant impact on the development of the professional identity of teacher educators. This can be seen through the changes effected in the academic qualifications of staff, the participation of education faculties in the world and work of academia and the development of a research profile for education through the work of professional and other associations.
THE ACADEMIC STANDING OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

The academic qualifications of staff involved in teacher preparation have increased significantly. While the staffing policies of the teachers’ colleges varied from state to state, the nature of staff qualifications at the Melbourne Teachers’ College in the 1960s serves to illustrate the issues being experienced more generally at the time. This college, run by the Department, was the main institution responsible for the preparation of primary school teachers for the state of Victoria up until 1972. Staff qualification details from 1969 show that only one staff member held a Masters level qualification with the rest of the approximately 90 staff members evenly split between Bachelors degrees and teaching Certificates or Diplomas (Garden, 1982, p.198). As such, around 1% of the staff had a qualification above a Bachelors degree and the average qualification equated to less than a degree. At the same time, staff retention compounded the issue with a 64% turnover rate shown in one five-year period (1957-1961) (Garden, 1982, p.198). While the situation was a little better at the Secondary Teachers’ College, also in Melbourne, where almost 90% of the staff had degree qualifications, the number of Masters level qualifications was still low at just 10%.

In the contemporary context, the staffing statistics of a typical education faculty demonstrate a reversal in the academic qualifications of staff in teacher education. An analysis of qualifications in one of the largest education faculties in Australia shows that the minimum qualification of all academic staff is a Masters degree. Of the staff listed on the institution’s website (institution withheld, 2013), 9% held a Masters degree as their highest qualification with at least some of them listed as undertaking doctoral studies. Therefore, 91% of the academic staff holds doctoral qualifications. Furthermore, 39% of the staff with doctoral qualifications also hold titles of either Professor or Associate Professor. In addition, for the vast majority of the staff their academic career comes in addition to professional work and experience in schools and other educational contexts.

In the 40 years since the granting of autonomy to the teachers’ colleges, the nature and quality of the academic standing of lecturing staff in education faculties has developed considerably. Even in the much smaller faculties of non-self accrediting providers of teacher preparation the expectation is that the minimum qualification for working in teacher preparation is a Masters degree. Not only has the level of academic qualifications increased dramatically, but universities have also shown a willingness to confer a significant number of titles usually reserved for faculty members that, ‘demonstrate leadership, eminence and distinction’ on either academic or managerial grounds (Farrell, 2009, p.2). Education faculties, despite the often quoted rhetoric otherwise, have established solid academic standing comparable to other faculties within higher education in terms of qualifications and promotion.

ENGAGING THE WORK OF THE ACADEMY

The engagement of teacher educators in the work and world of the academy has grown steadily since the granting of autonomy in 1972. Traditionally, the work of the academy has been divided into three key areas; teaching, service and research (Boyer, 2015/1997). From the development of teachers’ colleges in the early 20th century, the staff of these colleges across the states has participated in at least the first two of the traditional areas for faculty engagement that were relevant at the time. The early programs of the teachers’ colleges demonstrate a strong commitment to teaching with the focus being on a ‘multiplicity of subjects’ with ‘large amount of contact time’ (Hyams, 1979, p.92). The staff were also involved in service to both the college and broader community, particularly in relation to the supervision of students outside of timetabled classes, organisation of extra-curricular activities including study and sporting tours, provision of lectures and classes for inservice teachers, and
participation in community responsibilities such as the war effort (Fist, 1993; Garden, 1982; Hyams, 1979; McKenzie, 1981). While the rules and regulations dictating college life for students and supervisory responsibilities for staff were progressively relaxed across the 1940s to 1960s, the timetabled hours of teaching and learning remained significant and the staff continued to be involved in extra-curricular responsibilities in service to both their students and the broader community (Garden, 1982; Fist, 1993; Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999).

In relation to participation in research, the situation is considerably more varied. Up until the 1930s there is considerable evidence of educational research being carried out in Australia. Those states where the university offered Diplomas in education were involved in a range of experimental and psychological approaches to research that was typified at the time as the ‘new education’ (Aspland, 2010; Hyams, 1979; Mackaness, 1928). However, the links between this work and the staff and students of the teachers’ colleges were often tenuous. In contexts where the lecturing staff shared responsibilities across both the teachers’ college and the university there was some opportunity for this type of educational research to cross over to the colleges. However, only limited staff worked in both contexts, and in some states there was no formal relationship between the two types of institutions (Anderson, 1960; Garden, 1982; Mossenson, 1955).

The importance of university participation in the growth and development of educational research can also be seen in the development of research journals in the Australian context. Prior to the 1960s, two major research journals in education developed out of the work of university-based teacher educators. These are the Australian Journal of Education commenced in 1957 (Australian Council for Educational Research [ACER], 2015), and Education Research and Perspectives started in 1950 (UWA, 2013). The Australian Journal of Education is the journal of the Australian Council for Educational Research whose development was initiated and supported by professors from Sydney University, Melbourne University and the University of Columbia (ACER, 2015). Education Research and Perspectives was and continues to be published by the Faculty of Education at the University of Western Australia. Educational research was the domain of the university, and in particular those with an education faculty and education programs (Turner, 1943). The participation of college-based teacher educators and propaedeutic teachers in research was a result of proximity to and connections with the university rather than its significance to the colleges’ core business of teacher preparation.

As such, the work roles of teacher educators up until the 1970s were closely aligned to the nature of the teacher preparation provider for whom they worked. Employer-based providers, such as the state-sponsored teachers’ colleges, focussed the roles and responsibilities of the teacher educators on workforce needs. While perceptions of these needs transitioned over time from an emphasis on character and moral standing to an emphasis on cognitive capacity and teaching skills (Garden, 1982; Hyams, 1979; Mossenson, 1955), the focus of the pedagogical, social and cultural activities of the teachers’ colleges and their staff was designed to maintain the status quo in and the workforce needs of the department. In contrast, teacher educators working within university contexts were from the beginning engaged across all of the roles and responsibilities of faculty members.

The granting of autonomy to the teachers’ colleges established the need for the development of a culture of research for teacher educators working in newly established independent tertiary contexts. The 1970s and 1980s saw unprecedented expansion in this area (Kyle, Manathunga & Scott, 1999; Phelan, 2000). This is seen in the development of educational research across these newly formed institutions and in the number of professional associations and journals that emerged during this time. Some of the most significant journals to emerge in relation to teachers and teacher education being
the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* (1973), *The Australian Educational Researcher* (1974), and the *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* (1976). The teacher educators of the time can be shown to have embraced contemporaneous perspectives on the roles and responsibilities of the academy (Boyer, 1997).

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH**

The growth of research and scholarly activities and the development of professional bodies and associations is indicative of the emergence of a professional identity for teacher educators within higher education. Both educational research and professional and academic associations have emerged out of the work of teacher educators both before and after the transition to autonomous tertiary institutions. The ACER established in 1930 through a grant from the Carnegie Corporation in the United States of America (ACER, 2015), is one of the most significant early contributions of tertiary teacher educators to the development of educational associations in the Australian context (Anchen, 1956). At the time, the establishment of a national bureau or council was an innovation that was achieved through the work of Dr Cunningham of Melbourne University, Professors Lovell and Mackie of Sydney University, and Mr Frank Tate a recently retired Director of Education in Victoria who had started his career as a teacher educator and had fostered strong links between the departmental teachers’ college and the university throughout his directorship (Anchen, 1956). Each of these men worked in and had promoted the role of university-based teaching and research in the development of teachers and the discipline of education long before the advent of teacher preparation as the sole domain of tertiary contexts. As such, the role of tertiary teacher educators in the development and promotion of professional and academic associations, even before the establishment of autonomous tertiary institutions, was significant.

However, the contribution to and development of professional and academic associations saw enormous growth around the time of and immediately after the granting of autonomy to teachers’ colleges. Between the Martin (1965) review and the granting of autonomy in 1972, teacher educators seeking to promote their professional standing developed a number of initiatives. Staff associations and faculty structures were established in some teachers’ colleges (Garden, 1982), as a means of influencing and supporting change, reflecting practices in other tertiary contexts and promoting the professional status of the staff. A number of associations for promoting research in the discipline of education were also established. The Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) and Australian Teacher Education Association (ATEA) were both established in 1970. Both associations established journals shortly thereafter and these have continued since and attained rankings from Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) in 2010 (Australian Research Council [ARC], 2010). For ATEA, the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* (APJTE) commenced publication in 1973 and received an A* rating, the highest possible ERA ranking. The rest of the 1970s and 80s saw the development of a large number of associations along with journals and other publications as shown in the Australian Education Index administered by RMIT (RMIT Publishing, n.d.).

Within the Australian context, the output of research and other scholarly writing in education has become quite significant. As an example, the Australian Education Index produced by RMIT Publishing for ACER currently indexes 250 journals, 88 comprehensively (RMIT Publishing, n.d.). These comprehensively indexed journals report educational research across a wide range of areas including educational leadership and policy; philosophic traditions, cross-disciplinary educational research, teacher education, schooling sectors, specific groups of learners and teaching or subject areas. There is also evidence of growth in quality as well as quantity in contemporary educational research.
The quantity, quality and impact of Australian educational research have been the subject of inquiry since at least Phelan’s (2000) bibliometric analysis. This analysis analysed the international contribution of Australian educational research based on publications indexed by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) from 1981-1997 (Phelan, Anderson & Bourke, 2000). The analysis demonstrated that the productivity and relative impact of Australian educational research throughout this period was very high, ranking third for research production and fifth for citations, and when compared to other fields the international impact of Australia’s educational research came second only to the field of earth sciences (Bates, 2003; Phelan et al., 2000). As Phelan et al. (2000) concluded, ‘By any measure, it is reasonable to conclude that Australia is a major contributor to international education research’ (p.592).

While Phelan’s analysis had its limitations (Bates, 2003; Phelan et al., 2000), particularly in relation to the fact that ISI publications represented just 25% of the research output of Australia’s educational researchers (Bates, 2003), it does serve to demonstrate that within one decade of the move of teacher preparation into tertiary contexts the research output of teacher educators was making an international contribution. The conclusion, that educational research ‘punched above its weight’ especially when research grant figures were taken into account (Goodyear, 2013, p.2) was affirmed again between 2005-2008 by the ARC through its annual reporting processes. Using similar ‘effectiveness metrics’ the ARC identified that the ‘global footprint of Australian educational research’ (Goodyear, 2013, p.3), had maintained comparability with that reported by Phelan et al. (2000) and in terms of international impact fared better than most of the sciences.

However, the development of the ERA initiative, which assesses and then prepares national reports about the quality of research conducted in Australian universities, has painted a quite different picture from these earlier bibliometric findings about educational research. The key findings of the ERA seek to map the quality, volume, activity, application and recognition of research for 22 fields of research in the Australian context (ARC, 2012). Of the 38 universities found to be research-active in the field of education, only half were considered at world standard or better (ARC, 2012, p.13). While education as a field of research was well represented in terms of the number of outputs, ranking 7th (ARC, 2012, p.25), and numbers of staff, ranking 5th (ARC, 2012, p.27), many of the other measures reflect poorly on the state of educational research. In terms of research income the field of education ranked 12th overall (ARC, 2012, p.28), with its worst performance in the key area of Australian Competitive Grant income where it ranked only 18th (ARC, 2012, p. 29). The ratio of weighted research outputs to full-time staff was another area of poor performance. The number of outputs per staff member in the field of education was 6.7 weighted items, which was the lowest of all the fields of research and well below the mean of 10.6 (ARC, 2012, pp.18-24).

While it might seem that the earlier bibliometric analysis of the state of Australian educational research was wildly optimistic, it is important to remain cognisant of the differences between the methods used and the limitations of the ERA analysis in coming to conclusions. The structure of the Excellence in Research for Australia 2012: National Report (ARC, 2012) maps the 22 fields of research against each other in a series of tables, graphs and sections where the outcome for each field can be overtly compared with the others. As such, the apparent poor performance in the field of education is a construction of the comparative approach to assessing the quality, volume and application of research that is built on an assumption that researchers from across the disciplines experience a ‘level playing field’ (Goodyear, 2013). There are, however, significant issues with this assumption. The most foundational issue impacting upon the variation in research performance across the fields covered by the ERA is the allocation of resources. For the field of education there are two areas where resource
allocations fall far behind those of other higher performing fields, funding and staffing (Goodyear, 2013). A comparison of the ranking of the field of education in terms of full-time staff (5th) and research outputs (7th) with overall income (12th), and in particular Australian Competitive Grant income (18th), serves to demonstrate that the research income in the field is not commensurate with its size (ARC, 2012).

For teacher educators this paucity of funding is further aggravated by low staff to student ratios that result in larger teaching loads (Universities Australia, 2011), that are even further exacerbated by the additional supervisory responsibilities attached to the preparation of teachers. The impact of staffing in educational research can be further problematised in terms of the raw numbers of equivalent full-time staff working in education faculties. The numbers of staff reported to be contributing to educational research far exceeds the number of actual teacher educators. For ERA in 2012, 37% of the research outputs being reported in the field of education were produced by academics outside of the discipline (Seddon et al., 2012, p.2). As such, much of the research is being produced by staff who may not have strong disciplinary foundations or appropriate support for their research in education. This calls in to question their capacity to produce quality educational research.

Another significant issue for educational research is the classification system used in the preparation of the ERA report. The classificatory system for the ERA was developed through a bureaucratic process undertaken in 2007 (Pink & Bascand, 2008), that identified four sub-fields in education based on issues of methodology rather than content (Goodyear, 2013). The four sub-fields are education systems, curriculum and pedagogy, specialist studies in education and other education. As such, they all relate specifically to research into educational contexts and practices. A consequence of this is that the field of educational research has been trimmed of all of its cross-disciplinary research in areas such as educational policy, economics, psychology, sociology, history and philosophy (Goodyear, 2013; Pink & Bascand, 2008; Seddon et al., 2012). Given the high number of cross-disciplinary journals in educational research, the separation of cross-disciplinary research in the assessment of research in the field of education is particularly problematic.

While the messages appear to be mixed and significant criticisms can be made against the methods used in both the early bibliometric and the ERA analyses, there are a number of positive conclusions that can be gleaned. Most significantly, education appears as a field of research that can be assessed alongside a range of high-powered, well-funded fields. Furthermore, there are a number of factors where education fares well in the circumstances. The field of education represented 5% of the reportable research outputs listed in the ERA in 2012 (ARC, 2012), a level which far outstrips the 1% of funding it attracted (Seddon et al., 2012). Academics from across a range of faculties, including a range of sciences, humanities, arts and business (Seddon et al., 2012), conduct educational research demonstrating that the field of education has a significant role to play in the academy. Three of the four sub-fields in education, which are all listed as emerging fields of research, showed above average growth, ranging between 26% and 33%, in the period from 2005-2010 (ARC, 2012, p. 38).

Given the fact that the situating of teacher education and teacher educators within the academy is still a relatively recent phenomenon, having commenced just 30 years ago, these findings are not surprising. Education as a discipline shows signs of its youthfulness in relation to research. Educational research has continuously shown signs of steady growth since 1981, which was the starting points of Phelan’s bibliometric analysis (2000), with a ‘compound annual growth rate’ of 5% that was increasing across the entire period of the latest ERA analysis (ARC, 2012, p. 40). In terms of research collaboration, the average number of authors per output in the field of education was on the
low end of the spectrum, with around 2.5 authors/output, with the highest being around 7 authors/output in a number of the scientific fields (ARC, 2012, p.54). The education field also ranked in the middle in terms of institutional cooperation with more than 70% of its research outputs submitted by a single institution. Given Seddon’s et al. (2012) finding that there was a, ‘stronger rating of expertise in qualitative research among researchers working in Education’ (p.21), and the evidence that educational researchers tend to work in small teams on individual or institutional pursuits, it is not surprising that educational research is not attracting an appropriate share of research grants, particularly from government sources. This should not, however, detract from the growing body of research, with both national and international impact, that is produced by teacher educators in the Australian context.

All of this activity and development reinforces the idea that teacher educators have been and continue to proactively and responsibly promote their professional identity. In doing so, they have also demonstrated that they have kept abreast of more contemporary ideas about the roles and responsibilities of the academy. Boyer (2015/1997) proposes that the work of the academy in contemporary society needs to incorporate four types of scholarship; discovery, integration, application and teaching. Each of these types of scholarship is evident in the work of contemporary teacher educators.

The scholarship of discovery seeks to make a contribution to the human knowledge in the field and has always been at the heart of the academic work of faculties (Boyer, 1990). The doctoral programs offered by all university-based education faculties ensure that the scholarship of discovery remains a core focus within the field of educational research. The scholarship of discovery in the field of education contributes knowledge about the field and also about the research processes for the field. One example is the contribution made by Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) to the development of the participatory action research model as a research process specifically designed in and for the field of education (Hine, 2013; Koshy, 2005).

Quite apart from discovery, teacher educators within the Australian context are heavily engaged in the scholarship of integration, application and teaching. The scholarship of integration is focussed on making connections between and across disciplines in order to give meaning to facts that would otherwise stand in isolation (Boyer, 1990). For education, this type of scholarship has been central to conceptions of the discipline (Furlong, 2012; Peters, 1977). Peters’ (1977) outlined the interdisciplinary nature of the discipline of education through the contributions of the foundational disciplines of, ‘philosophy, psychology, history and sociology’ (p.168). Contemporary education faculties continue to employ a range of discipline specialists in interdisciplinary teaching and research and the continued support of interdisciplinary associations and journals in the field of education is evidence of the importance of the scholarship of integration. It is also significant that one of the core issues identified as problematic to the standing of the field of education in the ERA processes in 2010 and 2012 was the bureaucratic decision to classify interdisciplinary educational research studies with the foundational disciplines (Goodyear, 2013; Pink & Bascand, 2008; Seddon et al., 2012), even though this research is largely undertaken by education faculties.

The scholarship of application focuses on scholarly service that applies professional expertise and knowledge to the activities in the field (Boyer, 1997). As a faculty that is directly tied to the professional work of teachers and teaching, education is also integrally aligned with the scholarship of application. The vast majority of the educational research reported in the literature relates to the application of the discipline of education to school contexts. This scholarship involves teacher
educators in serving education through the application of research and scholarship with both propaedeutic and inservice teachers for the development of education.

Finally, education faculties also participate in research in the scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of teaching engages faculty members with the content knowledge and pedagogical practices of their field for the purposes of knowing, transforming and extending knowledge for themselves and their students (Boyer, 1990). Again, teacher educators are well placed as both academics and educators to participate in this type of scholarship. In fact, the very identification of ‘teacher educators’ is an indicator of the role of the scholarship of teaching in education faculties. That is, there is a clear delineation between research and scholarship for schools and other educational contexts and research into the core principles and practices of teacher education itself. The commitment to the scholarship of teaching in education is evident in the work of associations such as ATEA and the ACDE, and in the research that teacher educators contribute to the conferences and journals of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA).

**QUESTIONS THAT Emerge ABOUT THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF TEACHER EDUCATORS**

In the decades since the granting of autonomy to teacher preparation providers the work roles and responsibilities of teacher educators have grown such that they align with contemporary expectations of academic faculty members. The academic qualifications, research, teaching and scholarship of teacher educators serves to undergird the position of education as a field within the academy. While some comparative studies of research fields in the Australian context can be interpreted in ways that undermine the work of educational researchers, there are other indicators that underline a continual and steady growth in the global impact of Australian education faculties. Despite this, the current regulatory climate, coupled with discordant social and political discourses, call into question the value of teacher education and teacher educators to the pursuit of quality in contemporary educational contexts. As such, the following questions about educational research, the discourse of regulation and the role of teacher educators emerge as potential points of focus for this investigation into teacher preparation:

- What educational research is used in the development of regulations?
- What alignment can be found between regulatory requirements and the evidence-base available in the field of education?
- What contributions have the regulations made to the quality of the work of teacher educators?
- How is the research and scholarship of teacher educators used in the development of regulations?
- What contributions have teacher educators made to the development of the regulatory climate in teacher preparation?
- How might research and scholarship be engaged productively for the future of teacher preparation?
- How might the regulatory approach be reworked to better reflect the research knowledge available in the field of education?
- How might the research and scholarship of teacher educators be redesigned to facilitate the needs of the regulators?

**READING THE STORY OF TEACHER PREPARATION DIFFERENTLY**

The brief analysis of both historical and contemporary contexts provided above demonstrates the influence of cultural, social and political links from the past into the present in the context of teacher
preparation. As such, historical analysis is significant to considering the future of teacher preparation. Since the 1930s educators and educational historians have been constructing historical conceptions of teacher preparation founded in conventional, modernist readings that highlight evidence of progress, development and improvement in the nature and quality of that preparation (Anderson, 1960; Hyams, 1979; Turner, 1943). While there is undoubtedly evidence of improvement in teacher preparation when a comparison is made across large periods of time, the preceding discussion has served to problematise conceptions of incremental progress between the various models or paradigms for teacher preparation. The issues evident are founded in the ebbs and flows in the pathway from model school to university-based teacher preparation, the synchronous engagement with multiple paradigms in historical and contemporary teacher preparation, and the dissonances evident in a comparison of political or bureaucratic discourses with those of the educators themselves. As such, an alternative reading of the history of teacher preparation is needed to bring to light the issues at play in its outworking in the contemporary Australian context. Thinking differently about the history of teacher preparation and its influence on the contemporary moment, requires a re-interpretation founded in alternative philosophical and sociological analyses of the historical and political context of the story.

**Philosophical Foundations for Alternative Readings**

Philosophically, conventional readings of the story of teacher preparation construct a progressivist narrative that is founded in an empiricist historiography. Empiricism describes the writing of history as a scientific inquiry that uses inductive processes based on impartial observation and analysis of the historical record (Crotty, 1998; Green & Troup, 1999; Brzechczyn, 2009). It assumes the possibility of an objective examination of the evidence of facts in the preparation of an historical narrative. As such, empiricism is modernist in its orientation and as a consequence it serves to validate existing paradigms by framing them within the modernist ideals of scientific progress and improvement. This approach is clearly evident in the traditional presentation of the history of teacher preparation as a grand narrative of improvement that was prevalent up until the 1970s and continues to hold sway into the contemporary context. By comparison, a contemporary critique of the history of teacher preparation requires consideration of alternative theoretical modes of interpretation. For this to be achieved an understanding of alternative approaches to history is needed.

Historiography is the study of the methods and practices used by historians in the development of historical writings (Little, 2012; Tucker 2009). It involves articulation of ‘standards and criteria of good performance’ (Little, 2012, p.24) in the writing of history, and with the unpacking and critique of the philosophical assumptions that undergird these criteria. Empirical historiography emphasises both a professional and scientific approach to facts, evidence and justification (Tucker, 2009) as significant to historical study. It has its roots in the scientific revolution, came to the fore in the work of Ranke in the 19th century and, despite growing disquiet, retained its position as the dominant historical method into the 20th century (Green & Troup 1999).

However, the persistent critique of the philosophical assumptions of positivist scientific approaches to the disciplines lead to the development of at least a dozen alternative historiographies across the second half of the 20th century (Green & Troup 1999; Little 2012; Tucker 2009). Of these historiographical alternatives to the doing of history, four have been identified as significant to developing an approach to the task of developing an alternative reading of the story of teacher preparation in the Australian context. This approach employs both the philosophical assumptions and methodological practices of Marxist, ethnohistorical, narrative and postmodern historiographies.
Firstly, a Marxist historiography is underpinned by a material conception that considers history in an economic sense. It focuses on the production of material goods, for the physiological needs of humans, and its role in manipulating human history through the economic control of the many by the few (Green & Troup 1999; Wolff 2011). For Marx, historical study served to illuminate the relationship between economic production and class and thereby highlight the significance of class struggle in historical change (Green & Troup 1999). In applying a Marxist historiography to the story of teacher preparation, the issues surrounding the rule of the bureaucratic and political spheres in educational decision-making can be foregrounded. The production of teacher preparation by educators in both employer-based and independent institutions has and continues to come under political control for ostensibly economic reasons, such as efficiency and cost effectiveness. However, the transition of government control over teacher preparation since the 1970s, from organisational to regulatory control, facilitated by economic means and justified in relation to quality production, serves to highlight the political power relationship that curbs the agency of teacher educators. When coupled with the dissonance evident between political rhetoric and educational discourse in relation to issues such as the nature and quality of educational research, the need to critically interrogate the nature and influence of the tussle between political and educational ideology in the processes and practices of teacher preparation becomes evident.

Secondly, an ethnohistorical historiography emphasises the interpretive, rather than scientific, nature of historical study and focuses on symbolic expression in the cultural context of the historical moment (Iggers, 2005; Green & Troup, 1999). As such, it takes a cross-disciplinary approach that combines anthropology with history. This is established on an acceptance of cultural relativism that recognises that there are multiple histories to be found in the perspectives of participants (Green & Troup, 1999), and then uses a semiotic approach to constructing micro-history through the interpretation of discourses (Iggers, 2005). Therefore, ethnohistorical approaches emphasise the presence of multiple perspectives and employ the study of both emic and etic perspectives in the construction of historical stories (Green & Troup, 1999). They also facilitate awareness of conceptions that are silenced or go against the grain.

The application of an ethnohistorical historiography to teacher preparation facilitates interrogation of the differing perspectives of the emic or primary participants as compared to etic stakeholders, bureaucrats and politicians, particularly in relation to specific events or circumstances. Across the history of teacher preparation, the marginalisation of the emic voices of the teacher educators has been evident in many situations. For example, at the time of the cessation of the apprenticeship model the stakeholder and political actors also called for the removal of in-school experience prior to training despite the clear opposition from teacher educators who sought to retain this component for its educational benefit to propaedeutic teachers. More recently, the level of stakeholder rather than peer review of teacher preparation through accreditation processes (only one of the panel members must be a teacher educator; see AITSL 2011a, p.18), and the prevalence of stakeholder research in government reviews of teacher preparation (see for example Caldwell & Sutton, 2010a, 2010b) where just 21% of the experts in teacher education were teacher educators) has also served to marginalise the voice of teacher educators in relation to their field of expertise. Thus, this ethnohistorical approach will serve two purposes; it will act to critique the dominant political and stakeholder perspectives and give voice to teacher educators.

Thirdly, narrative historiography asserts that ‘history is first and foremost a literary narrative’ (Jenkins, 2003, Preface to the Routledge Classics Edition, para.3) that serves to create a meaning and a purpose for the story that is being told. As such, the development of an historical narrative, whether it is a
micro, master, grand or meta-narrative, is a work of fiction (Iggers, 2005). This means that the development of a narrative out of historical data and events results in the construction of a direction or plot that moves towards a purpose that did not necessarily exist in the historical moment (Green & Troup, 1999). Narrative historiography seeks to minimise this flaw in the historical process by focussing on the development of richly descriptive micro-histories rather than the construction of grand narratives. In the preceding discussion of the story of teacher preparation, the invention of a grand narrative of progress and improvement has already been problematised. In contrast, a narrative historiography would facilitate consideration of the micro-narratives surrounding the many changes and continuities evident in the story. In this way the nature and influence of context evident in the exigencism that has ruled much of the story, rather than an invented grand purpose, could be foregrounded and critiqued.

Finally, postmodern interrogation of history recognises that objectivity is an impossibility as the language of the historian is creative of the story not just descriptive of it (Iggers, 2005). As such, a postmodern historiography participates linguistically in the construction of the object of study and the deconstruction of the historical texts surrounding that object (Green & Troup, 1999). In this way it serves an ideological function in exposing the dominant voices that create the accepted versions of historical reality. When applying postmodern historiography to the story of teacher preparation, the discourses, not just the contexts at work in constructing changes and continuities, would come under scrutiny. A critique of conflicting discourses, such as the discourses of quantity compared with quality in determining the nature and length of teacher preparation, becomes possible. In the contemporary moment, this facilitates the identification and deconstruction of the discourses that underpin the apparent disconnect between the discourses of the politically driven regulatory climate and the professional identity of teacher education and teacher educators.

**Knowledge and Power in the Provision of Teacher Preparation**

The epistemological outworking of the development of multiple historiographies leads to a multiplicity of plausible readings of the story of teacher preparation. However, limitations inherent to the context of the study constrain the possibilities. As a consequence, both the researcher, or reader, and the contextualised discourses being read will influence an alternative reading of the story of teacher preparation.

As a result of this review of historical contexts in relation to the models for, providers of and participants in teacher preparation, it is evident that an alternative reading of the story must recognise the significance of change and continuity, rather than progress or development, as the underlying principles for constructing and deconstructing an historical narrative. It is also evident that these changes and continuities have been framed by binary disconnects that need to be interrogated. These disconnects include: employment-oriented preparation for the good of the department compared with higher education provided for the individual; privileging of the political and stakeholder perspectives over the voices of the primary participants; the role of political control in curbing the agency of teacher educators; and the brokering of the relationship of knowledge and power for ideological gain. Consequently, an alternative reading needs to critique the grand historical narrative of ‘progress’ by deconstructing individual stories, reconsidering the factors that have and continue to promote and support changes and continuities, and identifying and challenging the knowledge and power relations at work.

In the present context, the need for and urgency of this type of endeavour is increasingly apparent. The level of political and popular debate about education and educators has grown substantially in
recent years. With the added impetus of an election year, 2013 further accelerated this trend; barely a week went by without some reporting about an educational issue or perceived crisis. The outcome of the election and the transition to a new government did not curb the trend. While much of the attention is directed at contemporary testing regimes, such as the National Assessment Program Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) and Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), and the effectiveness or value derived from government spending on education, teacher quality emerged as a key issue that has significant implications for teacher preparation (Broadbent, 2005; Dinham, 2013; Rice, 2003).

The conclusion about teacher quality that is rehearsed in the media, by politicians and commentators alike, is that the evidence demonstrates there is a crisis of quality in teacher preparation. The logic presented rests on the idea that teacher quality is the single most important school-related factor in student achievement; an often quoted fact with some support in the research literature (see for example, Broadbent, 2005; Dinham, 2013; Hattie, 2012; Rice, 2003). Therefore, the argument goes, the lack of improvement, or in some cases decline, in student achievement as evidenced by the various testing regimes indicates a lack of teacher effectiveness or teacher quality. Since it is assumed that teacher quality is directly linked with or determined by teacher preparation, the lack of teacher quality must logically be the result of a lack of quality teacher preparation.

Despite the obvious flaws in the evidence and logic used to support this argument, teacher preparation is increasingly being targeted as the means by which the government can lift lagging educational outcomes. This need to lift the quality of teacher preparation is consistently present in the dialogue of the former Minister for Education, Christopher Pyne. In his maiden interview following the election, Pyne set out an agenda for schools and education with eight key points; two related to modifying the administrative processes of NAPLAN, one outlined the need for a review of the curriculum and the remaining five related to improving the quality of teacher preparation. The agenda for improving the quality of teacher preparation included the: establishment of a ministerial advisory group on initial teacher training, development of interviews and other processes for finding suitable candidates for entering teaching courses, teaching of pedagogies for ‘back to basics’ direct instruction in basic skills and knowledge in preference to child-centered approaches to learning, introduction of compulsory literacy and numeracy tests for teaching graduates, and increases in the practical placements of students in order to ensure that teaching graduates are classroom-ready (Hurst, 2013). Subsequent to the establishing of this initial agenda, Pyne continued to tout ideas relating to teacher preparation. One of the more alarming being the use of an examination, now more broadly conceived of than the original test of literacy and numeracy, to firstly ensure the quality of graduates, and secondly to facilitate students exiting early from a teacher preparation course to commence teaching, ostensibly without a teaching qualification (Ferrari, 2013, November 20). Interestingly, the current Minister for Education, Simon Birmingham has been relatively quiet in relation to teacher preparation, though he continues ministerial support for initiatives such as the literacy and numeracy test (Martin, 2015).

As such, teacher preparation finds itself at a crossroads in the Australian context. The sustained level of scrutiny bought to bear on the processes of teacher preparation since its move towards the education model in the early 1970s has been significant. After such a protracted period of rhetoric in relation to perceived crises, the current regulatory climate emerged on the back of the story, framed by policy makers, of ever-increasing progress brought about by the intervention of reviewers, policy-makers and increasing accountability measures. While the current regulations (AITSL, 2011a; see program standard 1.3) provide protection for the place of teacher preparation within higher education, the current political context does not provide any confidence that this protection is guaranteed.
There are increasingly troublesome indicators that the political climate in the Australian context is moving away from its base of support for the education model of teacher preparation. Firstly, recent announcements from both state and federal education ministers have stepped away from the 2011 commitment, via the National Program Standards, to the minimum length of two-years for a graduate qualification for teaching. In Queensland for example, the Education Minister in 2013, John-Paul Langbroek, determined that he would not make the required legislative changes until the commencement of the 2018 academic year. Federally, the then minister, Pyne took a policy paper questioning the legitimacy of the link between lengthening the graduate entry course to two-years and the improvement of quality to his first Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood (SCSEEC) meeting (Ferrari, 2013, November 20). Secondly, there appears to be significant support for a return to the principles of the training model or paradigm for teacher preparation. Pre-election policy statements emphasised practical skills and experience for ‘trainee teachers’, support for alternative pathways into teaching and increases to the ‘Teach for Australia’ program (Liberal Party of Australia, 2013). Thirdly, the language used by current conservative politicians in Australia almost exclusively uses the term ‘teacher training’ when discussing teacher preparation. This language choice is reflective of that used by Michael Gove, the conservative Secretary of State for Education in the United Kingdom. Gove has used the language of ‘training’, ‘craft’ and ‘learning in a work-based environment’ to leverage teacher preparation away from higher education institutions, stating that, ‘By 2015 well over half of all training places will be delivered in schools’ (Robinson, 2012). Given the frequency with which Australian politicians borrow policy initiatives from Great Britain, this mirroring of the language of the current conservative British Secretary for Education by the Australian Minister for Education does not bode well for the future of teacher education.

This all serves to illustrate the extent of political ideology in educational contexts and processes. Ironically in the English context, while Gove has been pushing for school-based training, the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted), who inspect all initial teacher preparation programs in England on behalf of the government, has reported that there is, ‘more outstanding provision in primary and secondary partnerships led by higher education institutions than in school-centred partnerships or employment-based routes’ (Ofsted, 2011). In Australia, both educational and political arguments abound in relation to the perceived effectiveness of various models of teacher preparation. This means that the ensuing policies and practices of contemporary governments are hampered by the appearance of contradiction in the available evidence and by the apparent lack of definitive empirical evidence favoured by contemporary policy makers (Productivity Commission, 2012). In the vacuum left by this reported lack of evidence, or in the case of the English story despite the evidence, ideological decisions appear to dominate educational policy about teacher preparation.

**The Research Question**

Consequently, the present study must interrogate the knowledge and power relationships that frame the political environment and agenda. In doing so, the study becomes critical in nature. It is possible to see that the questions converge into a consideration of the future of teacher preparation through the interrogation of the contemporary context of teacher preparation that emerges out of a critical analysis of the social, cultural, political and economic histories that have lead teacher preparation to its present moment. Thus, the core research question being asked in the current study is,

*How might emerging paradigms for teacher preparation respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?*
The central purpose of the question is to direct a study that will unpack and investigate preferred futures in light of both historical and contemporary contexts. As such, it is an open-ended question that requires rich qualitative data and an interpretive approach to data analysis. A review of interpretivist studies and methodologies identified ‘critical ethnography’ (Carspecken, 1996) and ‘critical case study’ (Vallego, 2011) as possibilities. However, these approaches could not be employed in investigating the core research question as neither a clearly defined cultural group nor case is involved. Rather, the research question focuses on ‘paradigm’ or theory version (Chen 2000). Therefore, Chapter 3 turns to the question of methodology to explore the landscape of research paradigms and designs to consider how a critical approach to research might be productively adopted in response to this question.


**CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY**

Having articulated the scope of the study and the core question for the investigation, the next task is to design a research process that supported the core goals of the researcher in undertaking the inquiry. The process of designing a methodology to respond to a specific research goal or question is deeply philosophical, but is also founded in the nature of the context and the worldview of the researcher. That is, the design of a research process for a particular inquiry is based on the interplay between methodological precedence as evident in the research literature and the researcher’s underlying view of the world. This chapter seeks to describe and justify a series of actions, designed to achieve the goals of this research project, which are the consequence of philosophical decisions made in the process of mediating methodological precedence with worldview commitments and in alignment with the purpose of the study.

**ELUCIDATING THE FOUNDATIONS OF RESEARCH/INQUIRY**

The research process is an outworking of philosophical, theoretical and methodological decisions made in relation to the conduct of a particular inquiry. It is a unique set of assumptions and actions that emerge in the doing of research. All research inquiries should be undertaken using a sound and robust research framework that supports confidence in the findings of the study. For this to be achieved, the development of a research methodology must effectively mediate between the authority of the research tradition and the relativity of the research context.

The literature in the field of educational and social research provides a rich and diverse tradition of approaches useful in developing a research process. Typical discourses about research differentiate these approaches using methodology and methods as core analytic devices. A methodology is an orientation to research that is designed to investigate a specific type of topic or question by undertaking a specified research process (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). In contrast, a method is a particular practice or activity used within a methodology to collect, analyse or explain data (Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Much of the research literature (see for example, Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2013; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2014) delineates approaches to research along quantitative/qualitative or positivist/interpretivist divides that differentiate methodologies by the types of data that they collect and the analytic processes they employ. In setting these boundaries, each of the described research methodologies is tethered to specific epistemological and theoretical foundations that place limitations around the types of topics that can be considered and questions that can asked. Developing a research process for a specific inquiry requires authentic engagement with this plethora of potentially useful research methodologies within the context of the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of the study.

After Heideggerian thought, authenticity requires a deep engagement with possibilities in order to interact meaningfully with both the familiar and the unfamiliar (Wheeler, 2011). On the other hand, inauthentic engagement is uncritical and superficial focussing on surface features or novel options (Heidegger, 1996; Wheeler, 2011). Authenticity is also paradoxical in that it recognises the significance of relating to a tradition without losing sight of the individual nuances of a particular context. Thus, authentic engagement in the research process is to take on an inquiring stance that is open to possibilities and limitations rather than directed by a superficial or unexamined application of methods and methodologies as novelties. This stance or paradigm of inquiry founded in authenticity can be juxtaposed against conventional discourses that focus on binary patterns such as the
quantitative-qualitative or positivist-interpretivist ‘paradigm wars’ (Gage, 1989; Guba, 1990; Morgan, 2014). Authentic engagement must go beyond these oppositional discourses that can uncritically direct an inquiry in a pre-determined direction. It is achieved through the bringing together of philosophical foundations with the practical issues or sources of entanglement embedded in the research process and in alignment with the purpose of the study.

A FOUR-FOLD PHILOSOPHICAL FRAME FOR RESEARCH

The core frame of reference for elucidating authentic engagement in research adopted for this study is an analysis of the philosophical foundations of a research task. Critical, authentic engagement is underpinned by a four-fold philosophical analysis that considers epistemological, ontological, aesthetic and ethical considerations. While epistemology has been thoroughly and ontology somewhat developed through the discourses of the aforementioned binary patterns (see for example, Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Creswell 2013; Crotty, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2014), axiological considerations such as aesthetics and ethics are no less significant despite the paucity of philosophical discussion evident in the literature.

Epistemology is the study of the ‘creation and dissemination of knowledge in particular areas of inquiry’ (Steup, 2012). When considering epistemological foundations, researchers need to answer questions about what it is that humanity can know about, whether we discover or construct knowledge, how we create or develop knowledge, how we can justify our knowledge and with what certainty. Ontology, on the other hand, considers even more fundamental issues. Ontology involves the consideration of what is, that is what exists or is real and how the things that exist relate to each other (Hofweber, 2012). For research, ontological considerations lead to questions about the nature of existence, of what is real, the distinction between perception and reality, and how we interact with reality in seeking to know something about it. Epistemology and ontology are interrelated in such a way that responding to a question that emerges from one will have implications for the other, and together they play a foundational role in the act of designing and conducting a research inquiry.

The term aesthetic is typically connected to art and beauty and its relevance to the foundations of the research process may not be immediately apparent. However, the concepts of taste and judgment, which are core to aesthetics, can be usefully employed in the development of the philosophical foundations of research. Taste is a preferencing of particular entities or actions based on a culturally mediated habitus relevant to a particular time and place (Bourdieu, 2010; Shelley, 2012). Judgement is related to taste in that this preferencing determines the relative value, beauty or quality of one option in comparison with other available options (Shelley, 2012). Judgements made about the quality of a research endeavour have not traditionally been related to taste, but in this study, a counter-stance is taken.

Within the empirical approach to research, reason rather than taste is considered the means for determining the quality of a research project. Reasoned analysis of the validity and reliability of the processes used and conclusions made is taken as the benchmark for determining the quality of the research process (Creswell, 2013; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2014). While alternative conceptions such as believability and trustworthiness, based in credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability, have emerged in relation to an interpretivist paradigm (Guba, 1989; Harrison, MacGibbon & Morton, 2001; Shenton, 2004), these too are closely related to reason in that they seek to reflect rather than transform empirical approaches to making judgements. Ironically, this preferencing of reason as the means to achieving and confirming quality is itself a matter of taste,
grounded in the historical valuing of reason. The culturally-mediated tastes of the research tradition drive the judgement of research in pre-determined rationalistic directions, even if unwittingly.

The positioning of reason as the highest and greatest form of knowledge making is no longer fully evident in a postmodern, post-structural, post-rational society. Epistemologically, alternative knowledges have emerged with different sources, such as perception, introspection, memory, reason and testimony; and foci, such as religious, social, racial or gendered (Steup, 2012). Since these epistemological possibilities have been authentically considered by the research community in the continued development of emergent approaches to the research process (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008), it seems both illogical and discriminatory to then close ranks in relation to making judgements about that research. Reason alone cannot be the determiner of quality and value in research.

The research process, about which these judgements are to be made, is a complex web of decision-making moments whereby the researcher must navigate a multiplicity of options in seeking to achieve a research goal. It is as much an art undertaken by an artisan as it is a science that follows a pre-determined, rational, scientific process. The culturally mediated tastes of the researcher are as significant to the process of making judgements about research as reasoned analysis (Bourdieu, 2010; Morgan, 2014). Within the inquiring stance, making judgements between alternatives in the process of the research and about the value and quality of the research project itself must be made using reasoned taste. That is, authentic engagement with the aesthetics of research maintains the paradoxical relationship between tradition and the individual in the making of judgements (Wardekker, 2010). This positioning will lead the researcher to ask questions about what research is valuable and for whom, what quality research is like, how the quality of research is determined and what grounds are available for determining value and quality in research.

The other axiological concern in research is ethics. While ethics has been significantly foregrounded as a practical requirement in the research process, its role in the philosophical foundations of research is not often discussed. Ethics relates to the determining of right and wrong, particularly in relation to conduct (Knight, 2006). Within research in the Australian context, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) provides culturally mediated ethical standards to be used in the gaining of ethical clearance for research conducted on humans (NHMRC, ARC & Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee, 2007/2015). However, such an approach to ethics can become reductionistic and inauthentic.

For ethics, as with aesthetics, judgement is core in considering implications for research. While guidelines provided by bodies such as the NHMRC are a useful baseline or starting point, these too must be recognised as culturally preferred ethical standards. If relativity is relevant in ethics, as it is in epistemology, then these and other guidelines are neither faultless, nor generalisable. They are instead culturally situated in a hypothetical context relevant to but not entirely reflective of any one research project. The individual cultures and nuances of the researchers and of the research context and participants provide a context against which the general guidelines of research ethics must be negotiated. In order to maintain ethical authenticity, reasoned morality must be used in making judgements about the ethical implications across the entire research process. Researchers need to consider ethical questions about upright conduct in the context of the study and in the lives of the individuals involved, and about the appropriateness and impact of the research in the communities of the researched and the researcher.

The issues of aesthetics and ethics lead to the second frame of reference significant to authentic engagement in research; an understanding of the sources of ‘entanglement’ (Palmer, 2007). While
philosophical theorising about research provides preferred or prioritised ways of working in the research process, the hypothetical construct it creates rarely matches experience. The doing of research brings the researcher into contact with a specific context that throws up practical challenges that need to be mediated against philosophical foundations. These challenges can be considered entanglements; troublesome or tricky situations that can be untangled by focussed, careful and patient exploration. In applying Palmer’s (2007) conception of entanglement, which he applied to teaching, to the research process three major sources of entanglement can be identified. These are the goal of the research, the researched and the researcher. Each of these components of the research process throws up unique challenges to the research process. While it is useful to identify the types of issues relevant to each of these sources, the nature of an entanglement means that an issue that emerges from one source will have consequences for the others.

The goal or purpose of the research often provides the first entanglement in the development of a research process, though it can continue to be problematic throughout. The task of specifying a goal through the development of a research question is challenging in itself, but it also must negotiate what the researcher wants to achieve against what is actually possible. For example, some questions might be important but there may be no way to ethically collect the data required. The second, closely related, source of entanglement is the researched. This entails both the topic of the research and the research participants involved in the project. These aspects of the research process can prove problematic in relation to issues such as cultural relevance, acceptance of the researcher, suitability of methods employed, and openness, willingness and honesty in participation. Thirdly, the researcher can problematise the research process in relation to issues such as philosophical preferencing of certain ways of researching, personal attitudes and opinions, bias and blind-spots.

The disentanglement of the issues that emerge in a research project is the work of the researcher in the research process. Authentic engagement in this disentanglement involves the researcher in philosophical practices that occupy the research context in order to achieve the research goal. This inter-relationship merges the two frames of reference into a single framework for thinking about research as a paradigm of inquiry. This framework was developed by the researcher to underpin the current study and is represented in Figure 3.1 Model of an Authentic Paradigm of Inquiry, below, where the four-fold philosophical analysis of the research process interacts across the three faces of the research context.

*Figure 3.1. Model of an Authentic Paradigm of Inquiry*

This model is the research framework used in this current study. The interrelating of philosophical foundations with the research context provides direction for methodological decision-making throughout the research process. In doing so, the question of the starting point was key. Ultimately,
the sustainability of the project is dependent upon the researcher buying into the process. The most appropriate segue into the paradigm of inquiry, therefore, is through a personal, reflective dialogue between the researcher and the other components of the identified research context. In the case of this study, teacher education was selected as the area to be researched as a direct result of this dialogue. Having been involved in teacher preparation, as a student, mentor, teacher educator and course coordinator, the rhetoric of crisis described across Chapters 1 and 2 does not rung true to lived experience. As a researcher, there is personal interest in investigating how this dissonance between rhetoric and experience has come about and about how these differences might be bridged. As such, the study needs to investigate the paradigmatic issues evident in the discourses that drive political initiatives in teacher education.

In this study, it is evident that narrowing the field of teacher education down to an investigation of political processes behind dominant paradigms brings a goal for the project into sharper focus. What is evident in the formative reading of recent reviews of teacher education and subsequent policy initiatives is the marginalisation of the voice of teacher educators and the almost complete absence of the voice of teacher preparation students. Considering the significance of these two groups to teacher education and their potentially positive contribution to discourses about teacher education, the purpose or goal of this inquiry is framed around the idea of giving voice to these groups. While it is important that both of these groups have a voice, just one group has been selected as a means of constructing a viable doctoral study. The selected group is the teacher educators. The lack of student voice in political discourses is no less significant, is acknowledged as a limitation within the current study, and remains a potential project for future investigation.

In seeking to give voice to teacher educators, the study is deeply personal for the researcher. As a teacher educator, giving voice to teacher educators is not just a theoretical concept, it is a self-empowering exercise in building the agency of teacher educators on the field of teacher education. As such, the goal is not just to be heard. What needs to be said relates to the outworking of the personal and professional work of teacher educators into the future, it should be responsive to the voice of their experience, and provide direction for change.

There are many ways that an investigation of teacher education could have been constructed. What is evident in this dialogue between the researcher, the researched and the research goal is a critical orientation to the research task. The focus on political processes, dominant paradigms, ideologies, silences, voice, empowerment and agency in defining the agenda for the inquiry places the study within the critical orientation to research (Carspecken, 1996; Crotty, 1998; Harvey, 2011; Kinchloe & McLaren, 2008). This orientation shapes the core research question:

How might emerging paradigms for teacher preparation respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?

Having reached this decision, the next step in the process is to interrogate the research literature in order to explore the methodological possibilities of critical inquiry.

**ENGAGING CRITICAL INQUIRY**

Defining critical inquiry or critical social research is a difficult task. This is in part a consequence of the paucity of consideration of the nature of critical theory in conventional research methodology texts (see for example, Creswell, 2013; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2014). In another way, this might be a consequence of the anti-establishmentarian underpinnings on which a critical orientation to research is built (Kinchloe & McLaren 2008). Equally significant is the nature of critical
social research itself and its tendency to defy definition in relation to the conventional frameworks for distinguishing different approaches to the research process.

The research literature typically differentiates educational and social research using methodology and methods as core analytic devices. As noted earlier, a methodology is a verified approach to the research process and a method is a specific action used within a methodology (Crotty, 1998; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). These analyses provide researchers with a range of research methodologies that can be accessed and applied to specific contexts and thereby provide the researcher with a clear pathway in relation to conducting their inquiry. However, critical social research is neither a methodology nor a method and cannot readily be described as such. It does not follow any sort of established pattern of action or require the use of specified activities and as such it does not provide a ready-made way forward for the researcher (Harvey, 2011).

Critical social research is, in every sense of the word, an orientational or ideological approach (Crotty, 1998) to a research process. In contrast to much of the literature on educational and social research, Crotty (1998) in his text, The Foundations of Social Research, has explored an orientational approach to defining and describing research. This approach analyses the epistemological and ontological assumptions that frame the theoretical practices of research. It starts from the philosophical foundations rather than the methodological practices of research and in this way is reflected in the model for an authentic paradigm of inquiry (see Figure 3.1) that was developed and adopted for this study. Using this approach, Crotty (1998) identifies and articulates critical inquiry as one potential orientation to social research.

Critical inquiry is based on the outworking of critical theory into research practice. Critical theory is a branch of philosophical inquiry that is commonly associated with the Frankfurt School, though this group is not the only source of critical theorists (Bohman, 2012; Crotty, 1998). What the Frankfurt School and other critical theorists have in common is a starting point in Marxist (1971) notions of domination and emancipation (Marx, 1971; Wolff, 2011). The core concept of critical theory and thereby the purpose of critical inquiry is ‘decreasing domination and increasing freedom’ (Bohman, 2012, p.1) in order to effect social change through real democracy (Horkheimer, 2002). Critical social research is underpinned by these assumptions about power and its outworking in the domination and emancipation of groups and individuals. It seeks to investigate; the nature of knowledge, truth and power, and their role in the establishment and maintenance of social systems (Carspecken, 1996; Crotty, 1998). It identifies and critiques ‘dominant ideological constructs and presuppositions’ (Harvey, 2011, p. 5), and uses this in promoting action for social change (Kinchloe & McLaren, 2008). These core concepts have shaped the framing of this study.

Methodologically, critical inquiry is defined by a praxis that combines ‘reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it’ (Freire, 1972, p. 28). The key feature of this reflection on action is expressed as ‘immanent transcendence’ (Strydom, 2011). Immanent transcendence is a concept taken from theology where it expresses the idea of the spirit of god that is both within humankind and beyond the universe. Within contemporary critical theory it signifies the idea that, ‘something belonging to the world is nevertheless able to distinguish itself from the world and to develop a perspective on and relation to the world’ (Strydom, 2011, Preface and Acknowledgements, para.1). This means that the critical researcher must stand both within and outside of the research context in order to reflect and act upon the outworking of dominant constructs and assumptions. How exactly that happens is neither consistent across nor pre-determined for all critical inquiries. It must be
framed by further reflection on the context and this is a challenged that has underpinned the research methodology employed across this study.

What is evident from this brief review of the literature relating to a critical orientation to methodology is that the selection of critical inquiry as an orientation to the research task is justifiable given the parameters of the research context as described in Chapter 2. But, it does not provide clear and direct guidelines in relation to methods and methodology. Rather, it sets a framework to guide methodological decision-making. Thus, a second layer of methodological consideration is required in order to move the project forward.

**EXPLORING METHODOLOGICAL POSSIBILITIES**

The task of methodological decision-making in designing the research process for this study requires careful consideration of the methodological possibilities evident in the literature. For this purpose, the typical literature (see for example, Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2014) that delineates research according to well-recognised and verified research methodologies is useful. This leads to the development of a list of methodologies, often labelled research designs, which can be accessed and used by researchers. The list includes designs such as the experimental, quasi-experimental, survey, case study, phenomenology, phenomenography, ethnography, action research, grounded theory and mixed methods (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Punch, 2014).

The methodological boundaries between these research designs place limitations on their uses both generally and in the case of this study. Each of these research methodologies is tethered to specific epistemological foundations that ultimately determine the purposes to which they can be employed. Authentic decision-making about the relevance of these potential designs to the methodological development of the current study is dependent upon the resolution of two important issues. Firstly, the epistemological foundations of the chosen methodology will have to fit with a critical orientation to research. Secondly, there has to be a match between the types of research questions the methodology is designed to address and the question being asked in the context of this study.

On the first point, the critical orientation that frames the current study leads towards interpretivist or qualitative modes of research. The work of a number of critical theorists has highlighted the role of language in the social practices of both dictatorial and hegemonic domination (Foucault, 1972, 1980; Gramsci, 1992; Habermas, 2003; Horkheimer, 2002). This and many of the other core theoretical concepts that underpin critical inquiry, such as emancipation, democracy and social change, require critical analysis and interpretation of the ways in which language is used in the distribution and maintenance of power (Foucault, 1980). As such, a critical inquiry such as this one is not well supported by experimental or survey approaches that focus on numeric forms of data and operate on deductive reasoning. For this reason, quantitative and positivist research designs were rejected as inappropriate for pursuing the research goal of the current study and interpretivist research designs became the focus.

There is a growing number of interpretivist research designs represented in the research literature. These designs predominantly use qualitative data and inductive or abductive reasoning, though quantitative data can some times be incorporated. Despite the growing number of possible approaches, only some of the available interpretivist designs have been applied to critical inquiries. A review of the research literature and interpretivist studies identified ‘critical ethnography’
(Carspecken, 1996) and ‘critical case study’ (Vallego, 2011) as two research designs that had previously used a critical standpoint. These are not, however, the only designs that might profitably be used with a critical lens.

As noted earlier, the second issue in considering the application of a methodological research design to this study involves alignment between the design and the question. The various interpretivist research designs each focus on responding to or investigating a different type of question. For example, the focus of ethnography and case study is on the detailed analysis and comprehensive description of an aspect of the context (Johnson & Christensen, 2008), where ethnography focuses on a culture or defined group of people and case study investigates an identifiable ‘bounded system’ (Stake, 1997, p. 406) that can be ‘examined in-depth’ within a ‘real-life context’ (Yin, 2006, p.111).

These two research designs have been used with a critical lens in the past in the investigation of context (Carspecken, 1996; Vallego, 2011). In contrast, phenomenology and phenomenography focus on answering questions about human experience (Johnson & Christensen, 2008); the difference being that phenomenology looks to describe the essence of the experience of a phenomenon (Barnacle, 2001), while phenomenography seeks to explore the breadth of alternative experiences (Bowden & Walsh, 2000). These two approaches to research are founded on existential philosophies, though this does not preclude them from being undertaken from a critical perspective. Grounded theory, as its name suggests, focuses on developing theoretical constructs that underlie social contexts, phenomenon and experience that is grounded in the data that is collected (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). The other main group of interpretivist designs are those that focus on action, such as action research and common forms of mixed methods research. These designs investigate practice in order to analyse and improve action within the research context (Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Any of these interpretivist designs could be harnessed for a study shaped by critical theory. In the case of this study it is, therefore, necessary to undertake an analysis of the question being asked and its underlying purpose in the light of these available designs so that alignment amongst purpose, question and process is.

In the development of a rigorous research process, it is the ‘research question, incorporating the purposes of our research’ that should lead to the selection of a methodology (Crotty, 1998, p. 13). The core research question being asked in the current study is, ‘How might emerging paradigms for teacher preparation respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?’ Its purpose being to unpack and investigate preferred futures in light of both historical and contemporary contexts. As such, it is an open-ended question that requires rich qualitative data and an interpretive approach to data analysis. The question focuses on ‘paradigm’ as a theoretical construct. As was explained and defined in Chapter 2, a paradigm is defined as a socially constructed framework or model used by individuals to guide their thinking and actions in relation to a particular phenomenon.

The research goal, as represented by its core question, is to investigate teacher education in relation to theoretical constructs represented by the term ‘paradigm’. This means that only one of the previously described interpretivist research designs is in alignment with the current study. The context of the research cannot be limited in relation to a culture or a case as for ethnography and case study research (Carspecken, 1996; Vallego, 2011). While the experience of teacher education is important to the study, the goal is to consider the underlying thinking about rather than elaborate the experience of teacher education that would be the focus of phenomenology or phenomenography (Barnacle, 2001; Bowden & Walsh, 2000). Again, the match between the action of action research and the theorising of the current study would not be productive (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988; Koshy, 2005).
None of these research designs could be employed in investigating the core research question. However, the concept of paradigm, as defined, that is at the heart of the research questions articulated for this study is closely related to the core constructs of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Clarke, 2005; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

EXAMINING GROUNDED THEORY

Within the context of social research, the history and development of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) is both a unique and unusual story. While most other methodologies are closely tied to particular philosophical assumptions that imply a bounded set of methods, grounded theory invites a wide range of approaches, both epistemologically and ontologically (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). The consequence being that across its history, grounded theory has productively been enacted in alignment with a number of philosophical orientations, all of which focus on grounding theory in data (Morse et al., 2009). The purpose of all grounded theories is to develop substantive theoretical models that explain social processes or situations as they fit and work in situ, such is the purpose of this study.

In order to explore this history of grounded theory, Crotty’s (1998) philosophical framework for social research has been used. This framework seeks to develop a paradigmatic approach to research that recognises the foundational role of epistemology, and to a lesser extent ontology, in the personal research process and the story of social research. Crotty (1998) uses a range of qualifiers that describe and explain social research in relation to a complex web of epistemological orientations. This web positions the objectivism of finding truth against the constructivism of constructing truth, and then reflects upon a continuum of subjectivity, from the social to the personal (Crotty, 1998). Figure 3.2 Framework of Paradigms for Social Research, below, outlines the scope of paradigms covered by Crotty in relation to the triptych of the objectivity, subjectivity and constructivity of knowledge. These paradigms have been used to explore the history of grounded theory; a narrative that follows and articulates the relevance to the research proposed here.

![Figure 3.2. Framework of Paradigms for Social Research (adapted from Crotty 1998)](image)

THE ORIGINS OF GROUNDED THEORY

The history of grounded theory begins in 1967 with the publication of Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. This seminal text was written at the peak of positivism’s paradigmatic hold on the scientific ‘high ground’ and the dominance of quantifiable approaches to research. In contrast, it sought to wrestle with the role, function and uses of qualitative data within the field of social science (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Glaser and Strauss
attempted to establish a methodological process that collects, analyses and synthesises qualitative data for investigating social phenomena scientifically. The purpose of this methodology, as its name suggests, is to use scientific processes to ground a theory in the data that is being collected.

To achieve this end, Glaser and Strauss (1967) introduced two core processes that stand out as alternatives to the accepted scientific research practices of the time. Firstly, Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) grounded theory required the researcher to begin with data rather than a theoretical framework established through the academic literature. Secondly, they proposed an alternative framework for determining the validity and reliability of qualitative data. This framework is founded in the methods of comparative analysis, and incorporates four key properties; fitness, understanding, generality and control (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

At the time, these were radical proposals designed to turn the approach to accepted scientific methodology on its head and provide an opening for the acceptance of social research as a genuinely scientific pursuit. As such, Glaser and Strauss (1967) were seeking to work within the ontological and epistemological boundaries of positivism. They were attempting to extend these boundaries by legitimising alternative means for using qualitative data in investigations of social phenomena. The revolutionary paradigmatic consequences of The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) were, however, never fully realised. The scientific community, as was to be expected, was not prepared to concede ground in relation to the legitimacy of qualitative data and its use in establishing valid and reliable research outcomes. At the same time, social scientists moved to openly and clearly reject the epistemological and ontological foundations of positivism (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Corbin, 2009).

As the paradigm war between positivist and interpretivist researchers took an even firmer grip on the landscape of social research (Gage, 1989; Guba, 1990), Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) work was positioned in ‘no-man’s land’ (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). While it might have been possible for their work to be dismissed as a hybridised oddity, it did, and still does, survive and thrive. Firstly, the groundbreaking work of The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) opened the landscape of qualitative research and spawned a number of other methodological approaches, such as phenomenology and phenomenography (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Secondly, grounded theory itself became part of the research landscape through the reimagining of the core practices of grounded theory inside other ontological and epistemological frameworks (Morse et al., 2009). This led, ultimately, to the disintegration of the collaboration between Glaser and Strauss (Stern, 2009). Of the two, Strauss was the first to respond to the debate that was raging over the philosophical and methodological implications of their original text.

**Interpretivist Grounded Theory**

In 1987 Strauss published a new text on the nature of grounded theory; titled, Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists (Strauss, 1987). In this individual work Strauss sought to respond to the criticisms that had been levelled against The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in relation to its paradigmatic relationship with positivism and its lack of clear methodological direction. This has since been expanded through Strauss’s collaboration with Corbin in the text, Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; see also Strauss & Corbin, 1990/1998). Philosophically, Strauss (1987) and Corbin and Strauss’s (2008) work is framed by recognition of the sociocultural construction of knowledge and reality as well as the relativity of one’s perception of that knowledge and therefore reality. The most significant consequence of this
epistemological re-framing is the denial of the possibility of a formal grounded theory that sits outside of context (Aldiabat & Le Navanec, 2011; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Haig, 1995).

In Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) earlier work, two types of grounded theories were mooted; these were substantive grounded theories and formal grounded theories (Aldiabat & Le Navanec, 2011). While both types must be grounded in data, substantive grounded theories are limited to the context used in the study while formal grounded theories are generalisable (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Substantive grounded theories are generated from a single context and written as such; they should not be presented as generalisable (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). They are, however, suitable starting points for the generation of formal grounded theories. Formal grounded theories add a conceptual layer over one or more substantive theories in order to attain generalisability through the synthesis of substantive ideas into a universal theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

In explaining these two modes of grounded theory, Glaser and Strauss (1967) were philosophically concerned about distinguishing grounded theory from grand theory. At the time, Glaser and Strauss (1967) believed that social researchers were oriented towards verifying grand theories founded in the genius of the ‘great men’ of a particular field (p. 10), at the expense of theory that is grounded in actual data. As such, their criticism of contemporaneous practice in social research was levelled at the source of the identified universal theory rather than the very idea that universal theory existed. Ironically, Glaser & Strauss (1967) admitted that, ‘since our experience and knowledge are least extensive in this area [formal grounded theory], most of our discussion will be concerned with general rules, positions and examples’ (p.80). To use their own definitions, Glaser and Strauss (1967) proposed a grand theory about formal grounded theory. As a result, Glaser and Strauss (1967) left their framework open for broad criticism, both methodologically and philosophically. Methodologically, Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) work has been criticised for its overly general explanations of methodological process and the lack of rigour evident in these practices (Haig, 1995), particularly, but not solely, in the area of formal grounded theory. Philosophically, the very idea of a formal grounded theory about a universal concept has been questioned (Oleson, 2007; Walker & Myrick, 2006).

Since the writing of The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in the 1960s, postmodern ontologies and epistemologies, which focus on the relativity of both reality and knowledge at both social and personal levels, have emerged as driving forces in the development of research methodologies, particularly in areas of social research. The general acceptance of interpretivist ideas, generated in the 1800s by thinkers such as Weber and Dilthey (Crotty, 1998; Kim, 2012; Makkreel, 2012), about the situatedness of social worlds or concepts, opened the way for social researchers to both abandon and rage against positivist understandings of legitimate research work.

Strauss’s (1987) response was to abandon any pretence relating to the scientific legitimacy of grounded theory, and to establish a form of grounded theory firmly established in an interpretivist paradigm. This philosophical shift had two significant consequences. Firstly, Strauss’s (1987) model of grounded theory could no longer use the framework of fitness, understanding, generality and control as a means of establishing validity and reliability. Validity and reliability became moot points, founded in positivism, which were no longer possible or even desirable within an interpretivist frame. Secondly, the possibility for formal grounded theory was quashed. Strauss’s (1987) interpretivist perspective continued to allow for differing levels of conceptualisation, but each theory is bound to the cultural and historical context or contexts from which it emerged and must be tested and developed in any new context. Within this paradigm, grounded theories are neither universal nor generalisable.
For grounded theory, these philosophical changes had significant methodological consequences. Positivist ideas about universality, validity and reliability being attributable to data had led Glaser and Strauss (1967) to establish a very fluid and flexible methodological process. Without a means to legitimise data, interpretivist research has moved to tight, rigorous methodological constraints as a means for establishing trustworthiness and believability in its findings (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Walker & Myrick, 2006). It is the thoroughness of the application of the methodology, rather than the nature of the data, that gives this research its legitimacy. Strauss’s (1987) grounded theory, therefore, sets out a very detailed list of actions and procedures for the sampling, coding and analysis of data, which, if followed, results in a credible substantive grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Walker & Myrick, 2006). This move towards an interpretivist orientation for grounded theory is useful to this study. Yet, it does not align readily with the critical orientation that is integral to the research question.

**Postpositivist Grounded Theory**

While Strauss (1987) readily embraced interpretivist philosophies, situated his work within this alternative paradigm and moved away from many of the core principles established in *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), Glaser (1992, 2007) maintained both his own and grounded theory’s links with positivism through post-positivist perspectives. Postpositivism has its early roots in the thinking of Heisenberg and Bohr (Crotty, 1998; Phillips & Burbules, 2000) who called into question positivism’s ontological and epistemological certainty. Its pinnacle, in the writing of Kuhn (1970/1962), radically reframed the history and philosophy of science through the identification and analysis of the role of social context in the development of scientific ideas including the scientific method. In accepting these propositions, postpositivism recognises the impossibility of both ontological and epistemological certainty due to the relativity of social and personal perspectives or beliefs (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). However, unlike interpretivist philosophies, postpositivism does not preclude the possibility of truth that is of value apart from the knower (Crotty, 1998). That is, while knowledge is relative and leads to situated truths, these truths can be judged for their fit with and relevance to natural and social phenomena.

Glaser’s first response to Strauss’s interpretivist vision for grounded theory came in his text, *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis* (Glaser, 1992). In this and subsequent writings, Glaser (1992, 2007) has argued strongly against the use of methodological constraint as a means of establishing credibility. He has maintained a postpositivist argument for the use of fit and relevance as a legitimate process for establishing validity and reliability in research (Åge, 2011). Glaser (2007) has also maintained his belief in the possibility of a formal grounded theory that provides conceptual insight into a universally held truth or belief. Since mainstream social research practices have embraced interpretivist paradigms, Glaserian thinking about grounded theory have largely gone out of vogue (Stern, 2009). Consequently, much of the mainstream research literature has ignored Glaser’s recent contributions. In recent times, a number of second generation grounded theory methodologists who studied under either Glaser or Strauss have emerged (Morse et al., 2009). Each of these theorists has sought to move grounded theory into alternative interpretivist positions, and in doing so to reinvigorate grounded theory from a different philosophical foundation. Much of the work of these second generation grounded theorists is in keeping with the methodological challenges of this study.

**Constructivist Grounded Theory**

In 2006, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis* (Charmaz, 2006), entered the arena of grounded theory methodology. In this text Charmaz (2006), as with other second-generation theorists, seeks to move grounded theory into the 21st century by arguing for a
paradigmatic shift for its philosophical foundations (Charmaz, 2006; Morse et al., 2009). Charmaz (2006) argues that both the Glaserian and Straussian schools of grounded theory are at once fighting against and tainted by positivistic assumptions (Charmaz, 2006); a philosophical position that she would argue is no longer defensible. Charmaz’s (2006, 2009) grounded theory is founded in pragmatic thinking, particularly Mead’s (1934) symbolic interactionism (Aldiabat & Le Navanec, 2011; Crotty, 1998); which positions human meaning making within social interaction. As such, Charmaz’s (2006) approach is constructivist, focussing on the construction of, rather than the discovery of, theory. By implication, Charmaz’s grounded theory is interested in how and why ‘participants construct meanings and action’ (Charmaz, 2006, p. 130), and also recognises the resulting theory as an interpretive construction.

Interestingly, Charmaz’s (2006, 2009) re-construction of the epistemological orientation of grounded theory towards constructivism frees grounded theory from the tight constraints of Strauss (1987) and Corbin and Strauss’s (2008) interpretivist grounded theory. While interpretivist grounded theory tried to maintain some sort of external verifiability through tight methodological processes, constructivist grounded theory has abandoned this type of verification as a research goal (Charmaz, 2006). As such, Charmaz (2006) returned to the methodological flexibility found in Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) original work by reframing the legitimacy of the research outcome. Constructivist grounded theory constructs a theory through the lens of the researcher and as such is limited only by the capacity of the researcher to recognise and see from alternative perspectives (Charmaz, 2006). The resultant theorising has the potential to be either formal or substantive (Charmaz, 2006); the limitations of the theory are the limitations of the researcher rather than the scope of the field of research. This orientation to grounded theory is moving towards a closer alignment with the purpose of this study.

**POSTMODERN GROUNDED THEORY**

Another second-generation writer to enter the debate over grounded theory methodology is Clarke (2005, 2009). Clarke’s text, *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn* (Clarke, 2005), seeks to align both the philosophies and practices of grounded theory with postmodern conceptions of deconstruction, dissolution and the demystification of dominant discourses (Crotty, 1998). In order to do so, postmodern grounded theory shifts the focus of its theorising from the social process to the social situation (Clarke, 2005). In this way postmodern grounded theory tries to avoid the positivist assumptions that underpin the search for coherence in theorising about social processes, by purposefully theorising from the ‘fractured, multi-centred discursive system’ (Clarke 2005, p.2) that comprises the situation of the phenomenon under investigation.

As such, Clarke (2005, 2009) employs a post-structuralist deconstruction of the language of participants in order to develop situational grounded theories that expound upon discourses. Clarke’s form of deconstruction aligns closely with both Marxist and feminist ideas about the power of dominant discourses and seeks to expose the power relationships and perspectives at play in those discourses (Clarke, 2005; Harvey, 2011), and this is useful in a study of this nature. However, Clarke (2005), in line with her postmodern sensibilities, stops short of participating actively with social change, which is a core component of the critical orientation to research that is aligned in the research question for this study.

**THE NEED FOR A CRITICAL GROUNDED THEORY**

When this story of grounded theory is mapped against Crotty’s (1998) model (Figure 3.2), a limitation in the landscape of grounded theory methodology becomes evident. Grounded theory, as first
described by Glaser and Strauss (1967), emerged from a positivist paradigm. Ironically, one of its core purposes was to explore positivist validations of qualitative data in response to the emerging paradigmatic war. Shortly thereafter, the rift between Glaser and Strauss is an indication of the pervasiveness of this war in the work of researchers. Glaser (2007), in his later work, remained committed to his positivist origins through postpositivist perspectives that seek to balance the objective-subjective paradox. On the other hand, Strauss (1987) modified his stripes, taking on an interpretivist approach to his epistemology and ultimately grounded theory. Of the second generation grounded theorists, Corbin (2009; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) has remained faithful to Strauss’s interpretivist approach, Charmaz (2006, 2009) has established grounded theory within a constructivist paradigm and Clarke (2005, 2009) has gone the other way in developing a deconstructive, postmodern approach to grounded theory. For grounded theory, the only epistemological orientation in Crotty’s (1998) model that is yet to be fully explored is that of critical inquiry.

**ELABORATING CRITICAL GROUNDED THEORY**

The possibility of a critical grounded theory has not been well explored in the literature and only a few examples exist. Problems associated with the integration of critical theory with grounded theory have been discussed by Gibson (2007) in his chapter, ‘Accommodating critical theory’. However, a number of quality studies using feminist grounded theory have already been undertaken (Gibson, 2007). One educational example identified was Abraham’s (2009) study, which was labelled as a critical grounded theory. Abraham’s (2009) article defined critical grounded theory as ‘initiating a change of perception on the part of the participants’ (p.83) without any further elaboration. While the reasons for this may be many, one significant factor in working out the possibility of a critical grounded theory is the issue of how to deal with the potential conflict between the idea of generating theory from data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), when the researcher has already taken a critical orientation to the phenomenon under investigation (Gibson, 2007). That is, critical social research declares its commitment to a grand epistemological theory about the nature of truth, knowledge and power relationships, and this grand theorising appears incommensurate with grounded theory’s commitment to grounding theory in data.

However, this problem is not exclusive to the critical orientation to social research. In effect, all of the orientations to grounded theory described above involve grand epistemological theorising and these epistemological assumptions will influence the generation of theory no matter which orientation is adopted. All research methodologies are grand theories founded in the epistemological and ontological assumptions the researcher brings to the process of developing a methodology (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Crotty, 1998; Morse et al., 2009). The difference is that critical social research is not blind to the ways that these assumptions position researchers, and as such, it accepts and declares them (Harvey, 2011; Kinchloe & McLaren, 2008). Critical grounded theory, therefore, holds within it the possibility of stripping grounded theory of its grandiose assumptions by positioning the researcher to concurrently generate, deconstruct and reconstruct theory directly from the data.

For grounded theory to be critical it requires a design that will identify orthodox and heterodox conceptions to then theorise the knowledge and power system relations that establish and maintain hegemonies within a particular social phenomenon (Foucault, 1980; Gramsci, 1992; Marx, 1971). It makes no assumptions about the possibility of neutrality in relation to these orthodoxies or heterodoxies; neither does it assume a pre-determined or prior position in relation to them. It does, however, assume that knowledge and power are at work in the social processes and situations under investigation and that the careful generating, deconstructing and reconstructing of theory will assist in exposing inequities and empowering action and change (Bohman, 2012; Harvey, 2011; Strydom, 2005).
In order to achieve this, Charmaz’s (2006) constructivist and Clarke’s (2005) deconstructivist approaches can be used as a foundation that is built upon using the lens of critical analysis. Such an opportunity presents itself to the research project outlined here.

**DEVELOPING CRITICAL GROUNDED THEORY**

Before applying critical grounded theory to the current study it needed to be developed beyond a mere possibility. In order to achieve this Crotty’s (1998) four ‘basic elements of the research process’ (p.2), have been used as a framework for considering the nature of critical grounded theory. Further, in order to fully articulate critical grounded theory as a methodology, it needs to be unpacked in relation to epistemology, theoretical perspective and method.

**Epistemological foundations.**

To be appropriately critical and grounded, critical grounded theory needs to incorporate the epistemological foundations of both traditions. While critical inquiry is influenced by Western European traditions such as Marxism and the Frankfurt School (Bohman, 2012), grounded theory is influenced by the American pragmatic traditions of Mead, Pierce and Dewey (Åge, 2011; Charmaz, 2006; Hookway, 2015; Morgan, 2014). What is interesting is the fact that these two traditions have ‘striking similarities’ despite the geographical and discursive distance between them (Bohman, 2012; Strydom, 2011). Consequently, the development of an epistemological basis for critical grounded theory that maintains contact with both traditions is possible through the integration of four key concepts. Such a challenge is outlined forthwith in preparation for the proposed research.

Firstly, the truth claims of critical grounded theory are normative. The normative realm is described as a third ontological category sitting alongside objectivity and subjectivity (Bohman, 2012; Carspecken, 1996). Carspecken (1996) argues that normative claims require agreement that is developed through intersubjective negotiation that can then be defended and verified. The normative realm includes all ‘meaningful action’ founded in claims about ‘what is proper, appropriate and conventional’ (Carspecken, 1996, p.83). Critical grounded theory, in fulfilling its emancipatory role must act meaningfully in relation to what is and what ought to be. As such, it makes explicit normative theoretical claims about a substantive context and thereby provides a critique of underlying ideologies and facilitates the genuine democratisation of that same context.

Secondly, truth claims made by critical grounded theory must be considered fallible. A grounded theory is developed through the systematic analysis of data such that the theory generated both fits with and works in the context of the study (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Therefore, grounded theory is juxtaposed against grand ‘theories logically deduced from a priori assumptions’ (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.6), thus avoiding a dependence on universalism, authority and absolutism for its truth claims. Instead, grounded theory embraces relativity for both the researcher and the researched. However, critical theory requires a non-sceptical approach to relativity in order to maintain its emancipatory capacity. The fallibilist position, which holds the tension between the need for some degree of certainty and the potential for error, fulfils this role (Hookway, 2015). Critical grounded theory detranscendentalises truth by recognising that knowledge is hypothetical, empirical and fallible (Bohman, 2012), but at the same time, appreciates that intersubjective and reflexive approaches to research practices will contribute to confidence in the normative claims made.

Thirdly, critical grounded theory rests on an intersubjective approach to pursuing knowledge. Broadly speaking, there are three positions that can be taken by the researcher in social inquiry; the first-, second- and third-person perspectives. For grounded theory though, validity and reliability is not
dependent upon the position taken by the researcher but on the fit and workability of the theory for the agents in the substantive context (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Critical theory uses intersubjective dialogue and communication between the inquirer and the agent as a means to ‘make explicit the operative social norms’ (Bohman, 2012, p.37), and can thereby provide a vehicle to facilitate interpretations that are accepted as theoretically sufficient, worthwhile and relevant (Charmaz, 2006). Critical grounded theorists, therefore, need to adopt a second-person perspective as a ‘participant in dialogue’ (Bohman, 2012, p.36) in order to interpret normative claims. However, this single intersubjective perspective will not achieve theoretical saturation in relation to the critical, emancipatory purposes of critical grounded theory.

This leads to the final epistemological concept necessary for critical grounded theory; interperspectival reflexivity. This is a reflective process designed to give social inquiry a critical edge. Interperspectival reflexivity involves the researcher in reflection from more than one perspective by using both third-person observation and first-person participation as positions for critiquing second-person discourses about normative claims (Bohman, 2012; Crotty, 1998). This type of reflectivity is dialogical as it negotiates both the observer’s explanation of the justification of the normative claims and the participant’s description of their practical consequences. In critical grounded theory, interperspectival reflexivity facilitates a critical analysis of the normative claims that are emerging and of the social constructs that uphold and reproduce those claims. It provides a double-edged criticism designed, ‘to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them’ (Horkheimer, 2002; as cited by Bohman, 2012, p.1). Together, these four epistemological concepts form a critical reflexivity that is a necessary to fulfilling the purpose of this study.

Theoretical perspectives.

Having established the epistemological foundations of critical grounded theory, the next step is the articulation of its theoretical orientation. For Crotty (1998) a theoretical perspective or orientation is a ‘philosophical stance’ that articulates the assumptions made about the social world by a particular research methodology. However, the integration of critical theoretical perspectives to grounded theory is the most problematic component of the development of critical grounded theory. This is because of the risks that articulating theoretical perspectives pose to grounding theory in the data. Consequently, theoretical perspectives that maintain an open stance to the critical emancipatory role must underpin critical grounded theory. In other words, it is not possible to pre-determine the underlying theoretical perspectives of a critical grounded theory.

Rather, the theoretical orientation that is applied to a critical grounded theory must emerge out of the data. This requires a broad based knowledge of the scope of critical theory that can then be accessed at significant junctures in the research process. The critical tradition spans from Marx (1818-1883) to Habermas (1929- ) to Honneth (1949-), and takes in Foucault (1926-1984) and Freire (1921-1997). It has spawned critical orientations to the traditional foci of gender, race and class (Harvey, 2011; Johnson & Christensen, 2008), and the more contemporary foci of democracy, geopolitical power, economic leverage and information warfare (Kinchloe & McLaren, 2008). Amongst this cacophony of critical theorists and theoretical orientations, there is any number of potentially useful perspectives for critical grounded theory, and as such, is also useful for this study.

Furthermore, maintaining an open stance also necessitates a twofold approach to the integration of critical theoretical perspectives with critical grounded theory. Firstly, critical orientations need to be pursued in the formulation of the research question. Secondly, critical orientations need to be revisited when constructing meaning from and drawing conclusions about the emerging grounded...
theory. At both of these points, the integration of critical perspectives is achieved by formulating a critical orientation, founded in the work of one or more critical theorists, in light of the social contexts encountered. Consequently, the critical theoretical perspectives that facilitate the design of the research question could prove to be quite different from those used when articulating conclusions.

In the formulation of the question for this study, theoretical perspectives based on the work of Marx (1971), Giddens (1991), Bourdieu (2010) and Habermas (2003) have been considered and subsequently rejected as they represent a disconnect with one or more of the key features of the contemporary context of teacher education. While Marxist (1971) perspectives on work and production are illustrative of the role of teacher educators in the context of teacher preparation, his emphasis on a revolutionary class-based struggle as the means of emancipation was considered too confrontational (Marx, 1971; Wolff, 2011). Giddens’ (1991) theory of structuration, which identifies the inseparability of social structures and human agency in social change, is also reflected in the context of teacher preparation (Bryant & Jary, 2003). However, its outworking in the conception of life politics, or self-actualisation, dependent upon dialogic democracy is an ambition that does not reflect the hyper-regulation currently being experienced in teacher education (Bryant & Jary, 2003; Giddens, 1991). Bourdieu (1984) extended Marx’s (1971) conception of capital to acknowledge the social and cultural capital present in a particular field, such as the field of teacher education. Yet, Bourdieu’s (2010) emphasis on the role of habitus and the power of socialisation on the embodiment of dispositions frustrates the emancipatory reflexivity needed in the conduct of this study (Bourdieu, 2010; Webb, Schirato & Danaher, 2002). Lastly, Habermas’ (2003) theory of communicative action with its emphasis on ‘action oriented by and toward mutual agreement’ (Outhwaite, 2003), is potentially useful but was considered too narrowly directive to be applied to the development of the research question.

The theoretical perspective that was used in the formation of the research question for this study was based on a ‘Gramsci-Foucault nexus’ (Stoddart, 2005). This nexus employed Gramsci’s (1992) conceptual tools with Foucault’s (1980) analytical ones. Gramsci (1992) worked with Marxist (1971) conceptions of power, culture and work, but conceptualised the role of hegemony (Gramsci, 1992), or ideological domination, that is as much the work of the dominated as the dominator (Jones, 2006). Foucault (1972, 1980) used the analytical tools of language and discourse for local criticism, based in ‘an autonomous, non-centralised’ theorising for the re-appearance of ‘subjugated knowledges’ (Foucault, 1980, p.81). Thus, Gramsci (1992) provided a useful analysis of the ways that hegemony is ‘constructed, maintained, challenged and transformed’ (Jones, 2006; Stoddart, 2005), and Foucault’s (1980) power/knowledge facilitated the application of this to a specific social context, site or situation through the analysis of discourse (Mills, 2003). As such, this nexus was considered useful for considering the knowledge and power relations that have influenced the discursive structures and systems that support and promote various ideological models of teacher preparation. It also allowed for critical theorising about the practices, structures and systems to support the identification of preferred futures for teacher preparation.

Having developed a critical theoretical perspective in the framing of the question, this orientation needs to be set aside in the conduct of the research to facilitate the grounding of theory. Across the phases of the study, critical activity is integrated in the research action, but this action does not assume that the emerging theory would reflect the same theoretical perspectives used in the development of the question. Rather, the outworking of a critical epistemology in the actioning of research methods is used to allow for the emergence of critical perspectives from the data. This is then integrated into the comparative analysis of the emerging grounded theory with critical theory, which reflects a
grounded theory approach to literature (Charmaz, 2006). The emerging grounded theory is compared to critical theoretical perspectives through juxtaposing with the literature in the process of making meaning from the grounded theory. In this way, the critical orientation that frames this study is expanded in the drawing of conclusions. Essentially, what is important in critical grounded theory is not the establishment of a theoretical orientation to be used in its conduct but an acknowledgement that, to remain faithful to the philosophical and methodological requirements of grounded theory, the grounding of the theory in the data must come before the analysis of its connection to critical theory. As such, the critical nature of the research action in critical grounded theory is maintained by the methodological integration of criticality in and with the research methods employed. This approach has integrated in this study through the methods designed to enact a critical grounded theory.

Methods.

When Glaser and Strauss (1967) first published, they stated that they didn’t want to prematurely formulate a tight set of methods for conducting grounded theory as they saw their work ‘as a beginning venture in the development’ (p.1) of the methodology. They did, however, identify a ‘general method of comparative analysis’ (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.1 – italics theirs), and ‘generating a theory from data’ (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 6), as two foundational methodological constructs that are supported by a research process rather than a set of methods. While later texts by Strauss (1987) and the follow-up text by Corbin and Strauss (2008) have set about identifying and describing elaborate research methods with multiple layers of coding and analysis, both Charmaz (2006) and Clarke (2005) have returned to the more open and flexible principles of the original text.

Critical grounded theory, in borrowing the constructive and deconstructive practices of Charmaz (2006) and Clarke (2005), also needs to maintain the core principles and practices of grounded theory through the flexible employment of various research methods while keeping a firm grasp on the dialogical interperspectival reflexivity that is necessary for criticality. This open processual nature of critical grounded theory is applied through the selection of relevant data, sampling for participants, analytic methods, and approaches to theoretical sufficiency.

Critical grounded theory uses ‘theoretical sampling’ (Charmaz, 2006; Clarke, 2005; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to direct the selection of relevant data and participants at the various stages in the process. Theoretical sampling generates a list of potentially useful data sources and participants as a starting point, but then moves from this to purposefully select data and participants in response to the needs of the emerging research process. This means that grounded theory places no restrictions on what counts as data. However, the focus on dialogue in critical grounded theory leans the selection of data and participants towards texts.

In addition, the classical principle of comparative analysis underpins the data analysis practices of critical grounded theory. Comparative analysis requires the continuous collection, coding and memoing of data (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This is then supported reflectively by ‘theoretical sorting’ that seeks to diagram and integrate codes and their memos (Clarke, 2005; Charmaz, 2006). This process has three significant methodological consequences. Firstly, a two-phase coding process is necessary, taking in Charmaz’s (2006) initial and focussed coding, to ground the analysis in the data. Secondly, diagramming using Clarke’s (2005) situational mapping should be used in the analysis of the contextual situations investigated and the nature, strength and power of the relationships at work. Thirdly, two different types of memoing need to be used. Conventional memo-writing in grounded theory is designed to elevate the focussed codes that have emerged from the data to conceptual categories (Charmaz, 2006). The second type of memoing needed for critical grounded
theory requires self-reflective dialogue designed to elucidate interperspectival considerations in order to think critically about emerging categories, concepts and their theoretical consequences.

In bringing a grounded theory process to a conclusion, researchers have traditionally referred to the concept of ‘theoretical saturation’ where the goal is to saturate the emerging categories till no new factors or conceptions of the categories emerge (Charmaz, 2006). This is, however, problematic, particularly in relation to identifying the point at which this has occurred. In contrast, Charmaz (2006) points to Dey’s (1999) conception of ‘theoretical sufficiency’ where the categories that have been ‘suggested by the data’ (Charmaz, 2006, p.114) meet the criteria of ‘credibility, originality, resonance and usefulness’ (Charmaz, 2006, p. 182-183). Critical grounded theory, in maintaining its connections to its fallibilist epistemological foundations, holds to Dey’s (1999) ‘theoretical sufficiency’. This facilitates holding the tension between fitness and workability and theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in determining when a theory has been sufficiently developed.

**ENACTING CRITICAL GROUNDED THEORY**

While a uniquely critical grounded theory has not been widely discussed in the literature and few examples exist, it has been shown that it is possible to articulate its principles and practices philosophically, theoretically and methodologically. The next step in its enactment is to develop a methodological approach to the research process that integrates the actions of the researcher with the principles of both critical and grounded theory. The purpose of this development is to innovate on the work of writers in the fields of both grounded and critical research methodologies whilst maintaining an authenticity to the principles and methods that have been identified as working towards the fit and workability of a critical grounded theory.

In relation to grounded theory, both generally and in the context of this study, the processes of critical grounded theory innovate on the practices of a range of authors; including Glaser and Strauss (1967), Dey (1999), Clarke (2005) and Charmaz (2006). The methods employed across the research process in enacting critical grounded theory through this study build on the foundations of Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) seminal work, with its focus on comparative analysis and theoretical saturation, from a critical standpoint. In doing so, it has integrated methodological practices for sampling, coding, sorting and theorising from Clarke (2005) and Charmaz (2006). Its fit and workability is then judged by reference to Dey’s (1999) theoretical sufficiency that embraces the hypothetical, empirical and fallible nature of knowledge when viewed from a postmodern, critical perspective (Bohman, 2012). As such, the literature in the field of grounded theory has been thoroughly mined for methodological advice for the design of the critical grounded theory as applied to this study. Identifying advice for the design of critical grounded theory out of the critical social research literature was more challenging.

Within the critical paradigm for social and educational research, the tendency for critical research approaches to preselect an emancipatory focus does not lend itself to application to critical grounded theory (Crotty, 1998; Harvey, 2011; Henn, Weinstein & Foard, 2009; Kinchloe & McLaren, 2008). However, one significant exception is Carspecken’s (1996) approach to critical ethnography, which follows ethnographic principles to investigate cultures from the point of view of the subject (Johnson & Christenson, 2008; Punch, 2013). As such, its criticality is driven by the emic voices of the participants in the selected cultural group or context (Carspecken, 1996). In looking beyond the literature of grounded theory for advice about the integration of a critical approach to this study, Carspecken’s (1996) model held the most potential. On one hand, Carspecken (1996) himself argued that his approach had relevance beyond ethnography and had wanted to label his approach ‘Critical
Qualitative Research’ (p.3). On the other, second generation grounded theorists made links between ethnography and grounded theory to provide methodological support for the collection and analysis of qualitative data (Morse et al., 2009). In other words, this literature has served to demonstrate that the philosophical, theoretical and methodological foundations of ethnography and grounded theory are more similar than different and that they might be productively integrated in the design of a research project such as this one.

While the application of various practices for data collection and analysis in grounded theory have been applied to maintain groundedness, the critical nature of this study is achieved by the application of Carspecken’s (1996) methodological sequencing. In his text, Critical Ethnography in Educational Research, Carspecken (1996) outlines ‘five recommended stages for critical qualitative research’ that are ‘meant to generally applicable’ (p.40). For this study, these stages present a broad pattern of investigation designed to lead the researcher to a critical and emancipatory analysis of the selected context. Despite the editorial preference for the label ethnography, in this study it has been applied to the sequencing of critical grounded theory. Carspecken’s (1996) five stages are:

1. **Stage One:** Compiling the primary record
2. **Stage Two:** Preliminary reconstructive analysis
3. **Stage Three:** Dialogical data generation
4. **Stage Four:** Describing system relations
5. **Stage Five:** System relations as explanations of findings (p.43).

The primary record involves a monological dialogue from the researcher in describing the context of the study. Its reconstructive analysis then seeks out the ‘cultural and subjective factors that are largely tacit in nature’ (Carspecken, 1996, p.93) to begin the reconstruction of discourse towards critical interpretations. Generating dialogical data is designed to ‘give participants a voice in the research process’ (Carspecken, 1996, p.155). The analysis thereof then seeks a ‘conceptual framework giving useful sense to the term “social system”’ (Carspecken, 1996, p.172), by both describing and explaining the system relations at work. This sequence of stages was deemed appropriate to develop the research process of critical grounded theory for this study, though not in a literal or linear way, thereby facilitating the critical orientation of the resultant study.
SEQUENCING THE RESEARCH PROCESS IN CRITICAL GROUNDED THEORY

This methodological plan for the application of critical grounded theory to this study uses Carspecken’s (1996) five stages to structure the research process whilst incorporating various grounded theory principles and methods in the details of how to undertake the data collection and analysis. *Figure 3.3 Methodological Sequence,* below, provides a diagrammatic representation of the sequencing of Carspecken’s (1996) five stages and the integration of Clarke (2005) and Charmaz (2006) in the data processes across the phases and stages of this study. This approach determined that this study would include three key phases: (i) situating the study, (ii) investigating the historical context, and (iii) investigating the contemporary context. These phases culminated in a concluding stage that integrated Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) comparative analysis with Carspecken’s (1996) explaining of system relations.

*Figure 3.3 Methodological Sequence*

The first phase of this sequence integrated Carspecken’s (1996) first and second stages, compiling a primary record and preliminary reconstructive analysis, and served as an initial review of both the literature and the context of the study. The primary record accessed included historical and contemporaneous literature and policy in relation to the processes and practices of teacher preparation. This phase interrogated the context of teacher education with an emphasis on the processes and practices of teacher preparation. It situated understandings of context in the discourses of both research and policy, outlining the accepted patterns of action in and thinking about the context in the literature to date. This was then used in the preparation of Chapter 2. The reconstructive analysis of these discourses called into question the accepted wisdom of the historical stories told about teacher education and concluded with the critical framing of the research question. This framing of the question used a Gramsci-Foucault nexus (Stoddart, 2005) that gave impetus to the re-analysis of the historical context using conceptions from Marxist (1971), ethnohistorical, narrative and postmodern historiography (Green & Troup, 1999).

Carspecken’s (1996) stages three and four were then completed twice across two distinct phases. Phase two focussed on dialogical data and system relations in the historical Australian context and
Phase three repeated this in the contemporary international context. While the stages occurred sequentially, in that stage three occurred before stage four, the two phases did not. That is, the processes involved in the collection and analysis of data in the historical and contemporary phases overlapped throughout. What was key to the completion of these two phases was the reconstructive analysis of the systemic factors through the collection and analysis of dialogical data for the purpose of theorising system relations as evident in each context.

Phase two of this study related to the historical context and concluded with reconstructive theorising of the systemic processes of change and continuity. In this phase, Carspecken’s (1996) stage three involved the generation and analysis of dialogical data. This involved the construction of historical stories of teacher preparation that were analysed using Clarke’s (2005) deconstructive discourse analysis processes. The outcomes of this dialogical data generation and its continuing reconstructive analysis are reported in Chapter 4. Stage four, from Carspecken (1996), theorised change and continuity as a social process that served to describe the system relations at work in the selected historical stories. The resulting theoretical model of change and continuity as a social process was articulated and is reported in Chapter 5.

Phase three involved interactions with leading teacher educators from across contemporary international contexts and repeated the generation of dialogical data and description of systemic relations (stages three and four). Data was collected by means of interviews and Charmaz’s (2006) constructive approach to analysis was applied. The analysis involved dialogical processes that traversed international jurisdictions to theorise about the system relation at work in the context of change and continuity. Again, this resulted in a theoretical model of change and continuity in social context that is reported in Chapter 6.

The culminating stage in Carspecken’s (1996) model was used to conclude this study and is reported in Chapter 7. This involved a comparative analysis, following the processes of Glaser and Strauss (1967), of the theoretical models that emerged out of the two main phases of this study. This commenced with the comparative analysis of the core categories across each model that resulted in the construction of an integrated model of a social approach to change and continuity. It then explored the meanings and discourses of all three of these theoretical models of change and continuity in relation to the four critical concepts integrated into the research question; namely, paradigms, change and continuity, knowledge/power relations, and futures for teacher education. This concluding process moved the study beyond a description of system relations to construct an explanation that can be used in the application of the emancipatory role for critical social research (Foucault, 1980; Harvey, 2011).

**Research Methods across the Phases of Critical Grounded Theory**

The final process in articulating the application of critical grounded theory to this study involved the identification and description of the methods that were used to select data sources and participants, collect and analyse the data and then report findings. Across the three phases data selection involved purposive identification of salient text and participants, data collection included literature searches and interviews, and data analysis employed critical discourse analysis, coding, mapping and memoing. The resulting findings were reported through the identification of the research question; presentation of situational and positional maps and theoretical models; articulation of both the substantive and comparative theoretical models; and interperspectival reflection on the meaning of the analysis to the research question.
Selection of texts, stories and participants.

The selection of data sources across this study involved the finding and selection of relevant literature and texts in phases one and two and the identification of potential interview participants for phase three. The processes used at each phase followed the practices of purposive sampling as applied in grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Johnson & Christenson, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), to ensure the usefulness of texts and participants to the purpose of the research question. Purposive sampling involves the selection of text and participants based on their capacity to usefully respond to the research question. It facilitates the validity and reliability of the findings by contributing to fit and workability by ensuring that the data collected is directly related and relevant to the purposes of the study.

Selecting texts for situating the investigation.

Phase one, situating the investigation, involved the development of a primary record of the context of teacher preparation. The scope of this primary record situated the contemporary Australian context in teacher preparation in the historical national and contemporary international contexts. It considered the sociocultural context of teacher preparation within various providers and the nature and role of teacher educators as the primary workers in those contexts. In doing so, it took on the role of an initial literature review, which is used in grounded theory to contextualise the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Hartas, 2010; Johnson & Christenson, 2008). As such, this phase was based on a thorough search and review of the literature that included reports of research, historical texts, newspaper articles, legislation and policy documentation.

Selecting texts for investigating the historical context.

In phase two of the study, the selection of stories to be used in the generation of dialogical data about the historical context of teacher preparation required a much more complex process. This involved clarifying the scope of the contexts to be interrogated to identify stories that could be used as micro-narratives. The framing of the research question describes the context of the study as teacher preparation. This is, however, problematic in light of the breadth of global and historical offering of teacher preparation outlined in Chapter 2. As such, it was necessary to identify specific stories that could be used to provide focus and clarity to the interrogation of change and continuity. The selection process involved identifying a productive historical time period in the Australian context that would facilitate the identification of stories from which relevant data could be generated.

The broad story of teacher preparation as described in Chapter 2 is one of change and continuity that has shifted backwards and forwards in terms of a wide range of factors. However, this phase of the study needed to focus on changes and continuities that were paradigmatic in nature. For this to happen the purposive selection of the historical period to be interrogated needed to include paradigmatic change and continuity. Historically, paradigmatic change was identified when changes occurred to the length or level of teacher preparation offered. It was assumed that increases in either the quantity (length) or quality (level) of teacher preparation would result in a superior model with consequent improvement in the preparedness of propaedeutic teachers. While no systematic empirical studies appear to have been undertaken to confirm this assumption, the research and work of historically situated teacher educators did not question it. Despite the problematic nature of this assumption, it remains a useful tool for making judgements about the development of teacher preparation within the historical context. That is, the durability of the assumption over the entire story, the lack of contradictory evidence to deny it and its role as a historically-situated truth claim lend weight to its usefulness. Thus, the selected historical time period needed to incorporate...
significant evidence of paradigmatic changes and continuities as evidenced by modifications to either the length or level of teacher preparation.

Across the story of teacher preparation in the Australian context, the two key drivers of paradigmatic change and continuity were shown to be the participants involved and the socio-cultural circumstances surrounding the context. While the ideologies held by various participants were relatively consistent, the influence of the ideological position taken was always tempered by external factors. The types of circumstances that impacted upon teacher preparation include both local and global political, economic, social or cultural events and circumstances (Hyams, 1979). These included wars, depressions, gold rushes and other economic booms, population growth and its geographical distribution. As such, periods of political and economic unrest had a destabilising influence on teacher preparation and maximised practical and discursive activity surrounding change and continuity. Thus, an analysis of the history of teacher preparation through the lens of sociocultural contexts and events was identified as the most productive method for identifying contexts where the systemic relations underlying changes and continuities could be most clearly identified for the purpose of critical analysis.

In order to achieve this, the story of teacher preparation needed to be revisited in terms of the broad pattern of sociocultural influences that impacted upon the story. Following the depression of the 1890s, the reinvigoration of the economic fortunes of the colonies alongside federation in 1901 saw education and as a consequence teacher preparation move into a significant period of growth (Hyams, 1979; Macintyre, 2009). By the 1920s, and despite the interruption of the Great War, the states had committed to the provision of a primary education as the minimum for all students and then supported this with the establishment of further education. By this time, all three models of teacher preparation had been established and were offered somewhere within the Australian context. However, the otherwise steady increases in the length and level of teacher preparation came to an abrupt halt in the 1930s and then largely stagnated right up until the end of the 1950s. A crisis of quantity ensued as the states were not able to employ sufficient numbers of qualified teachers. As this crisis abated across the 1950s to 1960s, the development of teacher preparation toward a university-based education as a minimum standard was reimagined as a means to improve the quality of teacher preparation. From 1972 federal intervention led to autonomy and exclusivity of teacher preparation inside higher education and further federally initiated developments in tertiary education across the 1970s and 1980s resulted in teacher preparation becoming the exclusive domain of higher education.

This brief analysis of the sociocultural influences on the history of teacher preparation showed that teacher preparation regularly experienced a decline in political and economic support as a result of circumstances beyond the domain of education. Crisis events, particularly those where several issues combined, maximised the likelihood and intensity of the responses of the political and bureaucratic power brokers on the processes and practices of teacher preparation. These times of crisis most effectively illustrate the nature of systemic relations and can be usefully employed in critiquing their outworking. As such, the period between 1930 and 1950 was identified as the most productive period of crisis in the provision of teacher preparation in the Australian context as it was dramatically influenced by the sociocultural, political and economic implications of the Great Depression, World War 2 and the beginning of the baby boom. Furthermore, all models of teacher preparation had been established and were active in the Australian context during this historical period. The responses to crises and resultant consequences for teacher preparation in the various states were also sufficiently different to be useful in the process of developing state-based micro-narratives across more than one context that could then be comparatively analysed.
Selecting participants for investigating the contemporary context.

Finally, phase three required the selection of participants for an interview process that was again used to generate dialogical data for the purpose of describing system relations. This time the focus of the data to be generated was on contemporary international contexts in teacher preparation. The purpose was to access dialogical data from a range of international contexts that might be usefully applied to understanding of and action in teacher preparation in the Australian context. As such, criteria were set for the purposive sampling of potential participants. After the setting of these criteria, potential participants were identified from the literature that was used in the completion of phase one. Email invitations to participate were sent to a number of identified teacher educators. From these invitations, five interested participants that matched the criteria were selected for interviewing.

There were three key criteria used in the selection of participants. Firstly, all participants were selected on the basis of holding a professional identity as a teacher educator. The marginalisation of the emic voices of teacher educators and the consequences thereof in the story of teacher preparation were established in Chapter 2. Given the significance of these voices to the emancipatory role of critical grounded theory (Freire, 1972), it was determined that the dialogical data needed to be generated out of the emic voices of teacher educators as both the primary participants and experts in teacher education. Secondly, the teacher educators were selected on the basis of leadership in the field. Leadership was determined on the basis of long-term participation, holding a position of leadership and recognition through publication as an expert in the field of teacher education. Thirdly, participants were selected from international jurisdictions that were identified as potentially instructive to the processes and practices of the Australian context. This meant that the focus was on jurisdictions with expectations comparable or higher than those of teacher preparation in Australia and sociocultural, political and economic contextual similarities. With this in mind, invitations to participate were sent to a range of participants in the United Kingdom, Europe, North America and New Zealand.

Methods of data collection.

Having selected the texts, stories and participants that were to be investigated across the three phases of this study, the second key set of research methods employed involved the collection of the necessary data. Again, the processes and practices employed varied according to the requirements at each phase. They were, however, guided by the principles of purposive sampling (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and theoretical sufficiency (Dey, 1999; Charmaz, 2006). Theoretical sufficiency is defined as, ‘the stage at which categories seem to cope adequately with new data’ (Dey, 1999, p.117). That is, the data collection processes continued up until the point where it appeared that any new data was not generating any further ‘extensions and modifications’ to the analytical categories being theorised out of the data (Dey, 1999, p.117).

Collecting data for situating the investigation.

For phase one, the data collection processes used literature searches used to identify literature relevant to constructing a primary record of the context of teacher preparation in relation to change and continuity. This involved the identification of key topics and words to be used across a range of library databases. In order to maximise the texts identified in relation to teacher education, the terms used included teacher education, teacher educators, initial teacher education, teacher training and teacher preparation. The available literature was then purposively narrowed by the identification of texts that included the topics of history, models, paradigms, providers, politics and regulation. In line with the process of snowball sampling (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011), the bibliographies and reference lists in relevant texts were then used to identify other useful pieces of literature.
Collecting data for investigating the historical context.

In phase two, the data collection process involved the generation of data through the writing of micro-narratives that told state-based stories from the selected historical period. Two supportive questions were designed to provide focus to data collection in this phase of the study. These were:

- How have structures and systems influenced paradigmatic change in teacher preparation in the Australian context? and;
- What knowledge and power relationships have been established, promoted and maintained by these change processes?

The data collection then involved a two-part process that combined the identification of the stories with the highest levels of paradigmatic change responses to the sociocultural context of the selected historical period with the availability of the required historical texts. Both of these processes were framed by literature searches designed to identify texts written by teacher educators that specifically focussed on state-based histories of teacher preparation. As such, the data collection process involved searching for and reviewing suitable texts from each state and the selecting and constructing relevant micro-narrative.

As with the selection of interview participants, the emic voices of teacher educators were used in the telling of the micro-narratives. In seeking to develop historically situated descriptions of systemic relations, narrative and ethnohistorical practices placed the emphasis on emic voices. In order to facilitate the use of emic voices, the selection of historical texts required that they be written by individuals that would have been recognised as insiders or teacher educators at the time when they were writing. This was taken to include members of the staff or faculty of a teachers’ college or university or a student studying with an education faculty. The key texts identified in each state have been listed in Table 3.1 Key Historical Texts in Teacher Preparation, below.

### Table 3.1. Key Historical Texts in Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>N.R. Anderson</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A History of Teacher Training in Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>E. Sweetman</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>History of the Melbourne Teachers’ College and its Predecessors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>B. Tabor</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>A History of the Preservice Education and Training of State School Teachers in South Australia 1945-1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. McGuire</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pupil Teachers and Junior Teachers in South Australian Schools 1873 to 1965: An Historical and Humanistic Sociological Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>D. Mossenson</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>A History of Teacher Training in Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Gardiner</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The Study of Education at the University of Western Australia 1916-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>E.G. Nichol</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>History of Teacher Training in Tasmania to 1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having suitable texts to be used in the generation of possible micro-narratives, a review of these texts was undertaken to identify the nature of the stories told about each state. This was also aligned with Turner’s (1940) comparative analysis of teacher preparation across all Australian states at the close of the 1930s. The evidence collect by Turner (1940) indicates that the standard of teacher preparation in relation to the models and lengths of preparation offered varied significantly from state to state. The worst scenario was found in Queensland where one-year training courses had only recently
overtaken the pupil teacher system. In contrast, both New South Wales and South Australia were lauded for offering courses up to four years in duration that combined professional studies at the teachers’ college with academic studies at the university. In between, both Tasmania and Victoria were criticised in relation to the negative impact of state-based control of teacher preparation. In Tasmania the retention of a ‘pre-college period of training’ (Turner 1943, p.456), ostensibly for the purpose of workforce management, and the lack of college facilities were the main issues. Victoria, on the other hand, was condemned for its over-emphasis on a narrow, college-based model of training that failed to involve propaedeutic teachers in the development of a sound general education. Issues of distance prevented a thorough investigation of the situation in Western Australia, though the data available indicated that there was a range of training courses, from six-months to four-years, for different types of teachers. While some were afforded participation at the university, the vast majority of teachers were enrolled in the shortest courses.

Having identified Turner’s (1940) survey as a benchmark, the next step in the process was to identify how these situations had changed or continued through the 50s and into the 60s. The purpose was to identify the stories with the most interesting or dramatic responses to the sociocultural context of the time. Unfortunately, another comparative survey does not exist and so the texts listed in Table 3.1 were used to piece the scenario together. By the 1950s, the situation in Queensland, New South Wales and South Australia had changed incrementally towards longer and higher levels of preparation for teachers. The teacher preparation offered in Queensland still lagged significantly behind the other states and with the re-introduction of an ‘emergency scheme’ reminiscent of the pupil-teacher system was effectively even worse (Anderson 1960, p.110; quoting Queensland Parliamentary Papers 1950-1951, pp.651-652). However, in New South Wales this meant the continuation and incremental development of teacher preparation that was already at a comparatively higher standard than other states (Turney & Taylor, 1996). This included the continuation of collaborative engagement with the university alongside increases in the variety, types and lengths of courses offered through the teachers’ college (University of Sydney, 2013a, 2013b). In South Australia, the junior teacher system that had been re-instated as a result of the Great Depression continued, though unlike Queensland it preceded a period of college-based training, but development continued at a university level (McGuire, 1999; Tabor 1979).

In contrast, the three other states had witnessed some interesting changes in relation to the development of teacher preparation. In Tasmania, the union or Teachers’ Federation had successfully argued for all teachers to receive a university education (Fist, 1993). As such, Tasmania was the first state to commit to teacher education as the standard for teacher preparation (Hyams, 1979; Fist, 1993). While the Hobart Teachers’ College was transferred to the University of Tasmania for the purpose in 1948, the commitment to university-based preparation was undermined by the launch of the Emergency Training Centre in Launceston (Fist, 1993). The staffing crisis that had prompted the emergency continued into the 1950s with the consequence that teacher preparation in Tasmania became a story of two halves (Fist, 1993; Nichol, 1969). In the north the department offered propaedeutic teachers expedient one-year training courses for at least half of the 1950s, while in the south they were able to enrol in a three-year degree program at the University of Tasmania.

The situation in Victoria had seen a reversal of the fortunes of teacher preparation. While the education faculty remained in the University of Melbourne (Macintyre & Selleck, 2003), its involvement in teacher preparation had been eroded to a fraction of its former influence (Garden, 1982). The education department continued to offer short and narrowly practical courses for primary teachers through the Melbourne Teachers’ College and had also established the Secondary Teachers’
College, which offered a similar course for secondary teaching (Garden, 1982; Turner, 1940). While the university continued to offer a four-year program that included a Diploma after a Bachelor’s degree, it was no longer the only pathway to secondary teaching and the numbers taking this route were small when compared with student numbers at the teachers’ colleges (Garden, 1982; Macintyre & Selleck, 2003).

As in Victoria, the situation in Western Australia represented a reversal in the fortunes of teacher preparation. However, in this situation the reversal represented a significant increase in the role for the university in teacher preparation (Gardiner, 2004). While the union in Western Australia had taken the opposite stance from that in Tasmania by consistently calling for teacher preparation to remain the responsibility of the education department (Mossenson, 1955), the key innovations in teacher preparation occurred at the university level (McKenzie, 1981). These innovations included establishing a faculty, offering both undergraduate and graduate studies, developing a profile in educational research and commencing a journal (Gardiner, 2004).

Within the time period of the 1930s to 1950s these three state-based stories were identified as meeting the criteria for the generation of micro-narratives to be used as data in the second phase of this study. While any of the states could have provided a potentially productive context, the paradigmatic changes and continuities in the Tasmanian, Victorian and Western Australian contexts were identified as the most likely to illuminate systemic relations. While the data collection process identified three potentially useful stories, only two stories were included in the study. The first two stories written were those relating to Victoria and Western Australia. These stories have been included, alongside their analysis, in Chapter 4. These stories were selected first because of the ready availability of two key texts in each of these contexts. In Victoria these texts were:

- Sweetman (1939), *History of the Melbourne Teachers’ College and Its Predecessors*; and

The two Western Australian texts were:

- Mossenson (1955), *A History of Teacher Training in Western Australia*; and

While three of these texts were ostensibly about the training of teachers, they all also discussed the relationship with the university and pupil teacher systems in significant detail. As such, these texts provided access to emic discourses about the apprenticeship, training and education models of teacher preparation.

The story of Tasmania was initially held in reserve because of difficulties with locating suitable texts. The one available text was First’s (1993) *Gladly Teach: A History of the Launceston Teachers’ College 1948-1972*. While it provided considerable insights into the contexts and circumstances of the education department’s northern training facilities, it was, by its nature, silent about the teacher education being offered concurrently by the University of Tasmania. As such, only half of the Tasmanian story was represented therein. A second text was accessed, Nichol’s (1969) thesis, *History of Teacher Training in Tasmania to 1968*. While this did contain some details relating to the Hobart Teachers’ College, Philip Smith Teachers’ Training College and the University of Tasmania in Hobart, the discussion was brief. Ultimately though, the Tasmanian story was omitted from the study on the basis of theoretical sufficiency. That is, the comparative analysis of the discourse analyses conducted on the two substantive cases of Victoria and Western Australia resulted in extensively described categories that were further elaborated by the initial review and analysis of the Tasmanian story.
Collecting data for investigating the contemporary context.

Lastly, the collection of data in the third phase of this study involved interviews with leading teacher educators. These interviews were conducted face to face with the selected participants within, or as close as possible to, their own context over a period of three months. The use of experts in an academic field meant that ethical clearance to conduct interviews was not necessarily required. Despite this, ethical clearance was gained for the conduct of the interviews and all participants were provided with participant information and consent forms as provided in Appendix 1. All participants consented to participating in the interview and provided evidence thereof. While all participants indicated that they were happy to be named if necessary, the means of reporting that has been used has maintained the anonymity of the participants. In total, seven individual and one group interview were conducted. The seven individual interviews included two trial interviews with Australian teacher educators and five interviews with international participants; one each in the United Kingdom, Europe and New Zealand and two in North America. The group interview was conducted with European participants who were colleagues from a single institution.

The interviews were recorded using audio devices and then transcribed by the researcher. Notes were also taken during each interview and reflective interperspectival memos were written in between them. An interview protocol, which incorporated three core questions, was developed and refined through two trial interviews with Australian teacher educators. The three questions were:

- What are the main principles of teacher preparation currently at work in ... (enter name of country/state)?
- What new principles or practices in teacher preparation are emerging in ... ?
- What would you consider to be the foundational or critical principles and practices of a preferred future for teacher preparation?
  - If you were able to develop teacher preparation in ... unhindered, what would you like to do or to see happen?
  - How might quality be assured in your preferred future for teacher preparation?
  - How might relationships with other organisations and bodies be involved?

These questions were used to broadly frame each of the interviews, though additional questions were asked in each interview. These additional questions sought to clarify and expand participants’ responses and to explore the emerging issues being reflected upon through the interperspectival memos. In this way, the simultaneous practice of data collection and analysis that is typical to grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was used to build up emergent themes or categories across the interviews.

Methods of data analysis.

The third and final key set of research methods in critical grounded theory involved the analysis of the data. In line with the practices of grounded theory, these analytical processes were undertaken alongside the collection of data in order to facilitate the grounding of theory in the data through theoretical sufficiency (Dey, 1999; Charmaz, 2006). The critical nature of the data analysis was maintained through the focus provided by the research question and the integration of interperspectival reflexivity with the analytic processes (Bohman, 2012; Crotty, 1998). While the analysis processes in each phase of the study differed in response to the types of data that was collected, the conventional practices of grounded theory were used across the phases. The methods integrated into this study included coding, memo-writing and theoretical sorting (Charmaz, 2006). While the analytical conventions of grounded theory were used throughout the study, there was a clear delineation between the practices used in the first phase as compared to the other two phases.
Analysing the data for situating the investigation.

Data analysis in phase one followed the practices of thoroughly reviewing the literature to construct a record of the contemporary context to be reconstructively analysed in order to generate a critically focussed research question. As such, it was a precursor to rather than a part of the theorising undertaken in this study. It required that the analysis of the literature worked towards building an understanding of teacher preparation using the literature to construct a critical review of current perspectives that could then be considered in the light of relevant theoretical conceptions. This followed a pathway that progressively refined the focus of the study through an exploration of the literature that was prompted by reflective memo writing. The outworking of this process is evident in the sequencing of the contextual analysis outlined in Chapter 2. The integration of a critical reconstructive turn in this process lead to the employment of both historiography and futures studies to the reading of the literature. This culminated in the development of the research question out of the analysis of the influence of alternative historiographies on the reading of the historical context.

Data analysis for investigating the historical and contemporary contexts.

In comparison, data analysis in phases two and three followed the practices of grounded theory in a more conventional manner. This incorporated a three-part process of coding, memo writing and theoretical sorting that ran concurrently rather than sequentially in each phase. In both phases they culminated in the construction of a model and descriptions of the systemic relations it theorised. While all three of these processes were present in both phases, their outworking varied in response to the different types of data that was collected. The interview data collected in the third phase was analysed using Charmaz’s (2006) practices that were reflective of Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) original work in grounded theory. For phase two the use of text-based data prompted the integration of Clarke’s (2005) discourse analysis tools with Charmaz’s (2006) analytical practices.

Coding is the foundational process in the generation of theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Dey, 1999). Its purpose is to ‘define what is happening’ and to ‘grapple with what it means’ (Charmaz, 2006, p.45). The original description of coding provided by Glaser and Strauss (1967) was very loose. However, later descriptions of coding processes have provided significantly more detail. Corbin and Strauss (2008) developed open, axial and selective coding, which can become fragmented and constraining of the flexibility required to ground theory in the data (Dey, 1999). Charmaz (2006) steps back from this framework to suggest a two-part coding process, initial and focussed coding. Initial coding involves the assigning of codes as names or labels to chunks of data using gerunds (Charmaz, 2006). It involves a close examination to assign meaning at the level of words, lines or segments. Focussed coding compares initial codes in order to, ‘capture, synthesize and understand the main themes’ emerging from the data (Charmaz, 2006, p.59). It identifies the emerging categories that lead to the construction of a grounded theory.

This study integrated Charmaz’s (2006) two-step coding process, though their application was quite different. In phase two the coding of the data used Clarke’s (2005) discourse analysis through situational and positional maps. The situational maps played the role of initial coding while the positional maps took the analysis into focussed coding in each of the substantive contexts of the two micro-narratives. The outcomes of this analysis of historical discourses are reported in Chapter 4. For each story this includes the telling of a micro-narrative that was constructed out of the data followed by the presentation and analysis of the situational and positional maps. For both stories these maps were initially constructed by hand prior to being converted to a digital format.
In contrast, the initial coding in phase three involved a line-by-line analysis of each interview transcript where discrete chunks of data were identified and then labelled using a gerund. Focussed coding then used comparative sorting for the construction of focussed codes and categories. This involved the manual manipulation of data chunks and their initial codes followed by the digitising of focussed codes and categories using Microsoft Excel. For each of the five international interviews a separate spread sheet was constructed with the interview transcript separated into data chunks that were then coded with an initial code, focussed code and category. Table 3.2, below, provides an example of a single category from one interview.

Table 3.2. Example of Initial and Focussed Coding of Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GRAB</th>
<th>INITIAL CODE</th>
<th>FOCUSED CODE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You can’t, because this can be an isolated process which you do with your students, neglecting the fact that you are working within the community of a school, that school is part of a community which is wider, um, than the schools bit it’s, it’s the neighbourhood and the environment. Aarr, which is part of, um, aarr, an academic and scientific community where you should be part of being involved, informed by and maybe contribute to.</td>
<td>Teaching needs to be contextualised within social, cultural, economic, environmental and academic communities</td>
<td>Education happens at the intersection of multiple contexts</td>
<td>CULTURAL FIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um, yes, um, I think that it’s part of [identifying term removed] culture, um, we are very much a culture which is focussed on trying to create consensus and, aarr, trying to be proactive.</td>
<td>Adapting the culture of the community proactively</td>
<td>School culture needs to be developed to support the goals and purposes of teacher education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, I think there are some, um, some issues in this. One of them is, um, if you are educating teachers to the Masters level but if they are just coming to school and doing the same thing as all the other teachers, then, um, why should there be Masters? So if there, within many schools in [identifying name removed] there is a lack of culture focussed on, aarr, more academic or elaborate approach to the teaching profession and that really is, aarr, is a problem.</td>
<td>Developing school cultures that support and facilitate the work of teacher with Master’s level capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But if those teachers coming into schools who don’t have a professional culture and who stay within that primary isolated role, aarr, you can’t expect teachers who have been educated in that narrow primary role to extend that role out of themselves in a context that doesn’t stimulate that.</td>
<td>Developing secondary roles in school contexts depends on those things being a focus in the school culture; which doesn’t always happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but also to involve their teachers in practice-based research groups. So that’s also quite an interesting development at this moment in [identifying name removed], putting more and more the focus on the teacher as researchers.</td>
<td>Involving teachers in research-based communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how can we stimulate in school cultures the development of that secondary role?</td>
<td>Stimulating school cultures to place more emphasis on secondary roles for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s a quite interesting development and that connects also with the development focussed on Master programs for teaching because that also strengthens, very much, the research focus.</td>
<td>Strengthening the focus on research through Master’s level study and school culture development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and it’s how schools focus on it because that’s what’s wrong. We have to have, aarr, well-qualified teachers and in the schools there is no culture of professional development, of challenging teachers on, aarr, research outcomes, etc, etc. Everything is focussed on, once you are a teacher, then you are a perfect teacher and you have the same responsibilities as a teacher who has been in the profession for 25 years. But I think that is an international problem.</td>
<td>Expecting completely competent teachers from the beginning as part of the school culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So that’s one thing, well we can say, well let’s educate all teachers at Masters level but if you don’t do anything about school culture and school organisation, you are just creating problems and frustration.</td>
<td>School cultures can work against the goals and purposes of teacher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking to change school culture in line with the development of teachers’ educational levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GRAB</th>
<th>INITIAL CODE</th>
<th>FOCUSED CODE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think one of the problems we are facing in [identifying name removed], and I think it is in many countries, that we treat the teaching profession as a profession where you have, which you have to develop during initial teacher education and once you are a teacher you are ready. And that’s the culture, in teacher education we have to prepare them for graduation and then they should be perfect teachers.</td>
<td>Treating the profession as a two-step process; preparation then teaching.</td>
<td>Working within traditional conceptions of school culture frustrating for Master’s level teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um, and the research on, um, teachers who are involved in one of these Masters programs, um, the extent in which they can practice the competencies they develop within the schools. It is a Masters program but it is focussing very much on the leadership of teachers but there is no leadership culture in schools. so, um, many teachers who have done this program are frustrated within their school because they don’t have the opportunity to take the role they think they could take.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alongside coding, memo writing was used to progress both the collection and analysis of data as it facilitates the generation of questions and directions to be pursued. It is pivotal to ensuring continuous comparative processes between collecting data and the writing of the emerging grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006). As such, memo writing was used from the outset in this study. Again, this took on a form that reflected that recommended by Charmaz (2006). Charmaz (2006) describes two types of memos, early and advanced memos. Early memos are written early in the analysis process and are designed to further the comparative nature of data collection and analysis by capturing thoughts, ideas and connections. These are distinguished from focussed or advanced memos, which link directly with theorising by taking focussed codes and articulating them to conceptual categories. In this study these two types of memos were used and distinguished as reflective and conceptual memos.

Reflective memos were modelled after Charmaz’s (2006) ‘early memos’ in that they were designed to progress the study. They were purposefully critical in that they pursued interspectival reflexivity when considering the questions and directions for the study. A range of writing and pre-writing techniques was used in the construction of these memos; including free writing, brainstorming, diagramming, clustering and note making. A notebook was kept throughout the study for this purpose, though memos were also written on whatever was available from napkins to whiteboards. Where necessary photographs were used to keep records of memos. Figures 3.4 and 3.5, below, are photographs of examples of reflective memos. *Figure 3.4 Example of Reflective Memo Using Writing Strategies* has been photographed from a notebook. It shows an early critical reflection upon the conditions of the core social process of negotiation that emerged out of phase two of this study. *Figure 3.5 Example of Reflective Memo Using Brainstorming* shows a brainstorm that reflected interspectively on the issues that were emerging during the collection and transcription of the interview data during the third phase of the study.
Conceptual memos were used to facilitate the abstraction of focussed codes into categories. Across both phase two and three these were structured around the five components of a category identified by Charmaz (2006). These were its definition; properties and dimensions; conditions of emergence, maintenance and change; consequences; and relationships with other categories (Charmaz, 2006). All conceptual memos were planned, drafted, written and edited digitally. In phase two, conceptual memos were written for each of the five categories that emerged from the theoretical sorting described below. These were then used in the preparation of Chapter 5. An example memo relating to the core category of ‘negotiation’ has been included as Appendix 2.
Then in phase three, conceptual memos were developed at two different levels of abstraction. Firstly, conceptual memos were developed as the culminating activity in the analysis of each interview. Each of these memos involved the construction of a diagrammatic model of the focussed codes and categories alongside descriptive analyses of the categories and codes. An example conceptual memo of an interview analysis has been included in Appendix 3. This example was taken from the same participant as the exemplar coding provided in Table 3.2. Secondly, conceptual memos were prepared for the categories that emerged from theoretical sorting, described below, that resulted from the comparative analysis of the interviews. An example memo relating to the category of ‘influences on the field of teacher education’ has been included in Appendix 4.

The final methodological process in the analysis of data involved theoretical sorting. Theoretical sorting is the process of constructing a grounded theory through the sorting of categories that have emerged from the initial and focussed coding (Charmaz, 2006). As the categories are analysed through coding and memo writing, tentative analytical categories and their properties and dimensions emerge. These become increasingly theoretical as further levels of sorting and memo writing are completed. In phase two this involved the theoretical sorting of the elements of the micro-narrative, the perspectives that framed the positional maps, and the positions identified on the maps. In phase three the focussed codes from the interviews were compared and theoretically sorted. As such, this final level of abstraction used the micro-narratives and interviews as substantive cases in abstracting towards grounded theory. In each case the process of theoretical sorting led to the development of a diagrammatic theoretical model and the articulation of its categories as a means of describing systemic relations. The first of these theoretical models, relating to the historical context of teacher preparation, has been included in Chapter 5. The second, constructed out of interviews in the contemporary context, is reported in Chapter 6.

PRESENTING THE OUTCOMES OF CRITICAL GROUNDED THEORY

This chapter has articulated the philosophical, theoretical and methodological principles of critical grounded theory and then applied these to the design of the research process developed for this study. Sequentially, this has incorporated a three-phase study process that has integrated with the five stages of Carspecken’s (1996) critical ethnography. Methodologically, the core practices of grounded theory as described in Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) original treatise have been employed through the application of Charmaz’s (2006) constructive and Clarke’s (2005) deconstructive analytical tools. As such, the research design has sought to integrate critical theory with grounded theory throughout.

The grounded theorising that has emerged across this research process is reported across the remaining chapters. As a result of the integration of both Clarke (2005) and Charmaz (2006) in the analytical processes of phase two, the findings have been separated across two chapters. Chapter 4 includes the state-based micro-narratives that were constructed from the textual data and then their deconstructive analysis using Clarke’s (2005) mapping tools. This is then followed up in Chapter 5 with the presentation and description of the theoretical model that emerged from the comparative analysis and theoretical sorting of the analysis of the two stories. Chapter 6 then shifts the focus to the third phase of the study and the interviews conducted in the contemporary context. Given the seamless use of Charmaz’s (2006) coding, memo-writing and theoretical sorting, this phase was reported in one step. As such, Chapter 6 presents and describes the theoretical model that emerged from the comparative analysis and theoretical sorting of the interview data.
CHAPTER 4: AN ANALYSIS OF NARRATIVES IN THE STORY OF TEACHER PREPARATION

The methodological process developed for this study incorporates three distinct phases in critical grounded theory for the purpose of interrogating the key research question; How might emerging paradigms for teacher education respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future? The first phase involved the development of a primary record of the context of the study culminating in the specification of the research question, discussed in Chapter 2, and the structuring of the other two phases of the study, as explained in Chapter 3. The second phase, as discussed in this chapter and then Chapter 5, was developed to investigate the historical content. It was designed to identify and then describe how orthodoxies and hegemonies have worked to maintain unjust or inequitable systems within changes and continuities in teacher preparation. The third phase then took the investigation into contemporary contexts. It used a dialogical process designed to reframe system relations through the empowerment of the counter-hegemonic voices of teacher educators, as discussed in Chapter 6.

The second phase of this study, investigating the historical context, focussed on the identification, articulation and critical analysis of hegemonic relations in the historical processes and practices of teacher preparation. The two supportive questions designed to provide focus to this second phase of the study were:

- How have structures and systems influenced paradigmatic change and continuity in teacher preparation in the Australian context? and
- What knowledge and power relationships have been established, promoted and maintained by these change processes?

These questions facilitated a historically situated analysis of the relationships between knowledge and power, and how the systems and structures teacher educators work with and in have been shaped by political and educational ideologies and discourses. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the findings from the use of Clarke’s (2005) deconstructive analytical processes to construct and then deconstruct stories from teacher educators’ discourses about the two historical contexts selected for this phase of the study. Chapter 5 then theorises the core social processes at work in these discourses using Charmaz’s (2006) constructive analytical processes.

CONSTRUCTING AND DECONSTRUCTING THE NARRATIVES

The discussion of the context of teacher preparation in Chapter 2 demonstrated that the operation of teacher preparation in the contemporary Australian context is a product of its history. As such, the phase two data analysis articulated in this chapter and the next interrogates the historical context of teacher preparation. The purpose of this analysis is to conduct in a critical reading of this history that stands in contrast to the conventional interpretations reported in Chapter 2. This is not, however, an historical study or analysis but a critical investigation designed to contextualise the present in the past. It does not claim to be a history or an historical study of teacher preparation. While it gives assent to historiographies or the philosophies of history, which were also discussed in Chapter 2, it does not seek to emulate historical methodologies. Rather, it uses critical grounded theory as described in Chapter 3 to investigate stories of the past as a means to understanding and influencing the present context for the betterment of the future.
Prior to the construction and deconstruction of the narratives, purposive sampling, aligned with the practices of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967), was used to select stories that would productively illustrate the system relations at work in change and continuity in teacher preparation. While the focus of the whole study was teacher education the more specific term, teacher preparation, is used throughout this chapter and the next because of the presence of the different paradigms for preparation in the selected stories. These stories were selected from the period between 1930 and 1950 because of the sociocultural circumstances and events present that generated points of crisis in teacher preparation. Within this time period, the stories of Victoria and Western Australia were selected because of the presence of significant changes and continuities that would effectively illuminate discourses about system relations.

Having identified the two contexts to be interrogated, the first task, described in this chapter, involved the construction and then deconstruction of the stories from the two selected contexts. In both cases the purpose of the construction of the narrative was to give voice to teacher educators as a means of exposing and critiquing their discourses and perspectives about the system relations at work in teacher preparation. Following the telling of these narratives, the first analytical stage in this phase of the study involved the use of Clarke’s (2005) situational analysis to deconstruct these stories and discourses. This process involved the development of situational and positional maps to critically analyse the teacher educators’ perspectives on the outworking of the system relations.

While the processes used in each context were comparable, the two stories were constructed and then deconstructed in isolation from each other. That is, the analytical construction and deconstruction of the two contexts was completed independently of each other. This assisted with minimising the contamination of issues from one context to the other. It also allowed for each context to be dealt with as a separate substantive case in the process of theorising the core social and systemic processes at work in change and continuity in teacher preparation. In alignment with this process, the Victorian context is discussed here first, commencing with the constructed narrative and concluding with a positional map. Following this, the Western Australian story is covered.

The Continuity of Teacher Training in Victoria

The first recorded evidence that educators in Victoria were interested in establishing teacher education within a university context as a means of providing teacher preparation is found in the recommendations of the Denominational School Board to the Government in 1853\(^2\) (Sweetman, 1939, p.47). While the latter part of the 19\(^{th}\) and early years of the 20\(^{th}\) century saw significant exploration of teacher education in Victoria (Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939), the possibility of a university education for all teachers failed to become a reality in Victoria till the 1980s (Fomin, Bessant, & Woock, 1986; Garden, 1982).

From 1877-1938 teacher preparation in Victoria was provided by the Teachers’ College located in Melbourne. The training provided was overseen by a succession of significant and leading teacher educators who consistently called for the development of university-based teacher education and

\(^{2}\) The 1853 Report of the Denominational Board to the Government included the following recommendations:

(3) That, when conditions were favourable, it would be advisable to secure the services of a highly-qualified Normal Professor to superintend the training system, to conduct examinations, and give lessons on the science of pedagogy;

(4) That, if such a person could be obtained, he would, probably, not be unworthy of a Chair in the University, which would bring its science into connection with the practical education of the colony;
actively worked towards that goal (Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939). However, despite the continued involvement of highly qualified and eminent teacher educators, the development of teacher education in Victoria stalled in the 1890s when even the training of teachers ceased in the wake of the depression, was severely truncated in the 1930s as a result of fiscal measures in response to the next great depression, and went completely cold in 1939. At that time, the then Director of Education, John Seitz, took full administrative control of the college and severed its ties with Melbourne University (Garden, 1982). Thereafter, a narrow, practically focussed college course of teacher preparation was continuously offered and supported by political and bureaucratic leaders.

As such, the training model prevailed in the Victorian context right up till the point of federal intervention in 1972. It was not until this point in time when all teachers’ colleges across Australia were granted autonomy that the teacher education model of preparation for all propaedeutic teachers re-emerged in Victoria (Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986; Roche, 2003). The story of the very protracted emergence of the teacher education model highlights the ideological strength behind the continuity of the teacher training model that ultimately thwarted the early development of teacher education in Victoria. The following construction of this story seeks to narrate the motivations, causes and consequences of the decisions that contributed to this continuity of the training model of teacher preparation. To facilitate the reading of the story, citations to the two key texts used in its construction have only been included when material has been directly quoted. Secondary texts and additional support materials have been cited as usual.

**The Foundations of Teacher Preparation in Victoria**

The story of teacher preparation in the state of Victoria dates back to the 1850s when both the Denominational School Board and the National School Board established Training Institutions to support the development of pupil teachers through teacher training. Following the Act for the better Maintenance and Establishment of Common Schools in Victoria 1862 (Vic.) and The Education Act 1872 (Vic.) a single Central Training Institution was established to provide the Board and later Department of Education with the teachers needed to provide free, compulsory and secular education for all (The Education Act 1872, s.10, 12, 13). This institution, under a range of different names, remained the main provider of teacher preparation under the Department of Education in the state of Victoria up until 1972.

The early history of the Central Training Institution (1870-1889), which became the Teachers’ College thereafter, was overseen by a succession of highly qualified teacher educators. These men served the Department of Education as the Principal of the training college, and from 1903-1939 also filled the position of Professor of Education at Melbourne University. Throughout this period these teacher educators led the development of teacher training at the Teachers’ College while also actively calling for and working towards the goal of a university-based teacher education for all teachers. It was even possible, during this period, for the best students to undertake teacher preparation that consisted of up to five years of higher education qualifying with a ‘Bachelor’s or Master’s degree, and with the Diploma of Education’ (Sweetman, 1939, p. 113).

The first training courses offered at the Central Training Institution were of one-year duration that was often undertaken after an initial period of apprenticeship as a pupil teacher. By 1879, however, the college principal, Gladman, recognised the need to provide a more thorough preparation for teachers and a second-year for students completing the Trained Teachers’ Certificate was developed. Despite these early developments, political and media criticisms of the college courses coupled with the depression of the 1890s culminated in the closure of the College at the end of 1893. After re-opening
in 1900, Frank Tate assumed responsibility for re-establishing the college and its courses. The two-year courses were re-developed to incorporate the contemporary educational ideas of European educators such as Pestalozzi, Froebel and Herbart. These had formed the basis of the ‘New Education’ recommended by the Fink Commission of 1899-1901 (Victoria Royal Commission on Technical Education & Fink, 1977) and were implemented across a number of Acts, starting with the Education Act 1901 (Vic.) (Anchen, 1956). The training course was later reduced in 1913 to a one-year program, ostensibly because increased provision of junior secondary education coupled with a year of apprenticeship for prospective teachers had improved the educational standing of entrants sufficient to warrant the reduction. By 1922 the Teachers’ College was training seven different categories of propaedeutic teachers in courses that ran for between one and three years. The college was also offering its courses by correspondence and actively pursued inservice training for practising teachers. The then principal, Dr Smyth, also supported higher levels of preparation for propaedeutic teachers by maximising the engagement of college students and staff with the university. This was particularly apparent in the educational qualifications of the college’s lecturing staff. Of the 16 lecturing staff members employed at his departure in 1927, two had doctorates and another 10 had masters’ level qualifications.

Alongside the Teachers’ College, the development of further education in Victoria also saw the founding of Melbourne University by the passing of The University Act 1881 (Vic). Gladman, the college Principal at the time, ensured that allowances for ‘formal links’ between the University and the Central Training Institution were included (Garden, 1982, p. 40). He was also active in encouraging the enrolment of propaedeutic teachers in university-level studies, stating that, ‘It will be a good point, too, if we lead the best of our young teachers to regard the attainment of a University degree as practical and desirable’ (Gladman cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.68). By 1903, this had become a possibility for at least some propaedeutic teachers with the development of the dual role of Principal and Professor of Education, introduction of a two-year Diploma of Education and the introduction of the ‘Diploma XX’ program (Anchen, 1956). This particular course provided university education for twenty teachers selected by the Director each year (Anchen, 1956). The increasing development of the discipline of education and enrolment of propaedeutic teachers in university studies continued under Dr Smyth. Dr Smyth, the first Principal and Professor, earned a promotion to Chair of Education in 1918, ‘won approval’ for the promotion of the department to a full Faculty in 1923 and promptly commenced the first Australian Masters degree in Education (Garden, 1982, p.111). By this time the majority of the propaedeutic teachers in the secondary course at least, the second largest at the college, were able to complete some university studies if not an entire course.

Despite the efforts made to improve the preparation of teachers in Victoria through both the teachers’ college and the university, the reality remained that the vast majority of teachers would not be able to avail themselves of these opportunities. Of the ‘4891 classified elementary teachers in 1924’, only 1460 were either in training or had already attained a qualification (Garden, 1982, p. 126). This left 70% of the workforce without any teacher preparation or education. When the 1757 unclassified junior teachers are added to this number it is evident that the College was incapable of providing for the educational needs of all teachers. In 1922 the number of students at the College was a mere 287 (Sweetman, 1939, p. 114). Even rises in the numbers of students and teachers connected with the College ‘from 534 in 1925 and 1002 in 1928’ (Garden, 1982, p. 129) and the establishment of rural Colleges in Bendigo and Ballarat could not keep pace with the needs of teachers and the department.

From its beginnings in the 1870s through to the beginning of the 1930s teacher preparation in Victoria across both the training and the education model had grown significantly despite the interruptions of
a range of sociocultural events and circumstances. While the depression of the 1890s and the Great War had cut the availability of funds, the progress of both training at the teachers’ college and the discipline of education at the university suffered only temporary setbacks. Ultimately, the most problematic issue throughout this period was the continuing growth and development of the state and of its education department that generated a demand for teachers that neither the college nor the university could supply. This need for teachers supported a context where developments in teacher preparation were generally encouraged.

As such, teacher preparation was largely able to develop uninterrupted throughout this period through the efforts of key educational actors and their ideological commitments. In the fifty years from 1877-1927 the key educational expert in teacher preparation in Victoria was the Principal of the teachers’ college, who from 1902 was also the Professor of Education at the university. Across this period three individuals of considerable educational standing filled the role. These men were Frederick John Gladman who served from 1877-1884, Frank Tate who oversaw the reestablishment of the Teachers’ College from 1900-1902, and Dr John Smyth who led both the college and the university faculty from 1903-1927 (Anchen, 1956). While both Gladman and Smyth had emigrated from the United Kingdom as already reputable teacher educators with international experience, Tate was the first local teacher educator having trained under Gladman (Anchen, 1956).

Each of these educators was committed to pursuing advances in the overall preparation and development of the teachers of Victoria not just in training them for the urgent needs of schools. It is clear that the goal for each, Gladman, Tate and Smyth, was always for teachers to be afforded the opportunity to undertake higher education. Gladman declared as early as 1879 the ‘attainment of a University degree as practical and desirable’ for young teachers (Gladman as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.68). By 1905 Tate considered a ‘time when the whole of its students will participate in University instruction’ as a real possibility (Tate as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.111). It is also evident from the scope of their achievements that they were also cognisant of the need to work in and with the current context while promoting change. Gladman, Tate and Smyth actively promoted the status of teachers and teaching as a profession, worked tirelessly on improving the training provided through the teachers’ college, but also recognised the need to work towards the adoption and development of education as a discipline and the advancement of the College and university staff as key to improving teacher preparation.

While these key teacher educators had a significant influence on the development of teacher preparation, other key participants, including politicians, bureaucrats and even journalists, were also influential. These influences were not, however, always positive. One such circumstance involved the pressures on teacher preparation throughout the 1880s when the Teachers’ College came under fire from both politicians and the press. The Central Training Institution struggled to provide for the colony’s workforce needs and the problems of training propaedeutic teachers with minimal educational experience prior to entering the college fuelled criticism. At the time, Gladman was well aware of the issues and used his annual report to parliament to make recommendations for improvements (Annual Report, Minister of Public Instruction, 1883-1884 as cited in Garden, 1982, p. 40; Sweetman, 1939, p.72). However, by the time of the depression of the 1890s the need for and usefulness of the training college was being seriously questioned. One parliamentarian argued in 1892 that, ‘the Training Institution is a "white elephant". ... It is pretty well known that there is a sufficient number of trained teachers already looking for positions and appointments, under the Education Department, who have never passed through the institution’ (as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.72). In
the end, the Central Training Institution was closed in 1893 despite the valiant efforts of Gladman and others to use it in furnishing educational opportunities for teachers in Victoria.

After the worst of the depression had passed and the short-sightedness of the original decision had become clearly evident, the Teachers’ College re-opened in 1900. From this time teacher preparation in Victoria, while not always fiscally supported as much as the Principal might have desired, experienced a period of political support right up until the 1930s. This was largely a consequence of bureaucratic support for the development of teacher preparation that was led by Frank Tate who had left his position as Principal of the teachers’ college to take up the role of Director of Education. As Director, Tate took an active role in promoting, in partnership with Dr Smyth, the development of teacher preparation towards the goal of higher education. His tenure saw: an improvement in the conditions and training offered to all propaedeutic teachers whether in the pupil teacher system, training college or university; growth in the autonomy of Smyth and his staff; and an easing of departmental control of the operation of college.

As such, teacher preparation in Victoria had developed solid foundations by the time that both Tate and Smyth were ready to retire. Tate’s leadership in the department had encouraged political and economic support for the educational developments promoted by Smyth as both Principal and Professor. On Smyth’s death in 1927 and Tate’s resignation in 1928, teacher preparation in Victoria was arguably the most advanced of that offered in any Australian state (for comparisons see: Anderson, 1960; Hill, 1966; Mossenson, 1955; Nichol, 1969; Turner, 1943). No doubt it was assumed that Tate and Smyth’s successors would take teacher preparation on in the ensuing decades.

**Coping with Crisis – The Depression Years**

The sudden removal of the insightful leadership of Tate and Smyth coupled with the financial crisis of the Great Depression set teacher preparation on a dramatic downward spiral. While memories of the disaster of the 1890s meant that the complete closure of the Teachers’ College was avoided, fiscal tightening put paid to many of the initiatives of both Tate and Smyth. The numbers and qualifications of the college staff steadily declined, lecturing staff who moved to the university were not replaced, and opportunities for students to participate in university study also declined. The payment of allowances to students ceased and a fee for residential students was introduced on the recommendation of a Board of Inquiry. Each of these factors placed downward pressure on the number and quality of propaedeutic teachers seeking entry to the College, the length of preparation provided and the educational outcomes of courses.

Nowhere are the consequences of the depression-induced cutbacks more evident than in the preparation of secondary teachers. In 1933 the then Director, James McRae, decided to ‘discontinue the training’ of secondary teachers through the teachers’ college under the assumption that there were sufficient university-educated teachers already in the department (Garden, 1982, p. 142). While the university continued to provide its Diploma course for its own students, this decision had an immediate impact on the quality of students the college was able to attract as it practically ceased the enrolment of students in combined university and college-based studies. This further contributed to the decline in the status of the college and served to apply even further downward pressure on the educational attainment, prestige and morale of college staff and graduates.

By the time the worst of the depression was over, George Browne, another internationally experienced teacher educator, had been appointed to the dual role of Principal and Professor. Browne like his predecessors was committed to the ideal of all students being, ‘given the opportunity of undertaking
a University course’ (Sweetman, 1939, p. 138). Despite the promise of a better financial position for the state and a well-credentialled and innovative educator at the helm, the fortunes of the teachers’ college and of teacher preparation in Victoria continued to decline. The decline in the educational standards and status of the college that resulted from the financial constraints of the depression had even further reduced the ability of the college to contribute to meeting the needs of the department for appropriately qualified teachers. Additionally, in the wake of the depression the department and its Director, John Seitz, were very keen to ensure that the ‘Department was obtaining sufficient return for the large contribution it made’ (Garden, 1982, p. 155).

Over the second half of the 1930s, John Seitz, the Director of Education, worked towards ensuring that the government was achieving value for its financial outlay in teacher preparation. Prior to taking the role of Director, Seitz had little involvement in teacher preparation. His focus was on the practical training of propaedeutic teachers and he saw little need for or future in teacher education. For Seitz, the teachers’ college needed to prepare teachers that, ‘would best suit the needs of the Department’ (Garden, 1982, p. 155). As a consequence, the relationship between the teachers’ college and the university became a point of tension, particularly in relation to staffing. As the numbers of lecturing staff working across both institutions had declined in the early part of the 1930s the proportion of time that the remaining full-time, experienced and educationally qualified staff spent teaching at the university had increased. This meant that the college courses were increasingly being staffed by temporary transfers of practicing teachers that the Department had to pay in addition to the full-time lecturing staff.

As a consequence of these and other concerns, an inspection of the college was undertaken in 1937 and in its aftermath battlelines were drawn between Browne and Seitz. For the first time in its history the key leaders in teacher preparation for Victorian schools were of vastly different opinions. Despite strong resistance from both Browne, as Principal, and Tate, as the President of the recently established ACER, the Department used this inspection to take full control of the teachers’ college and to sever the links between the teachers’ college and Melbourne University. The administrative control exerted by Seitz in order to improve the college’s capacity to meet the needs of the Department included control over such things as ‘organisation, timetables, term dates and examinations’ (Garden, 1982, p.159). Thus it effectively eroded the autonomy of the college and its Principal as developed during the tenure of Tate and Smyth. In the end, the ultimate victory in the battle over teacher preparation fell to the Director and the Department when in 1939 the relationship between the university and the college was severed and the dual post of Principal and Professor ceased.

**The Outworking of the Exigencism of the Depression Years**

The era of increasing engagement between teacher preparation and higher education through the work of significant educational leaders had come to an abrupt end. From 1939 the links with Melbourne University were severed and the Melbourne Teachers’ College, and later the Secondary Teachers’ College, continued as the main providers of teacher training under the control of the education department. While Melbourne University continued to offer Diploma level teacher preparation courses, its influence on teacher preparation was largely neutralised.

The consequences of these two significant changes, namely departmental control of the teachers’ colleges and their courses and the severing of links to the university, were very quickly evident. Turner’s (1943) comparative survey of teacher training in Australia was particularly critical of the condition of teacher preparation in Victoria. Turner (1943) stated in his report that, ‘State control of education in Victoria has for a number of years acted adversely on teacher education’, and that,
‘Victoria has retained a type of training which has elsewhere been superseded’ (p.459). Having been one of the leading states in teacher preparation during the 1920s, Turner’s (1943) assessment of the situation indicates a dramatic decline. Departmental control with its focus on practical training and the needs of the department had a significant negative impact on teacher preparation when compared with the best practices observed in other national and international contexts.

Despite these criticisms, throughout the 1940s the work of the Teachers’ College continued to focus almost exclusively on a one-year course for primary teachers that provided preparation for the immediate practical needs of classroom teaching without any furthering of the educational attainment of the propaedeutic teachers themselves (Turner, 1943). The crisis mode of the depression years continued in large part as a consequence of the social and economic constraints of the Second World War and the workforce challenges of the baby boom. This resulted in 1950 with the founding of a Secondary Teachers’ Training Centre that financially and educationally supported propaedeutic teachers undertaking university studies in preparation for secondary teaching. Thus temporarily restoring the relationship between the department and the university. After a name change to the Secondary Teachers’ College, the department eventually commenced the provision of training courses for secondary teaching independent of the university. While changes were rendered to the courses offered, corporate structure and identity of the teachers’ colleges during this time, the status of the colleges, their staff and students continued to lag behind that of earlier generations (Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986).

The administrative and economic constraints experienced throughout this period are also evident in the educational attainment of the staff of the departmental colleges. Garden (1982) provides the following statistics relating to staffing at the Melbourne Teachers’ College and Secondary Teachers’ College (p.198). From its high point in 1929 when 75% of the lecturing staff held a Master’s degree or higher, the educational levels of staff declined significantly. By 1951, only 32% of the lecturing staff held a Bachelor’s degree and 4% held Masters’ qualifications. By 1961, the Melbourne Teachers’ College, which provided teacher preparation for primary school teachers, had no lecturing staff with a qualification higher than a Bachelor’s degree. The Secondary Teachers’ College, which had overseen the re-introduction of college-based preparation for secondary teachers from 1950, fared a little better. In 1962, 10% of the staff of the Secondary Teachers’ College had a Master’s degree while a further 79% had Bachelors’ or Honours’ degrees.

Despite early initiatives in support of teacher education, a commitment to the education model as a minimum standard for all teachers came comparatively later in Victoria than other Australian states. The introduction of Bachelors’ qualifications at the Melbourne State College, formerly the Melbourne Teachers’ College, did not happen until 1980 (Fomin, Bessant & Woock, 1986). As such, Seitz’s ideological commitment to departmental control and the training model continued to dominate teacher preparation across the 1950s and 1960s. The staffing of both colleges and the length and level of their courses remained at similar levels up until the 1970s when federal initiatives effectively ended departmental control of teachers’ colleges across the country (Fomin, Bessant, Woock, 1986; Roche, 2003).
DECONSTRUCTING THE VICTORIAN STORY: SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

Having constructed a story about the fortunes of Victorian teacher preparation across the difficult circumstances of the 1930s and 1940s, the next step was the deconstruction of the story using Clarke’s (2005) situational and positional mapping. The purpose of this type of deconstructive analysis is to expose the discourses that operate in the system relations in the selected story or context. Given that the core extant texts used in the construction of the story have been selected because they were written by teacher educators or other academics, in this study this process focuses on the how the operation of power is perceived in the discourses of this particular group of participants.

This situational analysis occurred in two steps. Firstly, a situational map was developed to identify the actors, elements and discourses evident in the story (Clarke, 2005). From this, the key actors, discourses and contestations present in the outworking of system relations in the Victorian context were illuminated. Having identified a core contestation, the second stage involved the development of a positional map (Clarke, 2005). This map presents the various positions about this core contestation that are articulated in the story. From this, the factors at work in the privileging of these possible positions are critiqued.

SITUATIONAL MAPPING: CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN THE VICTORIAN CONTEXT

The story of teacher preparation in the state of Victoria as described here is a story in two parts. On one side, it is a story of the long-term continuation of the training model from its early inception in the 1870s right up until the federal intervention of the 1970s. Alternatively, it is a story of teacher education’s failure to launch despite very early evidence of the seeds necessary for its development. As identified in the story of the Victorian context, the critical juncture where the growth of teacher education was curbed in preference for teacher training happened during the crisis years of the 1930s and 1940s. In seeking to understand the factors that underlie the continuity of the training model in the Victorian context it is firstly important to identify the actors, elements and discourses present in the story throughout this period.

Clarke’s (2005) abstract situational mapping was used to identify the actors, elements and discourses evident in the analysis of the historical documents that describe the continuation of the training model in Victoria. The final product of this process is the abstract situational map, which is provided below as Figure 4.1 The Victorian Context: Abstract Situational Map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL HUMAN ELEMENTS/ACTORS</th>
<th>NONHUMAN ELEMENTS ACTORS/ACTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal of the Teachers’ College</td>
<td>Discipline of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Education</td>
<td>Practice of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>College and University; land and buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associated schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTIVE HUMAN ELEMENTS/ACTORS</th>
<th>IMPLICATED/SILENT ACTORS/ACTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government; politicians</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Roll</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University staff</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College staff</td>
<td>Department staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominational/National Boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL AND/OR COLLECTIVE HUMAN ACTORS</th>
<th>DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF NONHUMAN ACTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideals of higher education</td>
<td>Theory-practice divide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and bureaucratic conservatism</td>
<td>Craft contrasted with science in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic restraint – value for money</td>
<td>Lack of available support/expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum requirements – classroom survival</td>
<td>‘Making do’ – needs outweighing capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control contrasted with autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL/ECONOMIC ELEMENTS</th>
<th>SOCIOCULTURAL/SYMBOLIC ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denominational/National Boards</td>
<td>Metropole – liberal education in the classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Colony – practical, technical education in basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government; parliament</td>
<td>Colonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Council</td>
<td>Conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral aspirations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMPORAL ELEMENTS</th>
<th>SPATIAL ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colony/state – recency of founding</td>
<td>Shared space for College and University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralisation of infrastructure development</td>
<td>Centralisation of training options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic depressions – 1890s, 1930s</td>
<td>Rural dispersion of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported expertise</td>
<td>Distance between teachers and educational opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth spurts – gold rushes, baby booms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR ISSUES/DEBATES</th>
<th>RELATED DISCOURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training compared with education</td>
<td>Education in the ‘homeland’ – ‘Mother England’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and demand</td>
<td>Teaching and teacher preparation in national and international contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Teaching as a moral exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality/needs compared with goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required educational attainment for teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching as craft or science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional possibilities and realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 The Victorian Context: Abstract Situational Map

Out of the plethora of actors, elements and discourses that were evident in the historical documents and represented on this abstract situational map (Figure 4.1), those that were key to the continuity of the training model needed to be identified in order to make sense of the system relations at work. For this purpose, the story of the continuity of teacher training, provided earlier, was used in the development of a second situational map. This second map provides a lens by which the perspectives of the writers of the texts used in the construction of the story can be viewed. That is, it provides an analysis of the ways that the teacher educators, who wrote the extant texts used as data sources, made sense of and explained the decision-making that led to the long-term continuation of the training model in Victoria. The map is focussed around the key contestation at work in the continuity of the training model through the identification of key actors and discourses. The final abstract situational map is provided below as Figure 4.2 Continuity of the Training Model: Abstract Situational Map.
The situational analysis shows that, from the perspective of the teacher educators involved, the story of the continuity of teacher training in Victoria is dualistic in nature. That is, the operation of the decision-making described in the story pivots on a binary contestation supported by three key groups of actors and two significant discourses. The analysis of each of these elements or factors demonstrates their impact upon the way the outworking of the relationship between knowledge and power controls the situation.

Firstly, the key actors involved in the story of the continuity of teacher training are categorised as heroes, champions and villains. In the story, the heroes are the educators who, by word or deed, promote, support and work towards the provision of the best possible educational opportunities for all. While there are many educators involved at any particular time, the story is always framed around a primary hero. As the story revolves around teacher preparation, the primary hero at any particular time is the leading teacher educator. Their role as a hero is justified by their educational qualifications and experience, which demonstrate their suitability for the task. Their efforts are judged in terms of their support for, rather than actual success in, improving educational opportunities for propaedeutic teachers.

Thus, the heroes of the story of teacher preparation in Victoria are the succession of Principals of the teachers’ college. These men, Gladman, Tate, Smyth and Browne, are each described in glowing terms in relation to their suitability to the task of leading teacher preparation by virtue of their high level academic qualifications and their international experience. While their success in relation to the pursuit of the improvement of the educational opportunities of teacher preparation is varied, they are equally valued for their commitment to high ideals for teaching and continued support of university-based studies as the goal for all teachers. Dr Smyth, who was the Principal from 1903-1927 and also served as the first Professor of Education is one such hero. His qualifications for the title included a
PhD from Edinburgh and international experience in Scotland, Ireland, Germany and New Zealand. He was described by Sweetman (1939) as ‘so useful, so distinguished, and so memorable’ an ‘outstanding figure’ (p.124). He was recognised as being so ‘deeply immersed in philosophical and pedagogical studies’ that ‘few men could have been more suitable’ (Garden, 1982, p. 81) to take up the role of Principal and hero of teacher preparation.

The other two categories of key actors, the champions and the villains, are the politicians and bureaucrats who are the powerbrokers in the context. The champions are those who use their balance of power to back or support the work of the hero, while the villains are those that use their position to set an alternative agenda and thus oppose the educational ideals of the hero. As with the heroes, champions and villains are also identifiable by the language used to describe their suitability for their position and their educational ideas.

In the story of the continuity of teacher training, there was one key champion and one key villain. Both men held the top bureaucratic post of Director of Education and as a result their roles in the story were juxtaposed against each other. The champion, Frank Tate, was first identified as a hero who oversaw the re-opening of the teachers’ college before he moved to the position of Director where he could champion the development of teacher education. His commitment was demonstrated through his verbal backing of the goal of university-based study for teachers and his active support and provision for the educational ideas of Dr Smyth. In contrast, the villain John Seitz had an educational background as a Rhodes scholar and a private school teacher, not in teacher preparation. He was described as ‘a believer in teacher training rather than teacher education’ (Garden, 1982, p. 155), who used his position to actively pursue departmental control of teacher preparation in line with this belief. This juxtaposition demonstrates that the ideological perspectives of the chief bureaucrat, as either champion or villain, played a significant role in either supporting or quashing the initiatives of the heroes of teacher preparation.

Secondly, the two key discourses that emerged out of the telling of the story of the continuity of teacher training related to quality education and departmental needs. The discourse of quality education assumed that a civil society was dependent upon the presence of educated persons. As such, the development of the state, beyond its dependence on an imperial power, was contingent on its capacity to generate its own educated community. It also recognises that a pragmatic employment-driven education is short-sighted and a threat to both the goal of an educated society and the wellbeing of the state. This discourse was evident in the language of both the heroes and the champions.

The articulation of this discourse in relation to teacher preparation in Victoria focussed on the ideals of a high standard of education, with an emphasis on university study, and the cultivation of the educational advancement of both the individual teacher and the state. It is exemplified in the quotes selected by the writers of the extant texts used in this analysis to represent the perspectives of both heroes and champions. One particularly demonstrative example is found in the quotations offered by Sweetman (1939) from the writings of Dr Smyth. Dr Smyth’s language included:

- the teacher comes to bear away the burden of ignorance, and to bring into human lives delight in truth, beauty and goodness (date unknown: as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.119);
- widen the outlook of the students in their profession, to place them in the right attitude towards its ideal (1903: as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.108);
- send forth trainees so fitted for the work, and so imbued with a lofty sense of their calling that they will be able to do something to form in the public mind a just conception of the teachers’ place and the teachers’ work (1903: as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.108);
- education, in the sense in which it is used in more advanced countries of the world, would become possible (1904: as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.110);
- hope that, in years to come, the connexion will be even closer, so that the stimulus and inspiration of a University course will be carried by our trainees to leave their influence in the remotest corners of our State (1905: as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.109); and
- valuing education, honouring the profession to which I belong, believing in the uplifting power of the school in modern society (1927: as cited in Sweetman, 1939, p.125).

The second discourse articulated in the story was that offered as an explanation of the actions and motivations of the villains. This discourse perceived the goal of teacher preparation as the fulfilment of the needs of the department and the use of organisational and economic management as the means to ensuring that goal is fulfilled. The departmental needs were described as threefold; teacher preparation needs to provide sufficient teachers to fulfil workforce needs, prepare them cost-effectively and ensure that they capable of successfully undertaking any allocated teaching post. It was also assumed that these needs can only be achieved through close and careful management of the process through politically supported bureaucratic control.

Throughout the period covered by the story of teacher training the education department administered the teachers’ college. This is not, however, evidence of the outworking of this discourse. Rather, this discourse emerges only when the administration of the teachers’ college is used to control or curtail educational ideals, ostensibly for the purpose of achieving the needs of the department. As such, this discourse is most clearly expressed by the story of Seitz’s decision-making as the Director of Education through the 1940s. The departmental management prescribed by Seitz resulted in the curtailing of the enrolment of propaedeutic teachers at the university and the complete control of the teachers’ college right down to the daily details of ‘organisation, timetables, term dates and examinations’ (Garden, 1982, p. 159).

The final key element in understanding the situational analysis of the story of the continuity of teacher training in Victoria is the core contestation. The core contestation defines the boundaries that determine the options available to powerbrokers. It is different from a discourse in that it describes the limitations of rather than justify decisions. The contestation is described by its two extremes; educational expertise and colonial/state realities. Educational expertise refers to the knowledge and experience held by the highly qualified teacher educators employed to lead the development of teacher preparation in Victoria. This expertise is evidenced by academic qualifications, international connections and engagement in the academic work of teaching and research. From very early in the life of the colony, bureaucratic and political leaders maintained a commitment to the economic cost of high-level expertise through the employment of men such as Gladman, Smyth and Browne. This expertise provided a voice to the vision of the development of educational opportunity in the life of the state.

At the other end of the spectrum, colonial/state realities are the circumstances and attitudes inherent in the context that place limitations on the development of educational possibilities. These limitations include the lack of the social and physical infrastructure on which to build and the limited availability of resources to be applied to the development of education. The infrastructure needs of a relatively young colony/state, which also experienced economic contraction immediately followed by sustained
periods of rapid population growth, were many and they had to compete with each other for the limited resources available. Effectively, the youthfulness of the colony/state limited its capacity to provide for the development of the infrastructure required for the education of both children and teachers.

Inevitably, the contestation between educational expertise and colonial/state realities resulted in the development of educational infrastructure that, while useful, did not keep pace with the needs of the community. The constraints of colonial/state realities were not only evident during difficult times such as the Great Depression. Even during more economically prosperous times, questions were raised about teacher preparation and the validity of teacher educators’ calls for reform of the nature, length and level of teacher preparation offered in Victoria. A case in point can be found in the political commentary and associated media coverage of the review of 1937 that questioned the economic costs to the government of the relationship between the teachers’ college and the university. The outworking of this contestation varied significantly in response to the discourses and actors and their responses to the sociocultural circumstances they faced.

Ultimately, teacher preparation in Victoria was limited by the tendency to focus on achieving value for money for the benefit of the state. Teacher training was maintained in Victoria because of the influence of economic and ideological constraints exercised by political and bureaucratic power brokers who worked together in seeking value for money and efficiency in teacher preparation. As such, teacher educators were effectively sidelined and silenced in the decision-making processes that might have seen the development of teacher preparation towards teacher education in Victoria. These pragmatic goals were maintained through departmental control of teacher preparation that ensured that the ideological vision of teacher educators was kept in check. The ideal of higher education for all teachers as essential for the development and improvement of both schools and teachers was ignored in preference for the ideal of efficiently training teachers to fulfil the needs of the department.

**Positional Mapping: Competing Perspectives in the Continuity of Teacher Training**

Having established the key contestation in the story of the continuity of teacher training in Victoria through the situational mapping process, the positions that are evident in the outworking of this contestation were identified. An abstract positional map, *Figure 4.3 Core Contestation in the Continuity of Teacher Training*, was developed to outline the major positions (Clarke, 2005) present in the historical texts. These positions emerged from an analysis of the discourses and actions present around the contestation’s two competing perspectives; educational expertise and colonial/state realities. The map is structured by the two axes that represent the level of influence of each of the competing perspectives from low (-) to high (+). This creates a field within which the positions identified in the story can be represented. Only the positions evident in the historical texts are articulated on the map. That is, each of the five positions articulated on the map was present in the story of the continuity of teacher training in Victoria.
Teacher educators hold educational ideals that will not meet the needs of the state (1)

Teacher educators need to achieve whatever the state requests with whatever the state provides (2)

Teacher educator’s ideals need to be curtailed in order to ensure that efficiency is attained (3)

Teacher educators provide the needed reform agenda, but waste and indulgence must be avoided through careful management (4)

Autonomy for teacher educators will facilitate quality decisions for long-term educational advancement in the state (5)

**Figure 4.3 Core Contestation in the Continuity of Teacher Training: Abstract Positional Map**

The five positions (numbered 1-5) present on the map represent the key positions taken by various participants, including both actors and stakeholders, that were articulated in the historical texts. Importantly, the absence of a position that is low in the consideration of both colonial/state realities and educational expertise shows that these two issues were pivotal in the provision of teacher preparation at the time. Positions 1 and 2, which privilege colonial/state realities over educational expertise, represent the perspectives of the actors identified as villains. For example, John Seitz’s argued that the, ‘Education Department must take the full responsibility for the training of those desire to become teachers’ (Seitz cited in Garden, 1982, p. 160) and used this position to sever connections with the teacher educators employed in university-based teacher education. This was indicative of these positions that privileged the state’s needs over educational expertise.

At the other end of the spectrum, Position 5 is that presented in the idealised discourses of the heroes and their champions. Frank Tate who took the role of both hero and champion at different times in the story exemplified the presentation of this perspective as the ideal or goal for teacher preparation. In his report to the parliament in 1905, having just left his position as the college Principal to become the Director of Education, Tate stated that, ‘Its [the teachers’ college] connection with the University is steadily strengthening, and one can look forward confidently to a time when the whole of its students will participate in University instruction’ (Sweetman, 1939. p.111). His commitment to the importance of university-based education in teacher preparation for educational advancement
remained throughout his career. Even after his retirement from the department, he submitted a minority report in opposition to Seitz’s plans to take full departmental control of teacher preparation and sever the ties with the university.

While positions 1 and 5 represent the boundaries or extremities present in the discourses of the villains and the heroes, positions 3 and 4 represent the more pragmatic approaches that emerge out of the negotiations that happen between these borders. In both, educational expertise is recognised as significant, however, it is also subservient to the colonial/state realities. Both of these positions place the control of the decision-making with the political and bureaucratic participants that control the dissemination of state funds and resources. The result was that the teacher educators had to constantly go cap in hand to gain the support needed to advance teacher preparation.

Position 3 is representative of the circumstances surrounding the principalship of Dr Smyth (1903-1927) who benefitted from the presence of Tate in the role of Director. During this time the backing of Tate meant that many developments were supported and while Dr Smyth was aware of the limitations of the state’s resources, this did not impede steady progress. In contrast, position 4 is evident in Gladman’s earlier tenure as Principal (1877-1884). Again, Gladman showed an awareness of the realities of the limitations of the colony, though he also expressed his frustrations at the way that a lack of political support disempowered him in his role as Principal and as a result curtailed the development of teacher preparation. In his final annual report, Gladman stated that for, ‘seven years I have now spoken as plainly and earnestly as I have been able about the fundamental weaknesses which are evident from my standpoint, hoping to drive the truth home by repeated blows’ (Report, Minister for Public Instruction, 1883-1884, as cited in Garden, 1982, p. 40).

These descriptions of the five perspectives present on the positional map serve to illustrate the system relationships that underpinned the ideological issues that both supported the continuity of teacher training and constrained the development of teacher education in Victoria. The two factors that intersect on the map, educational expertise and colonial/state realities, represent the two worlds of education and politics. Within the context of the story, these worlds represent knowledge as found in the educational expertise of the teacher educator and power as held by the political participants who controlled the provision of funds and resources. The outworking of the relationship between knowledge and power is evident in the connections between these two worlds that was represented by the five positions. Thus, the different positions articulated on the map represent alternative system relationships that integrate the knowledge and power that have been played out in the story.

As such, the positional map outlines the nature of the relationship between knowledge and power in the history of the Victorian context. While the five positions reflect five carefully nuanced alternatives, there are three key relationships evident. Firstly, knowledge and power are separated in positions 1 and 2. From these two positions, the political forces of the departmental needs and the availability of resources are the key determiners of educational policy and action. Effectively, in separating knowledge from power the bureaucratic and political power-brokers are able to use colonial/state realities to justify both the need to focus on departmental needs and the resultant decision-making that defies educational expertise. From these positions the knowledge, grounded in the education expertise of the teacher educator, is entirely subservient to the power held through political and economic control.

Secondly, the perspective of position 5 sees the integration of knowledge with power for educational participants. Here, political and economic control in response to colonial/state realities makes way for a higher level of ideological autonomy for teacher educators. This autonomy facilitates the
development of teacher preparation for educational rather than political purposes. While this position is present in the discourse of the historical texts, it was present as a theoretical construct or ideal described by teacher educators rather than a position that was actually enacted in the story.

Thirdly, positions 3 and 4 reflect a relationship of negotiation between knowledge and power. From these two perspectives, educational expertise must negotiate within the boundaries of the limitations of colonial/state realities in seeking to attain an educational outcome. In the negotiations, the political and bureaucratic power-brokers take responsibility for ensuring that only economically and politically efficient and effective reforms are enacted. It is the teacher educators, as knowledge brokers, that must negotiate from a subservient position in relation to the power held through economic and political control.

As such, the system relationships that were present in the positions identified in the story of the continuity of teacher training in Victoria demonstrate that knowledge has consistently played a subservient role to power within this context. Of the five positions present, four were evident in the actions of the participants involved. Of these, two (positions 3 and 4) provided the knowledge brokers with some opportunities to negotiate with their political masters, while the other two (positions 1 and 2) see the knowledge brokers entirely divorced from the decision-making process. The fifth position exists only as an ideological construct in the discourses of teacher educators. Sadly, this position is the only one where knowledge experiences autonomy from or equality with power. As such, the political and bureaucratic power brokers in this context have used economic and political control to facilitate teacher preparation that fulfilled their political ideological needs. In doing so they have largely chosen to ignore and consequently silence the educational knowledge brokers they employed. It is ironic that the government was paying for the privilege.

**THE RISE OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

The second context that was selected as a substantive case to be used to consider the outworking of system relations in the history of teacher preparation was Western Australia. Again, the period of crisis between 1930 and 1950 was used as a critical juncture in the story that provided data that could be usefully interrogated in this study. Unlike the situation in Victoria, there were no early indications that teacher education was a likely or intended goal in Western Australia. Rather, the circumstances of the colony of Western Australia effectively worked against any developments in education for either students or teachers. *The Elementary Education Act 1871 (WA)* established the need to provide primary-level education across the colony. However, the large geographical scale of the state, its well-dispersed population and the distance from the other eastern states hampered progress in relation to the development of educational opportunity.

As a consequence, teacher preparation in Western Australia tracked well behind that of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia (Garden, 1982; Hill, 1966; Turner, 1943). Throughout the first part of the 20th century, Western Australia’s political and bureaucratic leaders in education were looking to the eastern states firstly to recruit teachers thereby avoiding the need for teacher preparation, and secondly to source ideas for the eventual development of teacher preparation (Mossenson, 1955). While the teacher educators of the time were keen to improve the nature and level of preparation provided for teachers, the social, economic and educational circumstances of the vast state of Western Australia continued to hamper their efforts right up until the time of the Great Depression.

Despite these early challenges and the ensuing crisis of the 1930s and 1940s, the fortunes of a university-based education model of teacher preparation in Western Australia had reversed by the
1950s. By the close of this decade the University of Western Australia had become one of the leading institutions in the field of education; having pioneered four-year undergraduate Bachelor’s degrees, instigated a number of higher awards, fostered research by staff and students, and commenced the publication of a research journal (Gardiner, 2004). By 1973 the state’s second university, Murdoch University, initiated a three-year Bachelor’s degree for primary teachers, the first such course in the country (Robison, 2010). As such, the story of teacher education in Western Australia stands in contrast to that of Victoria. That is, the key features needed for the promotion and development of university-based teacher education have appeared to emerge quickly, during a time of significant constraint and without strong ideological or physical foundations in earlier decades. Again, the reading of the story has been facilitated by only providing citations when material has been directly quoted. Secondary texts and additional support materials have been cited as usual.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF TEACHER PREPARATION IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

While the government of the colony of Western Australia recognised the need to provide at least a minimum of primary-level education for students by the 1870s (The Elementary Education Act 1871, WA), the same cannot be said about the provision of preparation for the teachers employed by its fledgling education system. The first main approach to teacher supply appears to have been to rely on the importation of trained teachers from the eastern states or, where possible, the metropole. As the numbers of teachers required did not materialise from the eastern states in sufficient numbers, the Central Board of Education took to employing locals, both with and without any form of preparation to fill teaching positions.

The pupil teacher system was the first model employed in Western Australia, though the approach was far less systematic than that found in New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia (Garden, 1982; Hill, 1966; McGuire, 1999). From the 1870s up until 1902 Western Australia’s pupil teacher system focussed on certification and inservice training rather than preparation. Unlike the eastern states, where the efforts of this period pursued the establishment of teachers’ colleges, the main focus in Western Australia was on the development of inspectorial and examination processes that lead to certification for unqualified teachers and on the provision of inservice training to assist teachers in the attainment of such certification. While improvements were made to the provision of support for some pupil teachers called monitors, a thoroughly systematic approach for all such teachers was never established. By 1890 the failure of this approach was clearly evident. At this time, just 43 or 36% of the 119 teachers employed by the Central Board were appropriately certified.

Despite the large numbers of uncertificated teachers and increasing awareness of the development of teachers’ colleges in the eastern states, the findings of the Report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the system of education pursued in the government primary schools, and into the management thereof, and to make suggestions for the improvement of the same (1888, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.11), lent support to the continuation of this system. Both the educational and political leaders of the time continued to advocate for the importation of qualified teachers from outside of the state and the provision of inservice learning as key activities for improving the standards of the teaching workforce. Ultimately, the Western Australian gold rush boom of the early 1890s coupled with the depression being experienced in the eastern states, lead to both a population boom that saw school enrolments double between 1890 and 1896 and an influx of qualified teachers from the eastern teachers’ colleges. This influx of trained teachers served to highlight the shortcomings of the teacher preparation available for Western Australian teachers.
As a result, several key actions made way for the development of a teachers’ college. Firstly, a ‘Teacher of Method’ was employed by the department in 1894 to assist with the provision of some teacher preparation for monitors. Secondly, Cyril Jackson, who emigrated from the United Kingdom, was employed to oversee the reorganisation of the entire education system in Western Australia from a newly created position of Inspector General of Schools. Thirdly, the Department of Education was restructured such that the Head of the Department, or Inspector General, was a professional educator who had a direct relationship with the Minister for Education. This ensured that there was a line of direct appeal in relation to the economic and political means to advance educational goals, including the adequate preparation of teachers. This relationship was proactively and effectively used to argue for the establishment of a teachers’ college in Western Australia. By Jackson’s (1897) reckoning, ‘out of 208 Head and Assistant Teachers there are … only 16 [7.6%] who have been through a course of training’ (as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.8). While the percentages in the other states were also low, Jackson argued that the situation in the west was exacerbated by a complete lack of systematic training for teachers via either a pupil teacher system or a training college. That same year land was procured in Claremont and the college finally opened in 1902.

From 1903 till 1927, under the leadership of William Rooney, the Claremont Teachers’ College proceeded to develop a range of courses designed to fulfil the state’s growing need for teachers. In 1903, Rooney’s first year as Principal, the college enrolled 39 propaedeutic teachers across a three-year course that led to certification by examination. In addition, uncertified monitors already working in the system were offered more systematic training through classes undertaken by the staff of the college. In 1904, some 164 monitors attended these classes, in both internal and external modes, as preparation for sitting examinations. By 1924 the number of propaedeutic teachers attending the college had risen to 210, which at the time was sufficient to fulfil the staffing needs of the department. Throughout his tenure as Principal, Rooney promoted the provision of teacher preparation that provided a liberal education, instruction in teaching and the inculcation of the attitudes and ideals of teaching as a profession. However, the level and length of the preparation provided through the teachers’ college in Western Australia continued to track behind that offered in the eastern states.

College students studied a range of courses with specialisations for rural schools, infants teaching, secondary teaching and domestic science. In the beginning, the focus of the work of the college was on providing a secondary education alongside some practical educational studies, and on the provision of more systematic training for the many uncertified and untrained monitors already working in schools. However, developments in the provision of secondary education at the turn of the century facilitated the development of a two-year Trained Teacher’s Certificate. This course had a minimum entry age of 17 years from 1904, and remained as such up until the 1930s. However, the vast majority of the propaedeutic teachers attending the college undertook the rural teachers’ course.

The course for rural teachers commenced in 1908 as a three-month course, was extended to six-months in 1911 and then again to a one-year course in 1919. During Rooney’s time, the number of schools in Western Australia more than trebled from ‘262 in 1904’ (Mossenson, 1955, p.25), to ‘669 [in 1920] to 789 five years later [1925]’ (Mossenson, 1955, p.28). The vast majority of the growth was in small rural schools of less than 20 students that were developed as a result of the government’s commitment, in 1906, to provide a school in all locations where there ‘was reasonable prospect of an attendance by ten or more children’ (Report of the Education Department for 1906, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.24). By 1922 the Report of the Royal Commission to inquire and report upon the system of public elementary education followed in the State of Western Australia (1921-1922, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.30) was critical of the provisions of the shorter rural teachers’ course and
recommended both matriculation and two-years of training as minimum requirements. Despite this, the one-year course continued up until the 1930s and throughout this period remained the largest course in terms of the number of teachers trained.

While Rooney’s work as Principal was important, his work at the university might be considered his most significant contribution to teacher preparation in Western Australia. The University of Western Australia opened in 1910 having been established in 1904 through the passing of the *University Endowment Act 1904 (WA)*. From the beginning, all teachers’ college students who were also matriculants were offered enrolment at the university and the majority took up the offer. In 1910 this totalled enrolments in 104 classes across English, History and Mathematics. By 1916 Education was introduced as a university subject and Rooney took up the added responsibility of lecturing. Between 1916 and his eventual retirement in 1927, Rooney firmly established the foundations of the discipline of education both in the propaedeutic teachers he taught and the institution itself. His successor, Robert Cameron, took up the dual role of Principal of the teachers’ college and Chair of Education some 24 years after the equivalent position was first filled in Victoria. Finally, in 1929, the University of Western Australia commenced its first Diploma program for the preparation of secondary teachers with strong enrolment numbers that grew quickly.

Jackson’s successor as Inspector General, Cecil Andrews who held the position from 1903-1933, also promoted the enrolment of teachers’ college students in university studies. Andrews used the direct relationship established between the Inspector General and the then Minister, Thomas Walker, to promote the founding of the university and the enrolment of propaedeutic teachers in university study. Andrews became a founding member of the Senate, and ensured that students of the teachers’ college had immediate access to the university through the provision of evening classes, part-time studies and flexibility in timetabling. As such, teacher preparation was jointly facilitated at both the university and the teachers’ college from 1910 through the support of both the Principal of the teachers’ college and the leader of the Education Department.

Interestingly though, there was significant and vociferous opposition from the Teachers’ Union to any move that appeared to remove the preparation for teaching out of the hands of the Education Department. The Union, through a report prepared in 1922 (*W.A. Teachers’ Journal*, September 1922, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.37), threw its support behind the clear demarcation of cultural or liberal studies that should be provided at the university, from teaching methodology to be taught at the teachers’ college. While this model was clearly designed to lend political support to the continuation of departmental control of teacher preparation through the teachers’ college, it also supported the enrolment of propaedeutic teachers in university-based learning.

Throughout the 24 years that Andrews and Rooney spent as Inspector General and Principal respectively, they proactively pursued the improvement of preparation for teachers in Western Australia. Their goals were to attain the standards already established in the eastern states and ensure that all teachers had opportunity to further their own educational attainment. Their preferred model of teacher preparation provided propaedeutic teachers with liberal, educational and cultural studies through the university and practical and professional studies at the teachers’ college. Despite these idealistic educational goals, the heavy reliance on the shorter rural courses meant that this was not the reality for the majority of Western Australia’s propaedeutic teachers.

Despite the slow start in the development of teacher preparation in Western Australia and the continuing challenges of providing for the ever-increasing number of rural positions, there was an air of confidence in the early years of Cameron’s tenure as Principal and Chair. By the time of his
appointment in 1927, a strong theoretical foundation for education as a discipline had been established. While there was no stand-alone university course, enrolment at the university by college students was integral to two of the four courses offered at the Claremont Teachers’ College. Cameron’s success with commencing the Diploma course in 1929, which had been first mooted in 1916, lent some support for an optimistic outlook for the development of teacher education in Western Australia. Furthermore, Cameron (1930) ‘forecast that within thirty years teacher training would become a function of the University, and that entry to the profession would be restricted to graduates’ (as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p. 46). At the time he would have been unaware of the seriousness of the implications of the depression years to come.

**Coping with Crisis – Depression and War**

The Great Depression of the 1930s was Western Australia’s first experience of massive economic and social upheaval given that a gold rush had averted the problems experienced in the eastern colonies during the depression of the 1890s. This depression in the eastern colonies coupled with the gold rush in the west had actually assisted to minimise the need to offer teacher preparation as teachers trained in the eastern states came looking for work. During the depression of the 1930s the state and its education system was not so fortunate. At the time, all three models of teacher preparation were present in Western Australia. A system of monitorships was used as a requirement for entry to the teachers’ college. Claremont Teachers’ College offered four different training courses designed around the specialised needs of different teaching roles. The University of Western Australia had also commenced its first stand-alone Diploma course for secondary teachers. As such, the apprenticeship, training and education models of teacher preparation were all present in Western Australia when the crisis of the Great Depression struck.

As the crunch in government finances deepened across 1930, cost-saving measures were sought across all areas of government. In education, expenditure was cut by 25% and the preparation of teachers was one of many branches of the department that experienced significant cuts. The Minister at the time, Norbert Keenan, calculated that the slowing of retirements, reduction of resignations due to marriage, suspension of long service leave and shrinking of the service would lead to an oversupply of teachers. Keenan’s most infamous decision was made to close the teachers’ college (Bolton, 1983). No new students were enrolled in 1931, leaving just the second year students to complete their courses, and in 1932 the Claremont Teachers’ College closed its doors. The education department was permitted to employ untrained teachers, including both monitors and supply teachers, and it effectively ceased to offer teacher preparation. Across the continent, Western Australia was the only state to do so. The lack of experience of this type of crisis appears to have heightened the severity of the response in Western Australia, while in the eastern states the mistakes of the earlier depression served to curb reactions.

By the end of 1932 the miscalculations of the Minister were becoming increasingly evident as the education department was plunged into possibly its worst ever teacher supply predicament. As the financial situation improved, plans were made to reopen the teachers’ college in 1934. However, decision-making over the years of the depression meant that the department needed teachers quickly and the first course offered was a truncated six-month program. In addition, long-term monitors, such as had been employed while the college was closed for three years, were excluded from the course and as such permanently excluded from any form of training or education. While teacher preparation was again available in Western Australia, the length and level of preparation available was more reminiscent of that offered nearer the turn of the century than the 1920s. Over the next decade the
length and level of the preparation courses offered at the college continued to track behind that which had been available in Western Australia in the 1920s and that which was being offered concurrently in the eastern states.

There was, however, several incremental steps taken to progressively lengthen the courses offered. Firstly, from 1935 a one-year course was added to the programs offered. Despite this, the six-month course remained the largest course in terms of numbers until 1937 when it was finally stopped after significant pressure from both the Teachers’ Union and Cameron. Having successfully petitioned for the removal of the short course, the Principal and the union continued to call for improvements in teacher preparation, including the further lengthening of the course and the financing of much needed resourcing and renovations. In 1940 the then Minister, William Kitson, approved the renovation of the buildings and the provision of a two-year course from the beginning of 1941. In a twist of fate, the Second World War intervened and the promised improvements never eventuated. Workforce issues remained a challenge for the department and the one-year course was continued as a result of the sharp decline in the number of male students available through the war years, though this was somewhat mitigated by population migration that resulted in a decline in the number of rural schools.

In what might have been an act of desperation, the union passed a resolution at its Annual Conference of 1943 that, ‘the training course for teachers should be a minimum of three years’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, September 1943, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p. 63). Finally, at the end of 1944 an agreement was reached to reinstate the two-year course, thus returning to the length and level of teacher preparation offered at the onset of the Great Depression in 1929.

During these 15 years of exigencism in relation to the teachers’ college, the University of Western Australia was also affected. While the University Senate provided a buffer from direct political intervention, economic constraints also served to curb the programs of the university. Despite the fact that the dual role of Principal and Chair meant that the department had some direct control of this position, the university was able to maintain both the position of Chair of Education and the newly developed Diploma course even when the teachers’ college was closed. Consequently, in 1932 the only teacher preparation offered in Western Australia was the university’s Diploma course. For the first time an Australian state was providing teacher preparation exclusively through university-based teacher education. It was unfortunate that this was accidental and that the circumstances of the time militated against the possibility that this education would be able to match the best practices of the time.

Cameron did, however, work to make maximum use of the available resources and promote the continued enrolment of propaedeutic teachers in university studies throughout this period. From 1935, students in the one-year course at the teachers’ college were able to attend the university for at least two days in the week. While Cameron was clearly an advocate for university-based teacher education as the future of teacher preparation, the close cooperation between the university and the teachers’ college during this time was a consequence of economic necessity rather than educational ideal. The cooperation involved the sharing of staff, space, maintenance and equipment that saved costs for both the department and the university. This resulted in the continuation of the university’s contribution to teacher preparation even if it was seriously compromised. Despite the sharing of resources, the lack of finances meant there were insufficient teaching materials, staff shortages and overcrowding that curtailed the development of quality teacher preparation at the University of Western Australia.
While it might appear that there must have been significant support for the university’s contribution to teacher preparation, the educational and political climate of the time was quite opposed. The Teachers’ Union had, from at least as early as 1925 (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, June 1925, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.37), actively endorsed and promoted the view that the responsibility for teacher preparation was the exclusive right of the department. Consequently, the union was very alarmed when the only teacher preparation left in Western Australia was the university’s Diploma course and stepped up their support for departmental control of teacher preparation. As it happened, the fears of the union were unfounded as the university was never in a financial position to take advantage of the opportunity. Criticisms of the university’s education programs also came from politicians. In 1933 John Tonkin, who had been newly elected to parliament, was critical of the theoretical nature of education studies at the university and sought to promote the practical training of teachers (as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.65). In addition, the Report of the Royal Commissioner, the Hon. Mr Justice Wolff, on the administration of the university (1942, as cited in Mossenson, 1955) into the administration of the University of Western Australia rejected entirely Cameron’s submission, which had argued that teacher preparation should become a function of the university. This rejection was largely justified by an emphasis on teaching as a technical activity that is more closely aligned to the goals of a training institution than a university. However, significant references were also made to the educational standards of the students of the teachers’ college that were deemed beneath the ideals of the university. In the circumstances, university-based teacher preparation did not have much hope of surviving. It is a testimony to both the efforts and the shrewdness of Cameron that the University of Western Australia maintained a significant contribution to teacher preparation throughout these crisis years.

**The Outworking of the Exigencis of the Crisis Years**

1945 was the turn around year in the fortunes of teacher preparation in Western Australia. By the close of 1944 the government, through the Minister for Education, had again agreed to the re-introduction of a two-year course and the renovation of the teachers’ college. The two-year program commenced in 1945 with approximately 50% of the college’s students enrolling in this course. This represented a return to the level of training that had been offered in the 1920s. By the end of 1945 the college was accepting returned servicemen and working on ways to accommodate the interruption to their teacher preparation. The financial situation also improved and the Minister, John Tonkin, announced that teacher preparation was to be completed reorganised. Tonkin’s reform agenda was influenced by the Teachers’ Union, which had continued to petition for departmental control of teacher preparation, and his own views founded in his personal experience as a teacher.

The key purpose of the reorganisation of teacher preparation was to fix that which had gone ‘radically wrong with the Training College’ (Tonkin as quoted in Mossenson, 1955, p.65), by re-emphasising the practical rather than theoretical aspects of teaching. In order to achieve this end, the reinvigorating of the teachers’ college was paramount. With this in mind, the dual role of Principal and Chair was separated. Thomas Sten was appointed Principal of the Claremont Teachers’ College, becoming Western Australia’s first locally trained leader in teacher preparation. Sten was charged with the responsibility to reinvigorate the culture and courses of the college. This was supported by a return to the Claremont facilities and an increase of the minimum requirement for teacher preparation to two years. While the teachers’ college was encouraged to assume full responsibility for teacher preparation, the courses available at the time were only for primary teachers. Cameron retained his position as the Chair of Education at the University of Western Australia. At the time, the university continued to offer the Diploma course ensuring that teacher preparation continued for aspiring
secondary teachers. The Chair of Education was also given a seat on the College Advisory Board, which had been established to counsel the Minister on issues relating to teacher preparation, thus maintaining the involvement of university-based teacher educators in the direction of teacher preparation in Western Australia.

The teacher preparation offered by the education department in Western Australia continued to develop in the years following the reorganisation of 1945. In the second half of the 1940s funds became available to provide much-needed resources and also renovate the buildings at Claremont Teachers’ College. Student numbers were boosted by the return of servicemen, increases in secondary education, recruitment drives and financial incentives. The department also took up the training of secondary teachers in 1950 when the University of Western Australia dropped its Diploma course in preference for a Bachelor’s degree. To meet the increases in demand, the department opened Graylands Teachers’ College in 1955 and Secondary Teachers’ College in 1967 (McKenzie, 1981).

Changes were made to the courses through continuous improvement of both the syllabus and organisational processes. In order to establish a strong practical orientation for the college, the monitorial system, which required college entrants to have completed a year as a monitor in school, was abandoned in preference for a relationship that extended after course completion. To facilitate this, two-way communication between College-based teacher educators and the department’s inspectorial staff ensured that advice was passed on to assist in both the development of courses and the professional growth of new teachers. The practical experiences offered also grew over time to include longer and more frequent school-based experiences, camping opportunities and a range of extra-curricular activities and excursions (McKenzie, 1981). Even though the Principal no longer had any relationship with the university, college students continued to enrol in the theoretical and academic work of university study (McKenzie, 1981). The College staff proactively encouraged this continued participation in theoretical studies by developing supervisory, tutorial and counselling support designed to bolster students’ academic development and maximise student success and retention in university study.

Alongside these developments at the teachers’ colleges, and despite the protestations of the union, teacher preparation continued at the university such that it effectively became the state’s second major provider. This continuing engagement in teacher preparation at the university served as the main incentive for and driver of the development of the discipline of education in Western Australia. As Cameron (1953) claimed, ‘the inclusion of education among University studies can be justified only if it is a study that is susceptible of philosophical and scientific methods of investigation. This is indeed the primary aim. The training of teachers is a secondary aim and is made possible only by the attainment of the primary’ (p.2; also see Gardiner, 2004, p. 65). Following the severing of the dual role of Principal/Chair, Cameron used his position on the College Advisory Board to ensure that the relationship between the college and the university continued. This ensured that College students could continue to enrol in university studies, thus maintaining this outworking of the dual conception of teacher preparation as both academic and professional. At the same time, the university continued to provide its own teacher preparation through the Diploma program.

Education at the University of Western Australia, both the discipline and the faculty, benefitted from Cameron’s undivided attention. The advancements were both typical of higher education, such as increasing research and the offering of higher degrees, and innovative. One such innovation was the development of a research journal. The Educand, which later changed its name to Educational Research and Perspectives, is Australia’s longest running journal in educational research (Education
Research and Perspectives [ERP]). Other innovations involved the development of the university’s teacher preparation courses. The first change made saw the introduction of a four-year Bachelor of Education program in 1950. This course established a pattern of engagement with the discipline of education that has since formed the basis of the teacher education model of preparation used across the country. The course sought to ensure that its graduates had developed sound knowledge of the discipline of education and of the subject matter to be taught, the capacity to undertake the practical and technical practices of teaching, and the critical and moral dispositions required to interrogate and respond to educational problems and issues. Ultimately, the innovations in university-based teacher preparation in Western Australia were not limited to the one institution. It could be argued that the inclusion of education as one of six founding faculties at the commencement of Australia’s first three-year teacher preparation degree at Murdoch University in 1973 (Robison, 2010), was made possible because the University of Western Australia had prepared the way for the discipline of education.

Teacher preparation in Western Australia suffered massive setbacks as a result of the Great Depression and Second World War but the exigencies did not have flow-on effects. Rather, teacher preparation in Western Australia recovered quickly once the crisis was over and, having caught up, rapidly surpassed that offered in most if not all of the eastern states. While an upward trajectory in teacher preparation in terms of the length and level of teacher preparation is clearly identifiable, it is also evident that this movement has seen backward and forward developments at both the colleges and the university. As an example, the decision to drop the Diploma course when the Bachelor was introduced resulted in a sharp decline in student numbers at the university that threatened the viability of the faculty. However, the space afforded to cross-pollinate, collaborate and innovate provided a context where initiatives could be trialled, improvements made and findings shared.

In each component of this story there have been individuals pivotal to the developments made. The most notable being Robert Cameron, who commenced his career before the onset of the crisis, survived the lean years and then made his greatest contributions in the boom period that followed. His strength of personality and shrewdness in manipulating situations to the best advantage of the propaedeutic teachers in his care worked to maintain the momentum of teacher preparation towards his ideals. Cameron’s summarised his philosophy thus, ‘Today there is a new spirit abroad. Not the training of the teacher, but the education of the teacher and of the whole teacher is being undertaken. It is now recognised that he who would educate must himself be educated’ (Cameron, 1951 as cited in Gardiner, 2004, p.76).

While it is important to recognise the significance of the efforts of individuals in pursuing the development of teacher preparation in Western Australia, the impact of the educational and political climate should not be underestimated. Within this climate, two key factors gave rise to the context that was supportive of innovation and development in teacher preparation. Firstly, both political and educational discourses in teacher preparation in Western Australia supported a dualistic notion of the role of the teacher that encouraged a two-sided approach to teacher preparation. It was recognised that teachers needed to develop both academically and professionally and that this meant that teacher preparation needed to cater for each of these areas. Given the early segregation of these aspects of preparation between the two institutions, neither the university nor the teachers’ college could succeed without the other. The resulting collaboration ensured that the contribution of each institution was acknowledged and guaranteed their mutually symbiotic growth.

Secondly, clear channels of communication designed to facilitate the flow of information between educators and politicians were also established early in Western Australia. As a result, educators were
made aware of issues, had the capacity to influence decision-making and could put forward reasonable recommendations and innovations. The provision of a direct relationship between the Chief Inspector and the Minister was the first of these avenues and the second was the College Advisory Board. While both were used for the benefit of teacher preparation, it is arguable that the situation might have been different if the Chief Inspector at the time, Rooney, had not been supportive of teacher education and its contribution to the development of teacher preparation. However, at the crucial period when the involvement of the university in teacher preparation was most precarious, the capacity for the Chair of Education to negotiate with and through the College Advisory Board was pivotal in the continuation of the relationship between the university and the teachers’ college and to the future development of the education model of teacher preparation in Western Australia.

DECONSTRUCTING THE WESTERN AUSTRALIA STORY: SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

Having constructed this second story of teacher preparation in Western Australia, the same two stage situational and positional mapping (Clarke 2005) used with the Victorian story was applied to the deconstruction of this story. Again, these maps culminate in the presentation of the various positions that emerge from the data about a core contestation evident in the story. From this, an analysis of the system relations serves to critique the factors that are work in the privileging of the positions identified.

SITUATIONAL MAPPING: CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

Throughout the foundational years of the colony of Western Australia, teacher preparation was never a significant priority for the government or the education department and as such developed very slowly. By the beginning of the crisis years, all three models of teacher preparation were present in Western Australia, though the largest pathways to teaching were still the short course designed to prepare rural teachers and the monitorial system. Effectively, the teacher preparation available in 1929 was reflective of that which had been available in Victoria at the turn of the century. Teacher preparation then experienced 15 years of unprecedented exigencism that left it reeling with the length and level of preparation offered more reminiscent of the 19th century.

Unlike the Victorian story, the crisis years of the 1930s and 1940s did not lead to a curbing of teacher preparation. From 1945, teacher preparation in Western Australia commenced an almost meteoric rise. While this rise was evident at both the teachers’ college and the university, across the Australian context the development of teacher education at the University of Western Australia was most influential. Consequently, the factors that underlie the changes that led to the rise of teacher education in Western Australia have been identified and analysed. The resultant abstract situational map is provided below as Figure 4.4 The Western Australian Context: Abstract Situational Map.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL HUMAN ELEMENTS/ACTORS</th>
<th>NONHUMAN ELEMENTS ACTORS/ACTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal of the Claremont Teachers’ College</td>
<td>Discipline of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Practice of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Education</td>
<td>Claremont Teachers’ College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor; Teachers’ Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTIVE HUMAN ELEMENTS/ACTORS</th>
<th>IMPLICATED/SILENT ACTORS/ACTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government; politicians</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Union</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Advisory Board</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Senate</td>
<td>Department staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>College staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>University staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOURSE CONSTRUCTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL AND/OR COLLECTIVE HUMAN ACTORS</th>
<th>DISCOURSE CONSTRUCTION OF NONHUMAN ACTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideals of teacher education</td>
<td>Theory-practice divide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual focus for teacher preparation; academic and professional</td>
<td>Practical compared with cultural preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to teacher preparation contrasted with responsibility for it</td>
<td>Technique of teaching contrasted with education as a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and economic exigencism</td>
<td>Correlation of preparation with needs of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic constraint – lack of available funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL/ECONOMIC ELEMENTS</th>
<th>SOCIOCULTURAL/SYMBOLIC ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Nature of the colony – mining, farming, forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government; parliament</td>
<td>Predominance of rural schools and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMPORAL ELEMENTS</th>
<th>SPATIAL ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colony/state – recency of founding</td>
<td>Geographical size of the colony/state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread of infrastructure development</td>
<td>Dispersion of state population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic depression –1930s</td>
<td>Distance from the eastern states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second World War</td>
<td>Centralisation of training options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth spurts – gold rushes, baby booms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of secondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR ISSUES/DEBATES</th>
<th>RELATED DISCOURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching as technique or profession</td>
<td>Education in the eastern states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training compared with education</td>
<td>Teaching and teacher preparation in the national context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for teacher preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum educational attainment for teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.4 The Western Australian Context: Abstract Situational Map*

In seeking to understand the system relations at work in the rise of teacher education in Western Australia the key actors, elements and discourses were identified from this abstract situational map (Figure 4.4). Again, these are included on a second situational map. In this context this map is focussed around the key contestation at work in the rise of teacher education. The final abstract situational map is provided below as *Figure 4.5 The Rise of Teacher Education: Abstract Situational Map*. 
In the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia there are two groups of key actors and two main discourses. Again, these combine in various ways to support a number of alternative approaches to mediating across the core contestation. As such, each of these elements of the situational analysis need to be examined for the purpose of extrapolating their impact upon system relations and knowledge and power in the Western Australian context.

Firstly, the two categories of key actors in the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia are the leaders and the campaigners. The leaders were those participants who held positions of responsibility for decision-making in teacher preparation. They included both educational leaders, such as the Principal of the teachers’ college or the Chair of Education at the university, and political leaders, such as the Minister for Education or the Inspector General. Throughout the stories, the description given of each of these leaders was framed by their contribution to teacher preparation. Their effectiveness as a leader was judged in terms of the capacity to promote and support the development of teacher preparation towards the education model.

Within the Western Australian context, both educational and the political leaders were shown to be critical to the rise of teacher education. However, inconsistencies in their actions and decision-making were also highlighted. In the educational sphere, Robert Cameron was the most significant leader during the time frame of the story. Cameron’s career in teacher education spanned 1927-1954 during which time he was credited with the founding of the Faculty of Education, tripling of the academic staff, development of undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications and establishment of a research culture. He was also instrumental in ensuring that teacher preparation in the form of the Diploma continued during the worst of the crisis years and for upholding the ideal of university-based teacher preparation. Yet, at the same time, he was criticised for his role in approving the closure of the Diploma program when the Bachelor degree commenced; a decision that seriously truncated the contribution of the university to teacher preparation at the beginning of the 1950s. In assessing
Cameron’s contribution, Mossenson (1955) predicted that, ‘a future generation may yet regard his efforts in the nineteen thirties as the forerunner of well-established practice’ (p.67). While Gardiner (2004) conservatively stated that, ‘the nature of teacher education and acceptance of Education as a legitimate field of study at the University owed much to the vision and leadership of Professor Cameron’ (p.85).

Politically, after the relative stability of the Andrews and Rooney era (1903-1927) a number of men took up the positions of Inspector General and Minister for Education, many of which were unnamed by the teacher educators writing the historical texts. However, one individual of note was John Tonkin who served as the Minster for Education from 1943 to 1947. Tonkin was himself a teacher and had trained at the Claremont Teachers’ College under Rooney. As early as 1933 he was reported as being critical of the theoretical nature of the course and in support of a more practical approach to teacher training. Then, as Minister he was credited with overseeing the reorganisation of teacher preparation across the middle of the 1940s. What is interesting, however, is the emphasis placed on two key components of his reforms. The first was the severing of the dual role of Principal and Chair, and the second was the formation of the College Advisory Board. While the first appears to oppose the role of teacher education, the second maintains the contribution of the Chair of Education to teacher preparation across the state of Western Australia. As with Cameron, the dilemma of apparently inconsistent actions was key to the portrayal of Tonkin as a political leader.

The other key actors in the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia are categorised as the campaigners. The campaigners were those groups and individuals with an ideological perspective relating to teacher preparation that they have proactively promoted through targeted campaigning of political leaders. Campaigners were identified by the consistent presentation of a particular point of view, particularly where that perspective can be evidenced by quotation. Again, both educational and political participants in teacher preparation worked as campaigners, though the distinction was often blurred.

In the story of the rise of teacher education, the campaigners present two key perspectives on teacher preparation. On one side, educational leaders, such as Rooney and Cameron, were shown to be advocates for the recognition of teaching as a profession and the development of teacher education as the future for teacher preparation. Cameron exemplified this campaign when he stated that, ‘Thirty years hence the College would be a College of the University, and the Diploma of Education would be the recognized means of entry to the profession’ (Cameron, 1930, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p. 42).

On the other side, the Teachers’ Union was the most consistent campaigner for a practical focus for teacher preparation and the role of the education department in facilitating that process. In the 1920s the union perspective recognised a role for both the teachers’ college and the university such, ‘that “substance” should be taught at the University and “method” at the College’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, June 1925 as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p. 37 and Gardiner, 2004, p.56). But by 1938 the Union Executive was recommending that, ‘Control of teaching training must be in the hands of the Education Department’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, May 1938 as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.59). From at least that time forward, the Teachers’ Union in Western Australia was active in campaigning for the maintenance of responsibility for teacher preparation by the education department on the grounds that the financial cost to the government warranted control.

Secondly, these two campaigns found in the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia represent the perspectives of the two key discourses that emerged from the historical texts. These were the discourses of departmental rights in relation to and preferred futures for teacher
preparation. From the beginning of teacher preparation in Western Australia, the discourse surrounding preferred futures acknowledged that a dualistic focus was necessary. That is, teacher preparation needed to facilitate academic attainment for propaedeutic teachers while also ensuring the development of their professional practices. Interestingly, the articulation of this discourse is found in the language of the campaigners on both sides of the argument for teacher education. That is, the dualistic nature of this discourse lead to a dualistic approach that supported the engagement of both academic and professional institutions in the provision of teacher preparation.

The preference for teacher preparation to focus on both academic and professional development was already evident in the aims of the two-year Trained Teachers Certificate developed by Rooney in 1906. Rooney’s aims were threefold; to ‘provide student with a liberal education’, ‘provide instruction in special subjects required by teachers’ and ‘to inculcate the attitudes and ideals of the teaching profession’ (Rooney, 1906, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.21). By the 1950s, the ideal of a strong theoretical foundation in education coupled with relevant professional studies, activities and experiences was firmly entrenched in the practices of teacher preparation in Western Australia. The combination of, ‘the practical expertise and ready access to schools of Claremont Teachers’ College with the academic rigour of university studies in Education’ (Gardiner, 2004, p.75), was established in courses offered at both the university and the college. At the time, this model of preparation compared favourably with that being promoted by experts from both Great Britain and the United States of America (Turner, 1943).

Additionally, the discourse of preferred futures also consistently called for changes or improvements to teacher preparation. Throughout the story, educational leaders campaigned for increases in the nature, length and level of teacher preparation offered in Western Australia on the grounds that these changes were necessary for the educational future of the state and its citizens. Cyril Jackson, the first Inspector General, exemplified this in his report that called for ‘the necessity to insist in higher qualifications for the teaching staff’ and the development of ‘the long-promised Training College’ (Jackson, 1897, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.8). Rooney, the college’s first Principal, was applauded for holding ‘fast to his belief in the need for a theoretical foundation in teacher training’ (Gardiner, 2004, p.57), that saw him reflect that, ‘Probably by none was the inauguration of the University more happily received than by those associated with the Training College’ (as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.33). By Cameron’s term as Principal and Chair, the idea that ‘teacher training would become a function of the University’ (Mossenson, 1955, p.46), and the ‘possibility of the University replacing the College as the training institution’ (Mossenson, 1955, p.47) was firmly established as the preferred future of the educational leaders of teacher preparation.

While the dualistic orientation of this first discourse established a role for both the teachers’ college and the university, the second key discourse in the story of the rise of teacher preparation emerged out of the tension created by the educational claims of the long-term need for and inevitability of university-based teacher preparation. The second discourse sought to ensure longevity for the teachers’ college by affirming and promoting the rights and responsibilities of the Department of Education to teacher preparation. Throughout the story, this discourse was political and driven by the campaigning of the Teachers’ Union. The argument posited that the required financial outlay of the department entitled it to maintain educational and organisational control of teacher preparation. This supposition was buttressed by claims that studies in education at the university were too theoretical and that, ‘the provision of a much more practical training for teachers’ was ‘specially urgent’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, August 1927, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.40).
The final key element of this situational analysis, the core contestation in the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia, articulates the outworking of the tensions at work in the context. Rather than describing extremes as in the Victorian story, the core contestation in the Western Australian context is based on alternative conceptions relevant to the role of higher education in teacher preparation. The first of these relates to the contribution made by the education model exemplified by enrolment in university studies. The second relates to the locus of responsibility for teacher preparation.

From very early in the story all of the key actors, both leaders and campaigners, were openly supportive of the idea that, ‘the best methods in the world are of no avail unless the teacher has a knowledge’ (Andrews, 1901, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.13). An understanding of the importance of an educated teaching workforce to the development of education, and by association the role of the university in providing that education, was evident in the foundations of the story of teacher preparation in Western Australia. However, this role for academic development was always held in tension with the need for practical skills in teaching. The dualistic nature of the preferred future for teacher preparation led to a number of conceptions about the boundaries of university-based teacher preparation.

From the perspective of the teacher educators, the discipline of education ‘as an area of study in Australian universities was a product of two educational traditions’ (Gardiner, 2004, p.93). The University of Western Australia was founded with the ‘view that the universities had an important vocational role to fulfil’ (Gardiner, 2004, p.48) that led to a ‘strong, practical emphasis present in the curriculum’ (Gardiner, 2004, p.1). At the same time, the teacher educators were consistent in their defence of theoretical foundations and academic rigour. As such, their conception of the contribution of the education model was confident of the inevitability of the university becoming the core provider of teacher preparation. Cameron’s prediction of 1930 that teaching would become a graduate profession was indicative of this perspective.

In contrast to the optimism of the teacher educators, many other educational and political participants were less confident of the university’s capacity to effectively fulfil the dualistic requirements of teacher preparation. This perspective was supported by three key considerations; namely, the preference for the university to place more emphasis on liberal or classical studies, a critique of the quality of the students enrolling in teacher preparation and the importance of departmental participation in developing the practicalities of teaching. Interestingly, these arguments came from two directions. The 1942 Royal Commission into the operation on the University of Western Australia, which was led by Wolff, was critical of the participation of the university in the provision of teacher preparation. Wolff’s (1942) report stated that, ‘the function of the University lies in its pursuing a broader cultural basis’ (as cited in Gardiner, 2004, p.74). Effectively, the report sought to distance the university from its utilitarian foundations in order to promote a more liberal-oriented institution. Core to this move was the need to attract and cater for students with the capacity to participate in the more theoretical and research-based approach. As a consequence, it was recommended that the ‘purely sub-graduate students’ of the teachers’ college were better suited to the training provided there (Mossenson, 1955, p.64).

In line with this critique of the university from inside the educational community, political participants, including both politicians and the Teachers’ Union, also questioned the capacity of the university to provide effective teacher preparation. The argument ran that, ‘although men with degrees are desirable, it doesn’t follow that such men are good teachers’ (Rankin, 1926, as cited in Gardiner, 2004,
Interestingly, at no point was the argument made to entirely remove the engagement of the University of Western Australia in the provision of teacher preparation. Rather, in the 1920s the recommendations of the union held to a perspective that unequivocally supported the idea that, ‘all trainees should attend the University’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, April 1922, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.37). However, the ensuing exigencism of the depression years that left the University of Western Australia as the only institution offering teacher preparation caused great alarm. As a result, from the 1930s the union, political supporters and other critics expressed concerns about the possibility that the university might take full responsibility for rather than merely contribute to teacher preparation. The politician and later Minister for Education, John Tonkin, exemplified this argument. Tonkin (1933) criticised the university’s theoretical contribution to teacher preparation while lauding the practical training offered at the teachers’ college (as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.65).

The focus of this argument about the extent of the contribution of the university to teacher preparation brings into focus the second conception that makes up the core contestation. This conception relates to the locus of responsibility for teacher preparation. Effectively, the educational ideology of the teacher educators promoted a future for teacher preparation where the university took responsibility for all aspects of teacher preparation. However, the critics of the theoretical nature of university studies in education opposed this view. Generally, this perspective was justified on the grounds of financial contributions. It was argued that, ‘while the state assumed the burden of cost it should remain in control’ (Wolff, 1942, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.64). While this conclusion was included in the Wolff’s report, it is clear that in this respect Wolff was reiterating the opinion of the union. From as early as 1930 the union had maintained that, ‘the Education Department must always retain control of teacher training’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, June 1930, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.46).

This contestation between the contribution of teacher education and the locus of responsibility for teacher preparation was pivotal to the rise of teacher education in Western Australia. It effectively set up the context such that the argument centred on the level of impact of teacher education rather than its legitimacy as a model for teacher preparation. As such, periods of exigencism as experienced during the crisis years constrained teacher preparation economically rather than educationally. While different actors and discourses gave rise to a range of alternative perspectives, the emphasis placed on mediation by both educational and political leaders through such things as the College Advisory Board facilitated the negotiation of a role for teacher education in Western Australia. Over time, the opportunity to contribute led to opportunities to take increasing responsibility for teacher preparation, thereby creating the climate necessary to see the rise of teacher education.

**POSITIONAL MAPPING: COMPETING PERSPECTIVES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

Teacher preparation in all Australian states was severely impacted by the sociocultural factors surrounding the crisis years of the 1930s and 1940s. While all states experienced a major downturn in the level of funding for and provision of teacher preparation in response to the consequences of the Great Depression and the Second World War, nowhere were the cuts deeper and longer lasting than Western Australia. However, unlike the situation described in the Victorian story, the subsequent dawning of teacher education supported by both political and educational leaders demonstrates that the constraints of the crisis years were driven more by exigencism than ideology.

This does not negate the presence of alternative ideological perspectives on the processes and practices of teacher preparation. However, what is interesting is that in the Western Australian
context the outworking of decision making in relation to these alternative perspectives sought to mediate rather than decide between opposing views. As such, the key contestation in the story of the rise of teacher education that emerged from the situational mapping process provides the boundaries within which a number of major positions exist. These positions emerged out of an analysis of the perspectives, discourses and actions of various participants in teacher preparation as presented in the historical texts. They represent the ideological perspectives used in negotiating changes to teacher preparation.

The abstract positional map, *Figure 4.6 Core Contestation in the Rise of Teacher Education*, was developed to outline the major positions (Clarke, 2005) present in the Western Australian context. Again, the map creates a field within which the positions identified in the story can be represented against the two competing perspectives from low (-) to high (+). The four positions articulated on the map were evident in the historical texts used in the construction and analysis of the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia.

---

**Figure 4.6 Core Contestation in the Rise of Teacher Education: Abstract Positional Map**

The four positions (numbered 6-9) present on the map describe the four alternative positions advanced by various participants in relation to the role taken by the university in teacher preparation. While the positions described on the map are discussed below, it is also important to consider the nature of the other possible positions that are not represented. Firstly, the absence of a position in
the lower section of the map, where the university’s contribution to teacher preparation would have been low, aligns with the findings of the situational mapping. From its opening in 1910, the University of Western Australia enrolled propaedeutic teachers and this participation in university studies was shown to be supported by participants and stakeholders alike. Secondly, the two extremes of low contribution with high responsibility and high contribution with low responsibility are also not present. This further supports the conclusion reached about the significance of negotiation in the framing of the context in Western Australia.

The four positions present on the map can be identified in the discourses of the participants in two ways; in relation to their role as a key actor in the context and whether the perspective is preferred or actual. That is, Positions 6 and 9 represent the perspectives of the two key campaigners and as such present two alternative positions in relation to a preferred future for teacher preparation. On the other hand, Positions 7 and 8 provide two different interpretations of the actual experience of teacher preparation from the perspective of the educational and political leaders.

Position 6 presents a preferred future where the contribution of teacher education is acknowledged while denying the university key responsibility for teacher preparation. This position was exemplified in the discourse of the Teachers’ Union. As early as 1922 the union determined that ‘all trainees should attend the University’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, April 1922, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.37). However, by 1930 the union was also maintaining that, ‘the Education Department must always retain control’ (W.A. Teachers’ Journal, June 1930, as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.46). On both of these points the Teachers’ Union remained consistent throughout the period of the story. As such, it represents the preferred future held by the union as a major stakeholder and campaigner in the development of teacher preparation in Western Australia.

In contrast, Position 9 represents the preferred future held by the teacher educators, particularly those employed at the university. This position forecasts a future where the education model is the only pathway to the teaching profession and the university is entirely responsible for teacher preparation. For example, in 1930 Robert Cameron prophesied that, ‘teacher training would become a function of the University’ (as cited in Mossenson, 1955, p.46). He then actively pursued this in his work as Chair of Education, both as campaigner and leader, as evidenced by such innovations as the first four-year Bachelor of Education degree in Australia.

While positions 6 and 9 represent the preferred futures found in the discourses of the campaigners, positions 7 and 8 describe the actual circumstances of teacher preparation as seen from two alternative perspectives. Position 7 describes the emphasis placed on teacher education by the educational leaders in teacher preparation during the period of the story. From this perspective, the university was the lead institution in the provision of teacher preparation, while the teachers’ college facilitated professional and practical work. This position is epitomised by the arrangements made around the first Bachelor degree. For this course propaedeutic teachers undertook four years of study with the University of Western Australia that were integrated throughout with ‘school visits and observation of teaching’ that were organised by the Claremont Teachers’ College (Gardiner, 2004, p.77). To facilitate this arrangement the teachers’ college was formally affiliated with the university.

Finally, position 8 reflects the perspective held by those closely associated with the department’s teachers’ college in relation to its relationship with the university. These participants included political leaders, the Principal of the college after the role was separated and other educational stakeholders. This position attaches more equality to the relationship between the institutions both in terms of the nature of the affiliation and the substance of the contributions. That is, the two components of teacher
preparation, ‘academic discipline and professional concerns must go hand in hand’ (Gardiner, 2004, p.84) and be given at least equal weighting. As a result, the contributions of both the university and the teachers’ college were viewed as equally important and resulted in the assumption of an equitable relationship between the two institutions. This position was evident in the relationship established at the founding of the university where each institution contributed to the development of propaedeutic teachers in mutually exclusive but complementary ways. It continued, at least until the end of the story if not further, in the courses offered by the Claremont Teachers’ College that allowed enrolment in university studies to complement the teacher preparation provided at the college. Sten (1956), Principal of the college from 1945-1958, represented this position when he claimed that, ‘Claremont Teachers’ College had “a professionally key position in the whole service” arising from its close contacts with the university, teachers, head teachers, the Education Department administration and superintendents’ (as cited in McKenzie, 1981, p.34).

As with the positional map developed in relation to the Victorian context, this map of the positions evident in the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia serves to illustrate the relationships between knowledge and power evident in the context. That is, ideological issues surrounding the outworking of knowledge and power are fundamental to the roles played by these positions in the Western Australian context. However, the outworking of system relations in this story are much more subtle than those evidenced in the Victorian context. These subtleties relate to the relationships between the participants in the context and the roles that they played as key actors. Unlike the Victorian context where the key actors could be clearly demarcated in terms of educational and political participants, the key actors in the Western Australian context are distinguished by their role in the story rather than their position in the context. That is, the two key categories of actors, leaders and campaigners, include both educational and political participants. As such, it is impossible to easily demarcate the role of educational and political ideology in the Western Australian context as the discourses of the two key categories of actors have not set up a binary contestation.

Rather, the core contestation in the Western Australian story assumes that educational ideas about the development of teacher preparation are significant. That is, the academic and professional knowledge of educators is foundational to all of the positions found on the map. As such, the four positions are each underpinned by educational ideas or ideologies that represent competing or dissenting voices. In terms of preferred futures for teacher preparation, the two key positions (6 and 9) represent educational alternatives held by the teachers’ union and the Chair of Education. On the other hand, the two positions (7 and 8) descriptive of the actual context are both held by teacher educators; the difference being their relationship to one of the two key institutions. While teacher educators employed as leaders at the University of Western Australia presented a view that privileged the role of the university over the teachers’ college (Position 7), the Principal of the college presented a more egalitarian perspective (Position 8).

Given that the alternative positions cannot be explained in terms of different approaches to knowledge, the role of the power brokers, such as political leaders and stakeholders, needs to be considered. Across the story, political participants gave voice to a number of the positions represented on the map. For example, John Tonkin’s opinion, as expressed in the parliament, of the importance of practical work in training teachers was reminiscent of the professional focus of position 6. However, theoretical support for a particular perspective did not appear to necessarily lead to political decision-making in line with that position. Again in the example of Tonkin, his reforms of teacher preparation in the 1940s while cognisant of the need to strengthen the practical components of teacher preparation also led to increased contribution to and responsibility for teacher preparation by the
university. As such, the articulation of the alternative positions present on the map does not provide an explanation of the outworking of either knowledge or power. Therefore, an unpacking of the system relations evident in the Western Australian story needs to analyse how the context gave rise to these alternative positions rather than focus on an analysis of the positions.

Across the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia there were two key relationships evident between political power brokers and the decision-making processes they employed. The first of these relationships was evident during the crisis years. At this time, the decisions made in relation to teacher preparation were directly connected to the broader sociocultural context. That is, decisions were made based on exigencism forced on political leaders by the availability of resources. This mode of decision-making contrasts sharply with that used at other times. Both before and after the crisis years, power brokers used formal relationships established between educational and political leaders to broker educational advice when making decisions. During the foundational years, this formal relationship was formed through direct involvement with the Inspector General, who had to be a professional educator. After the crisis years, this role was undertaken by the College Advisory Board, on which all of the leading teacher educator sat.

In effect, the early adoption of the assumption that the knowledge held by educators is significant in seeking to develop quality teacher preparation, contributed to the formalisation of the relationship between knowledge brokers and power brokers. As such, it served to create a context where educators with alternative perspectives on the practices of teacher preparation felt the need to lobby or campaign for political support of their position. The political process of seeking advice created a context or space for alternative positions to emerge and compete in the field of teacher preparation. The system relations present in the story of the rise of teacher education is not framed by a contestation between knowledge and power but by a contestation for power by knowledge brokers.

Within that contestation, the different positions evident on the map emerged out of the different viewpoints held by educators involved with teacher preparation through different roles, backgrounds or perspectives. Interestingly, the position taken by a particular educational participant in relation to both their preferred future for and interpretation of the actual context of teacher preparation could be predicted based on their role in teacher education. For example, the leading teacher educators at the university, such as Cameron, were predictably committed to positions 2 and 4 that privileged the contribution of teacher education over the professional training offered at the teachers’ college. On the other hand, the leaders of the teachers’ college, as epitomised by Sten, were more inclined to support positions 6 and 8 that downplayed to role of the university. As such, the habitus or worldview through which a particular participant viewed the contestation had much to do with the positions taken.

In the end, the contestation between the educational ideologies represented in the four positions on the map saw the perspectives of the university-based teacher educators prevail. This began in the 1940s and 1950s with the rise of teacher education in Western Australia and culminated with the transfer of all teacher preparation to independent tertiary institutions in the 1970s. While the move to teacher education in the 1970s can be explained by reference to federal interventions, the rise of teacher education in Western Australia in the much earlier decades of the 1940s and 1950s is a consequence of the unique context present in the state at the time. Firstly, the perceptiveness, integrity and strength of character of the individuals campaigning for the contribution of teacher education contributed to the privileging of university-based teacher preparation. While not wishing to detract from the contributions of many others, men like Rooney, Andrews and Cameron were much
lauded, both in their own time and in the records of the historical texts, for their contribution to the pursuit of high standards of education for all teachers. Secondly, the tendency for political decision-makers to listen to, consider and attempt to appease both sides of the educational contestation also assisted. As Mossenson (1955) noted, ‘the government complied with the representations of both the University and the Union’ (p.40), in providing support to both the academic and professional aspects of teacher preparation in the 1920s, and this dualistic approach prevailed throughout the story.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the rise of teacher education in Western Australia was a consequence of the educational and cultural capital embodied by the university (Bourdieu, 2010). That is, the University of Western Australia is tacitly privileged because it is a university. As the holder and protector of knowledge, the university was the accepted institution of higher learning in the context, and as such held a more powerful position than that associated with the other institutions or stakeholders. The educational and cultural capital of the university when combined with the work of individuals such as Cameron served to build a powerful platform whereby the ideological positions framed by that capital were privileged. The political context that made space for the contestation of educational ideologies also served to promote the growth of teacher education through the privileging of the university in the hierarchy of institutions. As such, the system relations present in the story of the rise of teacher education in Western Australia reflect the idea that knowledge is powerful.

**CRITIQUING THE NARRATIVES**

The construction and then deconstruction of these two stories about the development of teacher preparation in Victorian and Western Australian was designed to answer two supporting questions. These being:

- *How have structures and systems influenced paradigmatic change and continuity in teacher preparation in the Australian context?* and
- *What knowledge and power relationships have been established, promoted and maintained by these change processes?*

That is, the purpose of the two stories and the situational analyses thereof was to develop two substantive cases. These were then compared for the purpose of theorising structures, systems, knowledge and power in the changes and continuities evident. While the two contexts and stories were very different, the situational analyses revealed that knowledge and power played pivotal roles in the systems and structures in both locations despite the antithetical outcomes. As such, it is important to consider how these two narratives have exposed, analysed and critiqued teacher educators’ stories about the development of teacher preparation. Charmaz’s (2006) constructivist approach to grounded theory was used for this purpose. However, given the use of narrative devices in both the texts used as data and the analysis thereof, the first step in this process of theorising was a comparison of the narrative devices at work across the two stories.

While both of the stories constructed here articulated the complications of change and continuity of teacher preparation, the different contextual settings, contestations and resolutions led to very different outcomes. Even though these differences are the most striking aspects of the stories, the similarities between the stories are equally as interesting and enlightening in seeking to analyse and critique the system relations at work. Therefore, the narrative devices of setting, character, plot and theme were used to comparatively explore the two stories of teacher preparation

**SETTING**
The setting of a narrative describes the context within which the story takes place. The context establishes the space, physical or otherwise, within which the story happens (Bold, 2012). The identification, description and development of context are the boundary markers designed to contain the narrative plot. As such, the context is used as a narrative device that constrains the setting of the story in order to manipulate or facilitate the development of a meaningful plot. Across the two narratives of teacher preparation in Victoria and Western Australia, the development of the setting or context of the stories provided physical, chronological, sociocultural and ideological boundaries.

The physical context or setting of each story was integrally connected to the unique features of each state and its provision of teacher preparation. In relation to the two states of Victoria and Western Australia, the differences were substantial. The geographical differences of size, location and resources were foundational to the impact of each state upon the outworking of the story. Victoria was a relatively compact state that was well connected with both the empire and the other eastern states for trading in both commodities and ideas. Western Australia, on the other hand was isolated and at the same time very large and rich in primary resources such that it encouraged the wide and thin dispersal of the population.

These factors impacted teacher preparation due to the resultant differences in the chronological context. While both states were settled in the early 1800s, the variation in size and location influenced the timeframes for the development of urban settlements and social infrastructures. In Victoria, the settlement in Melbourne developed quickly and had established the university and commenced teacher preparation in the 1850s (Macintyre & Selleck, 2003). In contrast, Western Australia did not offer teacher preparation till the turn of the century nor found the university till 1910. Consequently, the rate of change between the three models of teacher preparation was very different. While Victoria’s evolution from the apprenticeship model through teacher training to teacher education was spread over 120 years with clear points of transition, the three models were developed almost synchronously in Western Australia.

While the physical and chronological settings of Victoria and Western Australia had little in common, there were other aspects of the setting that bore some striking similarities. The sociocultural context described in each story illustrated the colonial origins of each state and the impact of this on the development of teacher preparation. Firstly, a range of dramatic sociocultural events including depressions, wars, gold rushes and population booms interrupted both stories (Macintyre, 2009). While the timing, breadth and depth of the consequences of these events varied, the financial and resource crises that followed these events seriously impeded the provision and development of teacher preparation in both contexts. Secondly, constraints stemming from colonial realities were also present in both contexts. This included the very pragmatic constraints of the lack of educational infrastructure and resources, as well as ideological constraints.

The ideological context of both stories was framed by colonial sensibilities, particularly in relation to economics. Throughout the stories, political decision-making about educational goals and values were driven by the economic and sociocultural realities of colonial contexts (Kohn, 2012; Said, 1979). While the colonial context placed constraints on decisions about and the financing of teacher preparation until well after federation, the ideological constraints of colonialism did not constrain the educational ideologies of teacher educators. From the inception of teacher preparation in each state the ideological context described by the leading teacher educators made the assumption that the preferred future and inevitable outcome of change and continuity would be the development of the discipline of education and of a university-based education model of teacher preparation. That is, the
ideological assumptions and resulting actions of participants in teacher preparation were shown to either pursue or oppose the development of the education model of teacher preparation based on either colonial or educational assumptions. In both stories, this binary construction of the ideological context served to frame the selection of characters.

**CHARACTERS**

The characters in a story are the people who play a specific role within the setting of the narrative. Amongst the many people present in the context, main characters are selected, named, described and integrated into the story (Bold, 2012). This selection generally employs narrative devices such as the binary device of identifying protagonists and antagonists, while also involving complex relationships that blur the lines between different characters (Klapproth, 2004). The complexity of characterisation and the subsequent relationships is linked with the complexity of the narrative construct used in the development of the story. That is, simple narrative patterns, which follow a clear predictable structure, tend to be matched by one-dimensional characterisation while complex patterns are generally linked with complex characterisation. While there were multiple layers of participants in the narratives of teacher preparation in Victoria and Western Australia, the privileging of specific key people has been used to manipulate the narrative plot and its themes.

The characters in the stories from Victoria and Western Australia were the participants involved and named across the various time periods involved in the narratives. Across the stories there are a number of ways to consider the classification of the people selected as the main characters. For example, characters could be differentiated in relation to their role as either a primary or secondary participant as defined in Chapter 2. However, this model of identification is not strongly evident in the telling of the stories. Of the possible primary participants only the leading teacher educator at any particular point in time is named, described and integrated into the story. Other primary participants, such as other lecturing staff and propaedeutic teachers, are generally unnamed and if ever mentioned they are discussed as a conglomerate group. The same preferencing of leaders is also seen in the selection of the secondary political and stakeholder participants named and integrated as main characters in the stories.

A more useful means of classifying the main characters developed across the two stories is the identification of educational and political participants. For each story, main characters are developed in connection with the alternative ideological contexts that are presented. That is, key people are identified, named and described in line with the different educational and political perspectives used to frame the setting ideologically. In doing so, two types of participants were described in relation to each story; namely individual and institutional participants. In both stories these participants were held in common. Individual participants were the political and educational leaders with key roles in the education system. In both contexts this included the leading teacher educator at either the teachers’ college or the university, the head of the department and the Minister for Education. A further similarity in relation to these individuals was the preference for importing expertise when seeking to fulfil educational posts. The key institutional participants involved in each story were the education department, the teachers’ college, the university and the teachers’ union.

While the types of participants and their ideological allegiances were consistent across the two narratives, there were key differences in the ways that the stories constructed roles for these characters. In the Victorian story, there were clearly delineated roles for individuals that were directly linked with their relationship to an institutional participant. There was a clear differentiation of people that aligned with ideological perspectives expected of their role. The one exception was the character
of Frank Tate, who pursued educational ideals from his political position in the education department (Anchen, 1956). As such, the story of teacher preparation in Victoria was strongly framed by the identification of protagonists and antagonists as a narrative device that supported the perspectives of the teacher educators that were narrating the story.

In contrast, characterisation in the Western Australian narrative was much more complex. In this story there is an appreciation of the multiplicity of roles and relationships required of the key people involved. Consequently, there was a carefully nuanced presentation of the individuals that reflected the internal dilemmas created by the dissonance between their personal preferences and allegiances and the external factors that placed limitations on their actions. While there were still protagonists and antagonists, their flaws and foibles were much more evident. In this way, the nuances and complexities of the relationships between individuals and institutions and between individuals across educational and political ideological contexts were considered in the development of the key people in the Western Australian story. While the presentation of the roles for characters was differentiated in this way, the participants’ roles as actors were linked with the plot in each story.

**Narrative Plots**

A narrative plot incorporates a sequence of events designed to present a problem and then favourably resolve the issue. This structure requires that a problem is constructed out of the perceptions of the narrator of the story that is then presented through the characterisation of the protagonist (Bold, 2012; Klapproth, 2004). In forming a sequence of events designed to resolve the issue, a preferred resolution is also evident in the perspective of the protagonist. This does not, however, lead automatically to a positive ending for the protagonist. Rather, two key narrative structures, tragedy and comedy dating back to the Greek philosophers, differentiate between tragic and fortunate resolutions for the protagonist (Morreall, 1999).

The plot or sequence of actions that unfolded in the stories of Victoria and Western Australia reflected a number of similarities and differences that were significant to the processes of change and continuity. The similarities in the plot included the formation of a dualistic focus in teacher preparation, the sequencing of the introduction of the three models and their related institutions, and employment of negotiation in resolving the perceived problem. The differences related to the ways that the main characters were framed in the unfolding of the events, the level and nature of the contribution made by each institution and the final resolution of the problem in relation to that contribution.

The first key component of developing a narrative plot about teacher preparation in Victoria and Western Australia was the formation of a conception about the nature of teacher preparation. In both stories, this involved a dualistic focus that recognised the need for both the academic and professional development of propaedeutic teachers. As such, the goal for teacher preparation was the provision of an educated workforce that also had the technical and professional skills and dispositions needed to succeed in the classroom. This goal for teacher preparation framed both the problem and the preferred resolution. The teacher educators who were narrating the stories perceived that this goal would be attained through the progressive development of teacher preparation towards a university-based model of preparation. Consequently, the perceived problem that was presented in each story was the decision-making, driven by political realities and ideologies, which prevented the development of teacher preparation towards this goal. Similarly, the preferred resolution of the problem was the prevailing of the required educational decision-making that would see the development of university-based education as the means of preparing propaedeutic teachers.
Having founded a goal for teacher preparation, both Victoria and Western Australia introduced the three models of teacher preparation one after the other as a consistent sequence of events. For each model a different form of institutional participant was introduced. Both states commenced with a Normal School to support the apprenticeship model, followed by a teachers’ college based on the training model and culminated in the development of the education model through a faculty of education at the university. Furthermore, the justifications proffered about the development of each successive institution were also underpinned by the same ideological assumptions about the educational benefits to be gained from the change. At the time, these assumptions were grounded philosophically in a modernist perspective of progress and improvement rather than in the collection and analysis of empirical data. As such, there is little evidence, apart from the positive interpretation given by the teacher educators narrating the stories, that the changes made from one model to the next did actually improve the quality of teacher preparation provided.

After the three models of teacher preparation had been introduced in each narrative, the contribution of the negotiations made between educational and political leaders in seeking a resolution to the problems of poor political decision-making emerged. In both Victoria and Western Australia the processes of negotiation between the individual participants was fundamental to the outcomes for institutional participants and for the outworking of the preferred resolution. However, the differences in the experience or nature of that negotiation lead to very different roles and relationships for both individual and institutional participants in each state.

The key individuals in each context were framed by the nature of their roles as the key actors. In Victoria, the key actors were identified as heroes, champions and villains. The heroic leading teacher educator was single-handedly responsible for providing the best possible teacher preparation and for negotiating change. The political leaders in Victoria were either champions or villains who had control over the nature and development of teacher preparation and could use that control to either support or hamper the work of teacher educators. Thus, responsibility for change was internal to teacher preparation yet it was also entirely dependent upon external support. As such, power was individualised and the process of negotiation was dependent upon the relationship between the educational and political individuals present in the story at any one time. In contrast, the process of negotiation in Western Australia was framed by reference to a formalised relationship between positions rather than participants. Within this formalised process, the key actors were framed as leaders and campaigners where both educational and political participants could take on both roles. As such, the educational and political leaders, who used these formalised relationships to campaign for and lead change, shared responsibility for teacher preparation and its development.

The differences in the mode of negotiation between individuals also impacted upon the roles and responsibilities of the different institutional participants. While a number of differences were evident at both the teachers’ college and the university, the difference in the contribution of the university at the point when the department re-exerted its control over teacher preparation was most pertinent to the resolution of the story in each state. The departmental takeover of teacher preparation in Victoria that severed the dual position of Principal and Chair also severed the relationship between the two key institutional participants. Melbourne University effectively lost its capacity to contribute to the broader context of teacher preparation as a result of this separation. While the university continued to offered courses, the majority of teacher preparation in Victoria happened in the teachers’ colleges without reference to the university, thus ensuring the continuity of teacher training in Victoria.
On the other side of the continent, the severing of the dual position of Principal and Chair also resulted from the decision to reinvigorate departmental responsibility for and control over teacher preparation. However, the similarities stopped there. The split of the role of the key individual teacher educator did not lead to a severing of the relationship between the two institutions. Rather, the two leaders used the College Advisory Board to negotiate a formal affiliation between the two institutions. The contribution of the university, to its own courses and those of the teachers’ college, was assured. As such, the rise of teacher education alongside the training model became a key feature of teacher preparation in Western Australia during the period the lead to the federal interventions of the 1970s.

Ultimately, the processes of negotiation across the various educational and political leaders and institutions were pivotal to the resolutions reached by the close of the two stories in the 1950s. The outworking of the narrative plots for the protagonists and their preferred resolution resulted in polar opposite resolutions. While Victoria resolved the problem by privileging teacher training at the expense of teacher education, Western Australia actively promoted the development of teacher education and its contribution to both the training and education models of teacher preparation. What is evident in the resolutions presented in each story is the significance of the nature of the narrative and the role of the narrator in the framing of each resolution.

The Victorian story followed the tradition of a tragic narrative that saw the downfall of the hero and the quashing of his educationally inspired goals for teacher preparation. Although there was some acknowledgement of the contribution made by Professor Browne to the break-down of communication with the political leaders of the time, the story was constructed to portray him as an educational hero in a long line of educational heroes that had worked tirelessly for the development of teacher education as the preferred model for teacher preparation. As such, the demise of the education model at the hands of Seitz, Browne’s political antagonist, was framed in the tradition of both Aristotelian and Hegelian tragedies. The demise of the otherwise good heroic character as a consequence of his own actions in his relationship with the political antagonist is the hamartia or tragic error, an Aristotelian device (Hyde, 1963). However, the political leaders were not entirely and always antagonistic. For much of the story, and particularly during the time of the demise of teacher education, the political leaders were thwarted by the necessities of economic and sociocultural realities. As such, their actions in the story reflected a Hegelian tragedy where the situation is created by the fatal conflict of two values or ideologies, both of which were seeking good in the circumstances (Houlgate, 2014).

In contrast, the Western Australian story employed a more comedic narrative construction. This is exemplified by the optimistic, steady and progressive rise of the education model even in the presence of challenging circumstances. The characterisation of the key people in the story also followed the comedic tradition, which calls for more nuanced and complex characterisation (Morreall, 1999). The educational and political leaders across the story were presented as rounded characters who worked, often unwittingly, both for and against the development of teacher preparation and did so with good grace toward each other.

The narrative devices used in the development of the plot for each of the stories were framed by and reflected the perspectives of the narrators, the teacher educators who wrote the historical accounts. As such, the use of teacher educators as the protagonists who were working towards the development of the education model of teacher preparation as the goal is unsurprising. In exploring the similarities and differences in the development of the plot in each of the stories the significance of the process of negotiation becomes evident. The narrators framed the negotiations between and amongst the
various participants as the point of crisis that determined the nature and outcome of the plot. That is, the nature of the negotiations between the educational leaders, who knew and understood the processes and practices of teacher preparation, and political leaders, who held the balance of power, is used to frame the climax of the story across both the tragic and the comedic plot structure. That is, the narrative plot, as framed by teacher educators as narrators, uses these negotiations as the climactic event that determines the outcomes for teacher preparation during the denouement that describes the outworking of the negotiations into the immediate future.

**THEMES**

The theme or themes that can be identified out of a story are the unifying concepts or central ideas that the story is seeking to illustrate or articulate. They need to be a universal idea, concept or truth that is applicable beyond the context or setting of the story (Bold, 2012). In a western narrative, the theme generally emerges from the framing of the problem and the nature of the climactic point that leads to resolution for the protagonist (Klapproth, 2004). Essentially, themes provide a description and analysis of the challenges faced by the characters such that they reflect these as part of the broader condition evident in the context. Three common themes about change and continuity emerged out of the two stories of teacher preparation that help to make sense of the narrative devices used in each context. These themes relate to interpretations of change and continuity, the influence of context and the locus of control.

The first theme explores the nature of progress or development in teacher preparation over the life of the story and the interpretations held by different individuals. Interpretations of action in teacher preparation, while framed by the decision-making of power brokers, were the products of the realities of the individual making the interpretation. Thus, change and continuity were interpreted differently by different individuals in the light of their particular point of view. It is therefore possible to analyse the underlying goals and ideologies of individuals by critiquing their interpretation of changes and continuities. For example, bureaucratic and political leaders in the 1930s and 1940s supported the continuity of teacher training in Victoria. These individuals used the discourse of departmental needs, justified by the limitations of economic and resource realities, to positively frame the reproduction of the status quo in teacher preparation. On the other hand, teacher educators both at the time and in hindsight have challenged the legitimacy of the influence of ideology on the continuity of teacher training and called for the development of teacher education. They have assumed that development towards teacher education was fundamental to the improvement of teacher preparation. Yet, this perspective is equally influenced by the experience of educational context as that held by the politicians or bureaucrats. The traditional, progressivist interpretations of development as improvement is thus problematised in the light of the role that the system relations played in its outworking.

The second key theme held in common by the two stories of Victoria and Western Australia was the influence of context. Both stories serve to illustrate the impact of the social, political and economic experiences of their colonial context on the development of teacher preparation. This impact went beyond the realities of the sociocultural context or setting of the story to include the influence of colonialist ideologies on the outworking of the decision-making that framed the events in each context. The presence and outworking of colonialist ideologies were particularly evident in the relationships that were forged between the knowledge holders and power brokers in each state. For example, Victoria’s political rejection of the liberal, classical model of teacher education in preference for the pragmatic needs of the department reflected colonialist ideologies that privilege economic
productivity for the state over educational attainment for the individual (Kohn, 2012). Interestingly, the alignment of Western Australian educational institutions, from the primary school to the university, to the utilitarian and practical needs of the state also served these same ideological purposes that privileged economic production over personal development. The hegemonies of the colonial habitus were present and powerful in both contexts despite the differences evident in the outcomes of the stories.

The final theme that emerges from a comparison of the two stories relates to the locus of control of teacher preparation. While in both stories the ultimate locus of control rested with the external political and bureaucratic leaders, the individuals and institutions internal to teacher preparation also took some responsibility for the destiny of teacher preparation. Effectively, the responsibility for teacher preparation that was bestowed on a particular institution was directly related to the contribution made to teacher preparation by that institution. For example, in Western Australia the mutual contributions that the university and the teachers’ college made to teacher preparation through their formalised affiliation served to ensure that both institutions maintained an avenue for negotiating about and thereby influencing change and continuity in teacher preparation. The same was not evident in the Victorian story where the failure of the university-based teacher educators to effectively engage the hegemonies of the colonial context served to ostracise the practically minded bureaucrats and curtail their potential contribution to and responsibility for the destiny of teacher preparation.

Together, these three themes provide a window into the ways that the narrators viewed the challenges faced in seeking the development of teacher preparation. From their perspective, the development of teacher preparation was not a natural or inevitable process; neither did it follow a simple upward trajectory. Rather, it experienced swings and roundabouts in response to the political and sociocultural context. Since improvement was not inevitable, the teacher educators saw that change was dependent upon the active engagement of educational leaders in and with political processes. Despite the limitations of the political construction of the sociocultural context, teacher educators framed the negotiations between themselves as knowledgeable experts and the political powerbrokers as the defining relationship in the outworking of change and continuity in the story of teacher preparation.

**THEORISING FROM THE NARRATIVES**

This chapter has identified, constructed, deconstructed and critiqued two micro-narratives from the history of teacher preparation in the Australian context. It used historical texts written by teacher educators as the core data and then used purposive data selection to identify and construct stories that might be used comparatively in responding to two enabling questions relating to the structures, systems and relationships that have supported and influenced change and continuity in teacher education. The analysis of each of the stories has utilised two distinct stages. The first analytical stage followed Clarke’s (2005) methods for the deconstruction of discourses using situational and positional mapping processes. An initial critical comparison of the outcomes of these mapping processes was completed in order to identify the emerging categories that might be considered in theorising from this deconstructive analysis. This has concluded with the identification of themes, shared across the two narratives, relating to the influence of context and the interpretation thereof on the relationships that emerge between individuals and their ideas about change and continuity in teacher education.
Following this initial comparison, the second analytical stage was reconstructive and followed Charmaz’s (2006) analytical processes for grounded theorising. This utilised the comparative analysis of the two stories and their deconstructive discourse analyses to identify a core variable and constructing a theoretical model built around that variable. The purpose of this form of critique is to take the comparative analysis commenced in the consideration of narrative devices to the level of theoretical or conceptual abstraction. The outcome of this theoretical work, which concludes the historical phase of this study, forms the content of Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5: THEORIZING FROM THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Phase two of this study, which investigated the historical context of teacher preparation through selected historical stories, comprised two distinct stages designed to interrogate historically situated hegemonic patterns in change and continuity. As such, it was the first of the two core phases that responds to the research question; How might emerging paradigms for teacher education respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future? Chapter 4 reported on the first stage of the historical analysis using Clarke’s (2005) deconstructive analytical processes to construct and then deconstruct stories from teacher educators’ discourses. This chapter takes this analysis further by conceptualising the outcomes of Clarke’s (2005) mapping processes into a theoretical model. As such, it builds a theoretical model out of the critical analysis of the discourses evident in the selected historical texts and stories.

This reconstructive stage of analysis is based on Charmaz’s (2006) constructivist approach to grounded theory. It uses comparative analysis and memo writing to theorise out of the stories presented in Chapter 4. In doing so, it provides a critical analysis of the emerging re-interpretation of the history of teacher preparation that responds theoretically to the problems present in the modernist assumptions that have underpinned conventional interpretations of the story of teacher preparation in the Australian context as described in Chapter 2. This analysis of the historical structures and systems implicit in the provision and development of teacher preparation identified the concepts of structures and systems alongside knowledge and power through the framing of two supportive questions that were applied to this phase of the study. These questions were:

- How have structures and systems influenced paradigmatic change and continuity in teacher preparation in the Australian context? and
- What knowledge and power relationships have been established, promoted and maintained by these change processes?

Despite the framing of these questions, the construction and then deconstruction of historical stories has foregrounded change and continuity in seeking to understand both structures and systems, and knowledge and power relationships. As a result, the imperative to theorise change and continuity has emerged as critical to the development of this thesis towards understanding the provision and development of teacher preparation in the Australian context.

THEORIZING CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

At the conclusion of the narrative analysis of the Victorian and Western Australian stories, as described in Chapter 4, three themes were identified. These themes were; i) change and continuity, ii) influence of context, and iii) locus of control. While each of these themes was shown to be of significance in understanding the provision and development of teacher preparation in the selected stories, change and continuity emerged as the central theme. Across the two stories, change and continuity complemented each other as alternative responses to the outworking of the other subsidiary themes of context and control. In this complementary relationship, change and continuity represent alternative approaches to decision-making about the normative processes and practices of teacher preparation. The significance of these alternative approaches was integral to their role in developing or improving teacher preparation over time. In seeking to understand the structures, systems, knowledge and power that underpin the practices of teacher preparation, change and continuity needs
to be conceptualised theoretically, both as the core theme of this study and a pivotal component of critical grounded theory methodology. This chapter presents this theorising of change and continuity out of the selected historical contexts in developing the first of two substantive theoretical models (Glaser, 2007), that contribute to the development of this thesis.

Theorising change and continuity out of the narrative analyses reported in Chapter 4 does not happen in a vacuum. Ideas relating to change and continuity were already evident in the first phase, reported in Chapter 2, which used a review of the literature to contextualise this study. Importantly though, in the literature the terms change and continuity were rarely used. The discussions presented in the literature conveyed the concept of development as a series of improvements that saw teacher preparation progress through the three paradigmatic models of apprenticeship, training and education. While the strength of modality used by authors waned over time (compare for example: Aspland, 2010; Hyams, 1979), the sequencing of the models and references to development as ‘progress’ remained consistent even in the presence of oscillating fortunes that saw forwards and backwards steps made in response to a range contextual issues. This presentation of change and continuity in terms of development, progress and improvement relies heavily on modernist conceptions that were prevalent at the time of the historical stories. These modernist theories of social and cultural change explain change in relation to two key constructs, evolutionary and revolutionary change (Kuhn, 1962/1970; Richards, 2004; Delaney, 2009).

Evolutionary social and cultural change is seen to produce greater levels of complexity in systems and structures through the building up of a series of small incremental steps taken in response to a stimulus in the social or cultural context (Hudson, 2000). There are two core modernist theoretical models of evolutionary social change, social evolutionism and structural functionalism (Delanty, 2009). Social evolutionism (Hudson, 2000) reflects natural evolution in that it views change as the natural consequence of the progress of time. That is, the development of social systems progresses from simple to complex in response to various stimuli that emerge over time (Delanty, 2009; Hudson, 2000). On the other hand, structural functionalism (Delanty, 2009) views change as the development of order in the structures and systems present in the social or cultural context that are taken as evidence of progress. Its development is a response to contextual factors such as the scarcity of resources amongst a multiplicity of competing needs. Since both of these evolutionary ideas developed out of western secularism, social evolution assumes that western, and consequently British, social and cultural norms are naturally superior to other Indigenous norms (Green & Troup, 1999; Torres, 2009). For evolutionary social change the development of structures and systems facilitates the effective and efficient meeting of the needs of the dominant group, thereby reducing or eliminating potential conflict with others.

In contrast, revolutionary change relies on a major upheaval of normative values, ideas or practices as a result of the upring of individuals or groups that challenge the normative ideals which are being maintained by other more powerful individuals or groups (Richards, 2004; Hudson, 2000; Pakulski, 2009). At a theoretical level, revolutionary change is dependent upon and responds proactively to conflict as the stimulus for change (Richards, 2004). The ensuing conflict theory (Hudson, 2000), which developed out of Marxist critical theory (Marx, 1971), acknowledges change is a consequence of the conflict that arises when subservient groups reflect about and then react to values and norms that are being forcefully maintained by the use of economic or social power. As such, modernist perspectives of revolutionary social and cultural change is focussed on the emancipation of the oppressed through a revolutionary overthrowing of power relations and the establishment of new normative practices.
Across the literature and stories reported in Phases one and two of this study, the underlying suppositions reflect components of both evolutionary and revolutionary variations of modernist conceptions of change. However, the labelling of change is less important than the identification of the suppositional properties of that change. Historically, change was assumed to lead to greater complexity through an increase in the quantity or quality of teacher preparation and this was in and of itself taken to be progressive. The suppositions evident in the literature assumed that complexity is a positive trait and therefore evidence of increasing complexity was taken to be evidence of progress and improvement. Furthermore, the development of systems and structures that reflect models of teacher preparation in Britain were also taken as evidence of progress. As such, in the historical texts change was conceptualised independently of both the circumstances and participants involved in the local context.

Logically, writers working in the time period of the stories, when these theoretical conceptions of change held sway, were influenced by these modernist assumptions. Yet, contemporary writers also rely heavily on these discourses of progress and development in describing change and continuity in the history of teacher preparation. Even writers who seek to frame their analysis in postmodern interpretations, appear to be under the sway or spell of the grand theory of historical change as progressivist (see for example ATEA, 2012, 2014). In doing so, both the historical and contemporary literature addressed in Chapter 2 present an unsophisticated interpretation of change and continuity through broadly framed stages of increasing complexity and, thereby, progress in teacher preparation. Thus, the theorising of change and continuity as a major contribution to this thesis must respond critically to these assumptions in seeking to ground that theorising in the critical discourse analyses of the data.

Given the modernist framing of the selected historical stories used in the second phase of study, the first step in grounding the theory in the data required the reframing of the stories from a contemporary, postmodern perspective. This process was undertaken using Clarke’s (2005) discourse analysis tools, and was reported in Chapter 4. Most significant in this reconstruction of the underlying suppositions about change and continuity was the shifting of the conception of progress or development away from being assumed to be the outcome, towards being the goal of the narrative plot. That is, the analysis showed that teacher educators used both tragic and comedic devices to illustrate how their progressivist, educational goals for teacher preparation were either realised or not in the outworking of the stories being told. This identified the integral role of the characters within a given setting on the construction of the narrative plot towards the intended goal of the development of teacher preparation.

While on the surface the historical texts were framed by modernist interpretations of development and progress, these modernist frames evidenced a sophisticated, analytical, intelligent approach that was far more circumspect than many contemporary reinterpretations. That is, the modernist frame of reference was used definitively in relation to the setting of goals for teacher preparation as shown by the educational ideology for and evidence of progress, but very cautiously in relation to the outcomes of those goals as change and continuity in teacher preparation. Across the stories, the goal for improving teacher preparation was the development of the length, level or model of teacher preparation. However, empirical analyses of the benefits or effectiveness of these changes to teacher preparation were not referred to in any of the texts. It would appear that this type of research-based evidence for the perceived benefits of modifications to teacher preparation was not undertaken or deemed necessary. As such, development was measured by either an increase in the length or level of a particular course or program or by a shift in the paradigmatic model used to frame teacher...
preparation; from apprenticeship to training to education. As such, ideological interpretations of the educational benefits of these types of changes were used to justify them as both progressive and as evidence of improvements.

The strongly modernist frame of reference for the educational goals of educational participants in teacher preparation was, however, counter-balanced by very cautious assumptions about the outworking of educational goals in the processes and practices of teacher preparation. These very judicious, almost postmodern, interpretations of the outcomes of teacher preparation depicted changes as both forwards and backwards movements linked to the locus of control. This demonstrated that these writers did not assume that change was always progressive, but that it was an outworking of the contextual factors that controlled teacher preparation. While progress or development in teacher preparation were viewed as external and objective realities, the goals present within them were shown to be subjective. The analysis of the selected stories showed that the characters or participants, in line with their relationship to context, constructed them. Thus, alternative and conflicting voices about the goals for teacher preparation were present in the stories and as a consequence the outworking of the plot relied on participants negotiating around these alternative perspectives about the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

The critical reading of the historical stories, as described in Chapter 4, problematised the uncritical, common-sense, modernist approach to conceptualising change and continuity that underpins much of the contemporary literature surrounding the history of teacher preparation. It demonstrated that modernist assumptions about progress and development in the story of teacher preparation are a consequence of modernist interpretations of discourse rather than a reflection of the evidence found in the texts. Firstly, the evidence as found in the stories points to a much more nuanced and circumspect understanding of change and continuity than is often presented in contemporary discourses about historical change and continuity. Secondly, the contemporary discourses and discussions about the history of change and continuity of teacher preparation can be shown to be problematic in that they are largely atheoretical in nature. Thus, the construction of a critical grounded theory of change and continuity needs to take account of a contemporary postmodern frame of reference that considers the subjective nuances of character and context within the historical stories of teacher preparation.

The problematising of the oversimplification of historical analyses of change and continuity also points to problematising of the theoretical basis of interpretations of change and continuity in teacher preparation. When the historical discourses of change and continuity in teacher preparation are analysed by reference to modernist theories of social change (Delanty, 2009), it is evident that change and continuity have not been systematically theorised. Rather, the literature reflects an eclectic, common-sense approach to explaining change and continuity by reference to various ideas from across both evolutionary and revolutionary theories of social change (Hudson, 2000). This reflects an atheoretical approach, that borrows modernist theoretical explanations to align with discursive interpretations thereof, but lacks a holistic theoretical critique against any one theoretical model. Taken together, these two challenges to the modernist interpretation of change and continuity point to the need for a sound theoretical conceptualisation of the processes and practices of change and continuity in teacher preparation. To date, theorising of this nature is not present in the literature and is a key contribution made by this thesis.

Alongside the problems that have been associated with a modernist frame of reference, the framing of the discourse analysis used in phase two of this study points to the potential of pursuing a postmodern frame of reference (Pakulski, 2009) for theorising change and continuity. Contemporary
postmodern approaches to change and continuity are post-structuralist and relativistic in their approach (Flanagan, 2012; Pakulski, 2009). This means that conceptions of change and continuity, development and progress embrace the chaotic, fragmented, discontinuous and ephemeral conditions of knowledge and reality (Flanagan, 2012), that problematise the assumption that change is a consistently experienced and objective reality that can be interpreted as progress. Rather, the influence of context on the processes and practices of change and continuity are highlighted in postmodern theories that emphasise the need to deconstruct the circumstances surrounding a particular situation (Pakulski, 2009).

Interestingly, both evolutionary and revolutionary conceptions are still evident in postmodernist theory of change (Pakulski, 2009). However, postmodern evolutionary change recognises that the wholesale application of British or western modes of interaction have not necessarily been more productive than the Indigenous forms they replaced and thus change cannot be assumed to be progressive (Torres, 2009). Similarly, postmodern theorising about revolutionary change considers the role of physical, economic and symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2010; Marx, 1971) and the implications of hegemony (Gramsci, 1992) and habitus (Bourdieu, 2010) on revolutionary change. As such, contemporary postmodern considerations call into question assumptions made about: progress and improvement; the externalisation of change and continuity as an objective reality separated from social, linguistic and cultural context; and the negativity of conflict (Flanagan, 2012).

Importantly, the conceptual framing of the themes that emerged out of the discourse analysis, as reported in Chapter 4, is closely aligned to this postmodern frame of reference. The central theme of change and continuity, alongside its subsidiary themes of the influence of context and the locus of control, highlights the subjectivity of interpretations of progress grounded in the social, linguistic and cultural context of the interpreter and the dissonances experienced between action in as distinct from control of teacher preparation. In so doing, modernist externalised conceptions of change and continuity as either evolutionary or revolutionary processes are challenged. In effect, both evolutionary and revolutionary theoretical constructs proved unhelpful because they only partially explain change and continuity as described in the stories of teacher preparation. It is therefore posited, in the development of this thesis, that change and continuity in teacher preparation is a social process predicated on the work of the participants in the decision-making processes that determine the provision and practices of teacher preparation within the political and sociocultural context of the moment. As such, the following analysis theorises the nature of the social process of change and continuity out of the comparative analysis of the stories presented in Chapter 4.

THE SOCIAL PROCESS OF CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

Fundamentally, change and continuity in the processes and practices of teacher preparation can be theorised as a social process predicated on the presence of multiple participants and the distribution of both knowledge and power amongst them. The resultant relationships between the participants are the social means whereby decisions about teacher preparation are negotiated. Beyond this, the critical analysis of the nature of these participants and their relationships with knowledge, power, context and each other articulate how the social process of change and continuity is outworked. Within this conceptual frame, change and continuity are related directly to the intra- and interpersonal relations of participants in the presence of ideological conflict. That is, change and continuity is negotiated in the relationships both within and amongst participants at points of dissonance between their ideals and the reality they experience. As such, change and continuity is integrally social in nature.
The key factor or variable (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in the social process of change and continuity is identified as negotiation. Negotiation involves the arbitration or brokering of the relationship between knowledge and power in the provision and development of teacher preparation by its participants and in light of the context present at any given point in time. As such, the social nature of change and continuity pivots on negotiation as its core social process. Negotiation is further understood through an analysis of the core questions of; who, what, where and how? The core categories that explain the social process of change and continuity are the participants in (who), spheres (what), dimensions (where) and practices (how) of negotiation. The categories and related sub-categories are as follows:

- **Category 1: Participants in Negotiation**
- **Category 2: Negotiation Matrix**
  - Sub-category 2.1: Spheres of Negotiation
  - Sub-category 2.2: Dimensions of Negotiation
  - Sub-category 2.3: Inter-relationship between Spheres and Dimensions
- **Category 3: Practices of Negotiation**
  - Sub-category 3.1: Psychological Practice of Intra-Personal Negotiation
  - Sub-category 3.2: Communicative Practice of Inter-Personal Negotiation

*Figure 5.1 Change and Continuity as a Social Process: A Theoretical Model*, below, illustrates these core categories diagrammatically. It depicts the centrality of the participants within their dimensional contexts, while also juxtaposing the spheres of knowledge and power across those same dimensions. It also shows the role of the practices of negotiation in negotiating between the spheres and across the dimensions of teacher preparation.

![Figure 5.1 Change and Continuity as a Social Process: A Theoretical Model](image)

However, before the core variable and its categories can be articulated, it is first necessary to clearly define both change and continuity as social constructs in the context of teacher preparation. Across
the stories, change in teacher preparation was identified as occurring when a current practice was modified whilst continuity happened when the status quo was maintained. While change and continuity can be clearly differentiated conceptually, their outworking in teacher preparation is much more nuanced and interrelated. Even within the identification of a significant paradigmatic change to teacher preparation it is possible to identify a range of integrally connected changes and continuities. For example, the introduction of the four-year Bachelor of Education qualification in Western Australia in 1950 (Gardiner, 2004; Mossenson, 1955), represented a significant change in the processes and practices of teacher preparation at that time. It embodied an increase in both the length and level of the course as well as a paradigmatic leap from training to education as the defining model for the preparation of teachers. There were, however, continuities also associated with this course. It represented a continuation of the participation of the University of Western Australia in the preparation of teachers and also continued to connect prepaeudetic teachers with the Claremont Teachers’ College for practical training and experience in the technicalities of teaching (McKenzie, 1981). As such, this teacher preparation course was ‘invented, constructed and formally instituted’ (Hobsbawm 1993, p.1) through a range of changes and continuities built upon the foundations or traditions of teacher preparation present in Western Australia at the time.

The changes and continuities present in the stories, such as the example from Western Australia in 1950, reflected what Hobsbawm (1993) and Giddens (1999) have labelled as ‘invented tradition’. Giddens (1999) describes an invented tradition as a ‘framework for action’ that is communally accepted as a form of truth or wisdom by a particular group or community and maintained by guardians rather than experts. Invented traditions remain ‘largely unquestioned’ though they are not ‘impervious to change’; are held in place by ritualised repetition rather than either longevity or suitability for purpose; and ‘incorporate power’ to both establish and maintain their influence on practice (Giddens 1999). Historically, there is any number of reasons for the invention of a tradition (Hobsbawm, 1993), not the least of which is the need to develop practices to control a particular activity.

Across the stories analysed for this study, the emergence of the processes and practices of teacher preparation have closely reflected the key features of an invented tradition (Giddens, 1999; Hobsbawm, 1993). A pattern of action framed by both the imported wisdom of teacher educators and the needs of the sociocultural context that is facilitated by bureaucratic and political leaders controlled the processes and practices of teacher preparation in both of the stories. This pattern formed a tradition that was ‘largely factitious’ (Hobsbawm 1993) in that it was not established by either empirical evidence or expertise, but nevertheless served as the recognised approach to teacher preparation. That is, the patterns of action in teacher preparation were formed out of a syncretism of both pragmatic and ideological concerns that responded out of necessity to the social, linguistic and cultural context of the time. Political and bureaucratic leaders then used these invented traditions as a means of maintaining management or control of teacher preparation for their own ideological goals. While change was possible, the positing of a change served as a challenge to the status quo of the established tradition and had to be negotiated with care. Interestingly, the same traditions and patterns of change were repeated across Victoria and Western Australia, though in different time frames. This highlighted the borrowing or adopting of patterns of action from other contexts as a core means of establishing a tradition for teacher preparation within a particular jurisdiction.

The concept of invented tradition (Giddens, 1999; Hobsbawm, 1993) also explains the challenges experienced by teacher educators seeking to align the processes and practices of teacher preparation with educational goals and ideologies. Continuities maintain the status quo through the repetition of an action that is a part of the framework of the invented tradition. Traditions are, by their very nature,
continuities. Change, on the other hand, seeks to modify some part of a tradition and thereby necessitates engagement with tradition in order to take effect. That is, to effect a change in a framework of action is to effect a change in the tradition that maintains or controls the continuity of current actions. Therefore, the effecting of change must respond to the means whereby tradition is guarded from change. In teacher preparation, this means engaging in a social process that involves negotiating with the political and bureaucratic leaders who hold the balance of power in making decisions about the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

**Negotiation as the Core Variable in the Social Process**

Within the social process of change and continuity the core variable or central process (Stern & Kerry 2009) used by educational participants to promote educational ideologies in teacher preparation was negotiation. In identifying negotiation as the central process it is important to remember that the core variable from the perspective of another group of participants could be quite different. Given the point of view taken by the purposive selection of discourses written by teacher educators, negotiation was identified as the central process because of its significance to successfully mediating the dissonances experienced by educational participants when their ideals and values did not align with the reality of their experience and expertise in teacher preparation.

Negotiation is the core social activity whereby participants influence the pattern of action for the purpose of seeking a change to that pattern. In the historical stories, teacher educators negotiated for the purpose of either seeking or obstructing a change or modification to the invented traditions of teacher preparation. For the participants the purpose was to seek a correlation between their experience of the practices of teacher preparation and their ideological commitments to and understandings about the goals of teacher preparation. As such, it involved both a psychological and a communicative act designed to navigate the disjunctions between ideology and actuality. Across the psychological and communicative acts present the process of negotiation appeared to involve four components, as evidenced in the narrative plots of the stories. These were; the development of an awareness of a disjunction between practices in and ideological goals for teacher preparation, the formation of an allegiance to a particular perspective about the outworking of that disjuncture, the arbitration of the alternatives presented in relation to the disjuncture, and then the assessment of the success or otherwise of the negotiations.

Effectively, this process of negotiation involved the arbitration or brokering of the relationship between knowledge and power in terms of their distribution amongst participants. It employed knowledge in that it sought an alignment between ideological orientations and the processes and practices of teacher preparation. However, negotiation also employed power through the actual outworking of the relationships amongst participants in negotiating an outcome. Without the alternative perspectives that emerge from the distribution of knowledge and power the process of negotiating would be moot. As such, the differential distribution of knowledge and power across the participants involved in teacher preparation was significant in that it promoted and supported all participants in negotiating, thus maximising the range of perspectives involved in the process.

Given the wide range of participants and perspectives involved, negotiation does not always result in, neither does it depend upon, the outworking of a preferred course of action. That is, the different perspectives brought to negotiations set up alternative objectives that are used simultaneously to form both preferred outcomes and a frame of reference for assessing those outcomes. However, what one participant might view as a very successful negotiation, in that it results in their preferred course of action, could be interpreted as entirely unsuccessful by another participant coming from a different
perspective. As such, a lack of success in negotiating for a particular outcome does not negate the presence and significance of the social activity of negotiation. Rather, negotiation is identified as the core variable in the social process of change and continuity because it is the key to influencing decision-making in the processes and practices of teacher preparation despite the fact that it does not assure the outcome for any particular participant.

This highlights the significance of the process rather than the outcomes of negotiation to the historical stories told about teacher preparation. While negotiation is critical to the educational participants who do not automatically hold the right of decision-making, other groups of participants involved in teacher preparation are also invested in the activity of negotiation. Firstly, both individuals and institutions participate in negotiations. Individual participants, whose positions were afforded them on the basis of their position with one of the institutional participants, undertake the actual activity of negotiating. As such, the perspectives of both individuals and institutions are involved in the process of negotiating. The individuals work on behalf of and represent an institution, though the ideological boundaries between the two are often blurred. Secondly, political, bureaucratic and educational participants all participated in negotiation, though they do so from very different perspectives. While educational participants did so with the aim of making changes to the processes and practices of teacher preparation, both political and bureaucratic participants usually participated for the purpose of guarding teacher preparation from unnecessary or inappropriate changes. While the educational participants used their primary experience in and knowledge of teacher preparation to innovate, the political and bureaucratic participants typically used their hold on the balance of power to act as the guardians of tradition (Hobsbawm, 1993).

Whether innovating on or guarding a tradition, participation in negotiations served two objectives. On the surface, it was assumed and communicated by all participants, recorded in the historical texts, that they were serving educational or social needs by seeking to maximise the potential benefits of teacher preparation for individuals, the community or both. That is, the ideological commitments that underpin participation in negotiations were grounded in assumptions about how to attain or maintain improvements to teacher preparation. Both the innovators and the guardians made the assumption that they were working towards ensuring the quality of teacher preparation for the benefit of others. While the participants appeared wedded to this concept of an altruistic objective in a social dimension, negotiations were also inextricably linked to egoist objectives on a personal dimension. Fundamentally, at a personal level negotiation was about minimising the conflict experienced in the dissonances that exist between actual experience of and aspirational goals for teacher preparation. For the individuals involved, the personal objective of negotiation was to harmonise beliefs with actions in teacher preparation.

In other words, the objectives of negotiation sought to work towards the outworking of knowledge in practice. Since this knowledge to practice objective traverses across the personal and the social dimensions, the objectives of negotiation equally worked across both dimensions. While the discourses of the educational participants sought to present an image of an altruistic endeavour in the progress of teacher preparation, this objective was undergirded by a more basal need to minimise personal conflict. That is, the hegemonic (Gramsci, 1992) relationship between the social and personal dimensions established a tautological reinforcement of the ideological commitments grounded in one’s experiences of teacher preparation through employment in a particular institution. This calls into question the validity of the assumptions made by participants about their purposes for negotiating. Given the hegemonic (Gramsci, 1992) influences of institutional involvement on the ideological commitments of individuals, the pursuit of a purely altruistic objective was rarely, if ever, possible. Ultimately, the objectives of negotiation were paradoxically two-fold and effectively biased.
towards ideological commitments that may or may not be grounded in empirically verifiable conceptions of improvement or quality in teacher preparation.

Similarly, judgements made about the results or consequences of negotiations take into account both of these objectives. Negotiation must have, at a minimum, two potential outcomes that remain open as possibilities until a specific point of negotiation reaches its conclusion. Once a conclusion is reached, participants assess the negotiation on a continuum between successful and unsuccessful in relation to their ideological commitments across both the personal and social dimensions. For a specific participant a successful negotiation is defined as one where the perspective taken by that participant is both heard and taken up in the determination of the course of action to be pursued. At the other end of the spectrum, an entirely unsuccessful negotiation is one where a participant’s perspective is neither heard nor heeded. In between, there is a range of positions involving circumstances where a perspective might be heard but not enacted, partially heard or partially enacted. Both altruistic and egoist objectives of negotiation were used by participants in determining the success or otherwise of a particular negotiation. As such, this assessment is highly individualised and biased towards the ideological commitment of the particular participant making the judgement.

The role and position held by the various participants involved in negotiations were also used in their determination of the success of negotiations. Most participants experienced a close alignment between their personal ideological commitments and their social institutional affiliation and this reinforced a unified assessment of the outworking of negotiations. For those participants with conflicting affiliations, negotiations that were assessed as successful in one dimension might be considered unsuccessful in the other. In the writing of the stories of teacher preparation used in this phase of the study, the perspectives expressed about the outworking of change and continuity were in effect a record of the assessments made by teacher educators about the negotiations that took place and their outworking in teacher preparation. As such, the promotion of the perceived triumphs of educational ideologies is a self-fulfilling objective. Again, different participants viewing the story from different perspectives may have told a different story.

Despite this recognition that the telling of the stories of teacher preparation had inherent bias in relation to educational participants preferring educational perspectives in assessing the outcomes of negotiations, theorising the social process of change and continuity through the articulation of the core variable of negotiation remains unaffected. The unpacking of the core variable of negotiation takes into account a range of contextualising factors and how they interact both with and for negotiation. These contextualising factors represent the core categories that explain and elaborate the social process of change and continuity by answering questions about who, what, where and how of the processes and practices of negotiation.

The following discussion further elaborates on these categories in relation to the discourse analyses reported in Chapter 4. Category 1 identifies and describes the roles of the key participants in negotiation. Category 2 elaborates on a matrix that cross-matches spheres of negotiation with dimensions of negotiation to explain what is negotiated and where negotiations are situated. Category 3 describes the intra- and inter-personal practices that are foundational to both the process of and success in negotiating.

**CATEGORY 1: PARTICIPANTS IN NEGOTIATION**

The participants in the social process of negotiation in teacher preparation were those individuals and institutions that participated in the decision-making that surrounds change and continuity. In the analysis of the stories in Chapter 4 the participants were identified from the abstract situational maps
of the context (see Figures 4.1 and 4.4) under the classifications, ‘individual human elements/actors’ and ‘collective human elements/actors’. In both contexts, Victoria and Western Australia, these participants included both primary and secondary participants in the processes and practices of teacher preparation, as identified from the literature discussed in Chapter 2. This means that direct involvement and investment in teacher preparation was not necessarily relevant to identifying participants involved in negotiations for change and continuity in teacher preparation. Rather, an analysis of the roles, positions and qualifications held by a particular participant was pivotal in determining their participation in negotiating change and continuity.

The role played in decision-making by a particular participant was dependent upon that participant’s institutional position. The further analysis of the stories through the final abstract situational maps of the processes of change and continuity (see Figures 4.2 and 4.5) identified a sub-set of all participants who were the key actors who held positions that afforded them the opportunity to participate in negotiations about a core contestation in the story. These key actors and the institutions that they represent are the participants in the social process of negotiation. As such, the analysis of the stories differentiated between participants involved in preparing teachers, and participants active in the social process of change and continuity in teacher preparation.

The classification of primary and secondary participants in teacher preparation described in Chapter 2 is, therefore, unhelpful in the analysis of the negotiations that lead to change and continuity. Rather, Chapter 4 identified key actors or characters who comprised a sub-set of participants from across the three classes of primary, secondary and stakeholder participants. This sub-set of participants can be classified against two criteria evident in the framing of the stories told in Chapter 4. Firstly, there were individual and institutional participants, and secondly, there were educational and political participants. While the distinction between individuals and institutions is clear, the classification of educational and political participants is more complex because teacher preparation, and by relationship its participants, is an educational field embedded in a political context. However, the analysis of the stories showed that the teacher educators at the time of the stories differentiated educational and political participants on the basis of the nature of their engagement in or with teacher preparation. That is, the primary participants were classified as educational, and secondary and stakeholder participants as political. Figure 5.2 Classification of Participants in the Social Process of Change and Continuity, below, classifies the key actors identified as participants in the social process of change and continuity in relation to these two classificatory dichotomies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL</td>
<td>Principal, Teachers’ College Dean or Chair in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>Director of Department Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2 Classification of Participants in the Social Process of Change and Continuity

This classification of the participants in the social process of change and continuity highlights the importance of positionality. Amongst the many participants involved in teacher preparation, the participants in negotiations were those that held a specific position that afforded them responsibility for or a voice in decision-making. The key positions were those held by individuals who were leaders in the political, bureaucratic and educational institutions involved in teacher preparation. There were, however, other influential participants identified as the campaigners in Western Australia (see Figure 4.5) and spread across the classifications of heroes and villains in Victoria (see Figure 4.2).
Interestingly, these positions were only identified institutionally rather than individually, the main example being the teachers’ union.

Across these various positions there were two key roles of these participants in the social process of change and continuity. These were to make or influence decisions. Across both stories, the responsibility to make decisions was always invested in the political participants, though they could choose to delegate. As such, the political and bureaucratic leaders who held responsibility for making decisions held the more powerful roles in the social process of change and continuity and as such had the upper hand in negotiations. In fact, a continuum from making to influencing decisions was evident across four the key positions of ministerial, bureaucratic, educational, and campaign leaders. This means that teacher educators, as educational participants, were acknowledging that the role of their leaders in negotiations about their work as the primary participants in teacher preparation was at the behest of those holding bureaucratic and ministerial positions.

This also highlighted the presence of a third role identified in the decision-making processes that surround change and continuity. This was the role of enacting decisions, where a particular participant in teacher preparation is required to act upon without the capacity or voice to either make or influence decisions. In effect, these participants in teacher preparation were either passively ignored or actively silenced across both historical contexts. While both teacher educators and propaedeutic teachers were acknowledged as part of the story, their role in change and continuity was merely to enact the decisions made by those with the positions that afforded them a voice. However, there was also evidence that the primary participants were sometimes actively silenced. The most notable example of active silencing of a participant related to the severing of the dual role of Principal and Chair in Victoria (Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939). This served to silence the leading university-based teacher educator in relation to the provision of teacher preparation by the departmentally run teachers’ colleges. The consequence of the silencing of such a significant educational voice was seen in the long-term promotion and continuity of teacher training under the control of bureaucratic leaders in the Victorian context.

A critical analysis of the selection of the sub-set of participants that negotiate change and continuity, as shown in Figure 5.2, identified two key issues significant to understanding the systemic relations surrounding the conceptualisation of the participants in negotiation. These both related to voice, or having the right to speak and be heard. Voice is a term that has developed out of feminist theory (Belenky, Clichy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1997; Smith, 1987). These key issues are: entitlement to voice, and the social construction of voice. The entitlement to voice considers how the identified sub-set of participants qualify for the voice they are afforded, and the social construction of voice considers how these participants came to negotiate.

The means whereby an individual or institution qualified for a particular position is critical in understanding entitlement to voice. Given the varied nature of the participant positions involved, qualifying for a position and therefore a voice in teacher preparation was dependent upon more than just educational attainment or knowledge of teacher preparation. Rather, the nature of the position held, the core purpose of that position and its relationship to the core processes of teacher preparation also impacted upon the qualifications required. In the two stories, all of the leading teacher educators were appointed on the basis of their educational qualifications and international experience in teacher preparation (Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004; Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). As primary participants in teacher preparation their qualifications for the role and position were based entirely upon their expertise in teacher preparation. However, these were the only participants in the social
process of negotiation whose qualifications for their position were directly related to teacher preparation.

Other participants qualified to participate in change and continuity by virtue of their political positions. Participants holding the leading bureaucratic position qualified on the basis of their core role in and responsibility for the development of education more generally, and qualifying for the ministerial position was by democratic election into the parliament and party appointment to the ministry. Similarly, the qualifications that determined the roles and responsibilities of institutional participants were also based upon the nature of their position in the processes of teacher preparation. While the teachers’ colleges, which were operated as a branch of the government department, qualified to undertake the training of teachers to serve the needs of the department, the university in its position as an institution of higher education qualified in relation to the development of the discipline of education and of teacher education.

As such, the qualifications that were required by participants to be entitled to a voice in negotiations about change and continuity in teacher preparation were determined by the nature of the position and the qualifications required to attain that position, rather than their level of engagement with or expertise in teacher preparation. Ironically, this relationship meant that most of the primary participants in teacher preparation did not have an established pathway that afforded them a voice in decision-making processes. Consequently, decision-making was something that was done to them rather than by them. This dissonance between qualifications in teacher preparation and entitlement to voice was a significant source of frustration expressed in the stories through the contestations identified in the abstract situational maps (see Figures 4.2 and 4.5).

The consequences of differentiated entitlement to voice highlighted the importance and need for educational leaders in teacher preparation to maintain pathways that facilitate the social construction of negotiation and to avoid being silenced. Fortunately, across the stories there were very few occasions where the political participants silenced educational participants by using their power over decision-making without first negotiating. Across both stories, participants preferred acting socially rather than independently, and it was usually social, cultural, economic or political factors beyond the context of teacher preparation that truncated negotiation. One such example is when the Minister for Education in Western Australia, Norbert Keenan, made the decision to close Claremont Teachers’ College in 1930 as a cost saving measure in the wake of the depression (Mossenson, 1955). Interestingly, the wholesale delegation of responsibility for decision-making to educational participants was also an uncommon event. One notable exception being the increasing delegation of responsibility for teacher preparation in Victoria to Dr John Smyth, as Principal and Professor, by Frank Tate, Director of Education, in the period leading up to the depression (Garden, 1982).

Across both stories, the group of participants entitled to voice consistently participated in the social construction of change and continuity through the negotiation of alternative ideological perspectives. This was promoted by the inter-relationships that were present between individuals and institutions and amongst institutions in the provision of teacher preparation. That is, participants related to each other in recognition of their mutual involvement in the task at hand. While the teacher educators and their institutions recognised the need for government funding, political participants and parties acknowledged the need for teachers in the provision of education. Furthermore, the differential dissemination of knowledge and power amongst participants necessitated the social construction of decision making by negotiation. This was particularly significant to the educational participants whose position in decision-making was tenuous. Effectively, those with the most intimate knowledge of the processes and practices of teacher preparation did not qualify for the positions that held the balance
of power in negotiations. For the teacher educators, who framed the texts that were analysed, this was the driving motivational factor in seeking to negotiate, the need for educational participants and perspectives to be heard. This brings into focus the influence of both knowledge and power for both individuals and institutions in the social process of negotiation.

**CATEGORY 2: NEGOTIATION MATRIX**

The second category of analysis of the social process of change and continuity considers the content of negotiations. This covers both what the participants negotiate about and where these negotiations are situated in the participants’ relationships. The inter-relating of these two questions, what and where, constructs a matrix from the intersection of the spheres of negotiation with the dimensions of negotiation. While the nature of the participants in negotiation was identified through the comparative analysis of the abstract situational maps developed across Chapter 4, the factors included in the negotiation matrix were identified through the critical comparative analysis of the abstract positional maps (see Figures 4.3 and 4.6). These maps plotted the various positions present in each of the stories that made up the discursive content of the negotiations between various participants. Figure 5.3 The Negotiation Matrix, below, provides a visual representation of the intersection of the spheres and dimensions of negotiation. It also labels the two alternative factors for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPHERES OF NEGOTIATION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS OF NEGOTIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERSONAL-INTERNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.3 The Negotiation Matrix*

The spheres of negotiation are the domains identified in response to questions about what was negotiated in the field of teacher preparation. These spheres were knowledge and power. They were identified in the selection of the continua of competing perspectives that gave structure to the abstract positional maps explained in Chapter 4 (see Figures 4.3 and 4.6). These continua demonstrated that negotiations focused around power, or how teacher preparation was controlled, and knowledge, or how teacher preparation was conceptualised. In the Victorian story the continuum of the influence of colonial/state realities on decision-making in teacher preparation demonstrated the influence of power (y-axis of Figure 4.3), while the continuum of the importance of education expertise illustrated the significance of knowledge (y-axis of Figure 4.3). Similarly, in the Western Australian context, power was described through the continuum of responsibility (x-axis of Figure 4.6) and knowledge by the continuum of the contribution of teacher educators (y-axis of Figure 4.6).

The dimensions of negotiation identified where the negotiations were situated. As with the spheres, two dimensions were identified; namely the personal-internal dimension and the social-external dimension. The personal-internal dimension considered the context of intra-personal negotiations of a particular participant. The social-external dimension related to the inter-personal negotiations amongst the participants. Unlike the spheres, the identification of the dimensions relied upon a complex critical analysis of the situational and positional maps. The discursive constructions, of both human actors and non-human actants, identified in the abstract situational maps of context (see Figures 4.1 and 4.4) were combined in the identification of the core contestation and its related discourses articulated on the final abstract situational maps of change in Western Australia (see Figure 4.5), and continuity in Victoria (see Figure 4.2). Across both stories, these discursive constructions, or
discourses, represented both the thinking and communication of the key participants in negotiation, as identified above. The impact of an individual participant’s understandings of these discursive constructions on their communication with others was identified in the positions reported on the abstract positional maps (see Figures 4.3 and 4.6). The resultant positions on the positional maps, both those identified and those absent, represent the discursive choices made by the participants in light of their considerations of both the context in which they worked and their preferences for teacher preparation. As such, the positions articulated on the maps were the consequence of negotiations situated in both the intra-personal, thinking, and inter-personal, communicative, dimensions.

The intersecting or cross matching of these two sub-categories, spheres and dimensions, formed the negotiation matrix, as shown in Figure 5.3, that explained the processes and practices of the individual negotiations undertaken in any given moment in time. This matrix demonstrates that the two spheres, knowledge and power, have an influence on the social process of change and continuity in both the personal-internal and social-external dimensions. Figure 5.4 Conceptions of Influence in the Social Process of Change and Continuity, below, provides a further visual representation of the negotiation matrix that names the four outcomes at the intersections between the spheres and dimensions of negotiation.

![Figure 5.4 Conceptions of Influence in the Social Process of Change and Continuity](image)

A critical analysis of the negotiation matrix requires that each of these components of the matrix be further articulated and discussed in relation to the social process of change and continuity in teacher preparation. As such, three sub-categories relating to the negotiation matrix have been conceptualised in the following sections. These are: sub-category 2.1, the spheres of negotiation; sub-category 2.2, the dimensions of negotiation; and sub-category 2.3, the inter-relationships between the spheres and dimensions. These inter-relationships, as shown in Figure 5.4, include the: social-external/knowledge intersection classified as ‘ideology’, personal-internal/knowledge intersection classified as the ‘goals’ for teacher preparation, social-external/power intersection identified as ‘control’, and personal-internal/power intersection classified as ‘responsibility’.

**Sub-category 2.1: Spheres of negotiation.**

The two spheres of this first sub-category, power and knowledge, were consistently and integrally present across the stories of teacher preparation. The pervasive influence of both of these spheres on change and continuity in teacher education was brought into sharp focus by the critical analysis of the participants in reference to the situational and positional mapping in Chapter 4, as discussed above. The influence of knowledge was evident in the alternative ideological perspectives that underpinned the positions identified on the abstract positional maps (see Figures 4.3 and 4.6). In contrast, the influence of power was more nuanced and related to the interrelationship of position and voice in the roles taken by key actors as identified on the abstract situational maps (see Figures 4.2 and 4.5). Importantly, the use of a positional power, rather than expert knowledge, to determine entitlement to voice necessitated the identification and understanding of the influence of power on the social
process of negotiation. That is, the recognition that decision-making was something done to rather than by teacher educators served to identify an external locus of control in change and continuity that facilitated the influence of position as powerful in decision-making processes.

Despite the presence of an external locus of control, change and continuity in teacher preparation were consistently socially negotiated. The negotiations, as described in the stories, were predicated on the incomplete distribution of both knowledge and power amongst participants as evidenced by the continua that made up the abstract positional maps (see Figures 4.3 and 4.6). No single participant ever had complete control over either knowledge or power in a specific decision-making process. As such, each participant’s unique combination of knowledge with power facilitated the influence of knowledge and power on the social process of change and continuity. Across the discourses of the teacher educators who wrote the selected stories, a critical analysis of the outworking of the influence of knowledge and power on change and continuity in teacher preparation highlights the privileging of one perspective over another in the making of decisions.

The purpose of negotiating was to successfully argue for the privileging of a participant’s preferred perspective or knowledge of teacher preparation in order to see it enacted. The privileging of particular perspectives was defined as the bestowing of a ‘prerogative, advantage or opportunity’ (Delbridge et al., 2001, p.1512), on a favoured perspective without that advantage necessarily being connected to a rational analysis of the alternatives. This conception of perspectival privilege somewhat resembles social conceptions of privilege, such as white privilege or male privilege (McIntosh, 1988, 2012). Depending on which perspective is favoured, it can be viewed as an ‘unearned advantage’ gained through ‘conferred dominance’ (McIntosh, 1988, p.14). However, the incomplete nature of the external locus of control by political participants in teacher preparation and the acknowledgement of their tendency, where possible, to preference the experiential knowledge of educational participants limits this relationship to social conceptions of privilege (McIntosh, 2012).

Rather, the explanations given of the privilege that teacher educators saw in the bestowing of advantage to particular perspectives more closely resembled the type of privilege described by feminist standpoint theory (Anderson, 2015; Janack, 1997). Standpoint theory argues that epistemology or knowledge is contextualised by an individual’s ‘particular socially situated perspective’ (Anderson, 2015, p.17), and that the marginalised in a particular context hold a position of epistemic privilege (Janack, 1997). The original propositions of standpoint theory assumed a position of epistemic privilege for a particular perspective because and despite of a social position of under-privilege (Janack, 1997). While this assumption has largely been discredited in relation to feminist theory (Anderson, 2015; Janack, 1997), the discourses of teacher educators as recorded in the historical stories of teacher preparation reflected the logic of epistemic superiority in that they assumed epistemic privilege for educational voices in change and continuity in teacher preparation on the basis of the assumed superiority of an educational approach to an educational issue.

As such, two forms of privilege are evident in the discourses of teacher educators, used in this phase of the study, in relation to the spheres of negotiation. Firstly, the participants who held a voice in the change and continuity of teacher education experience varying degrees of positional privilege. This positional privilege is strongly weighted towards the political participants who held the balance of power. Secondly, epistemic privilege is attributed to the educational participants, whose voices were either diminished or silenced in decision-making processes, on the basis of an assumed superiority for these educational voices. Together, the identification of these forms of privilege demonstrated its significance to the critical analysis of the social process of change and continuity. Within negotiations,
the sphere of knowledge explains what is privileged in decision-making about teacher preparation, and
the sphere of power explains how that knowledge is privileged.

**Sub-category 2.2: Dimensions of negotiation.**

The second sub-category present in the matrix is the dimensions of negotiation that identified where
negotiations were situated. In the stories told about teacher preparation negotiations traversed two
dimensions, the personal-internal dimension and the social-external dimension. Both of these
dimensions were described above as evidenced by the language or discourses that underpinned the
positions identified on the abstract positional maps described in Chapter 4 (Figures 4.3 and 4.6). The
personal-internal dimension is situated within the participants involved in the social process of
negotiation. It relates to the internalised practices of negotiating personal commitments to and
actions in change and continuity in teacher preparation. In contrast, the social-external dimension is
situated outside of any one participant. It relates to the social experience of negotiating with
participants external to an individual participants and the institution in which they work.

The personal-internal dimension focussed on an internal psychological act of negotiation whilst the
social-external dimension centred around an external communicative act of negotiation. Essentially,
intra-personal negotiations used language to convince oneself of the rightness of a particular
perspective and inter-personal negotiations involved using that language to convince others. As with
all uses of language, its social purpose can be explained in relation to metafunctions linked to both
context and language choices (Derewianka, 2011; Fontaine, 2013). The functional approach to
language as developed by Halliday and Hasan (1985), identifies three metafunctions that cover the
two core functions of ‘making sense of our experience, and acting out our social relationships’ (Halliday
& Matthiesson, 2013, p.30). These are the ideational, textual and interpersonal metafunctions
(Derewianka, 2011; Halliday & Matthiesson, 2013), used in constructing discursive choices in the
personal-internal and social-external dimensions.

The psychological act of negotiation in the personal-internal dimension always involved the ideational
metafunction (Derewianka, 2011; Halliday & Matthiesson, 2013). The intra-personal negotiations of
participants identified in the stories took in ideas about; the quality of processes and practices in the
field of teacher education, dissonances between the views held about and the processes and practices
of the time, and the value or benefit of continuing to work in the field despite these dissonances. It
also took in the textual metafunction (Derewianka, 2011; Halliday & Matthiesson, 2013) of language
through the giving of voice to those perspectives. Even the primary participants without voice in the
social-external dimension exercised this psychological act of negotiation. This occurred when
individuals who were otherwise without voice found ways to declare their perspectives about the field.
The historical stories used in this analysis are themselves evidence of this textual function. They were
a means whereby otherwise silenced teacher educators have told their side of the story and expressed
their discursive understanding and interpretation of the events that have surrounded change and
continuity in teacher preparation.

The communicative act in the social-external dimension does not reflect the same level of inclusivity.
Rather, access to the communicative act of negotiating in the social-external dimension was kept only
for those key actors who were identified in category 1, explained above, as participants in the social
process of negotiation. Only those participants with an identified position in the organisational
structure of teacher preparation were in a position to participate in the interpersonal metafunction
(Derewianka, 2011; Halliday & Matthiesson, 2013) of negotiation. As such, the organisation of the
social-external dimension was used to manage or control perspectives in the social process of change
and continuity by controlling the interpersonal metafunction in limiting who was entitled to a voice in social negotiations.

The importance of the limiting of voice to the exercising of control over teacher preparation is identified by analysis of the dissonances that were being negotiated in the field of teacher preparation. Dissonance is a necessary factor in the social process of change and continuity because negotiation is only necessary in a context where there is something that needs to be negotiated. The social process of change and continuity is predicated on the presence of a range of conflicting perspectives, as mapped on the abstract positional maps (Figures 4.3 and 4.6). These dissonances are what must be negotiated by participants in seeking to privilege a particular perspective in the outworking of teacher preparation. For example, in the Western Australian context, a disjuncture that needed negotiation was established between position 8 that places equal importance on academic and professional studies, and position 9 that sets up teacher education as the sole preferred model of teacher preparation (Figure 4.6).

The dissonances that are negotiated in the field of teacher preparation are three-fold; there are internal dissonances, external dissonances and internal-external dissonances. Internal dissonances are located within the personal-internal dimension. They are present when participants’ experiences do not align with the processes and practices they are required to perform. External dissonances are found in the social-external dimension when different institutions represent alternative, conflicting approaches to the processes and practices of teacher preparation. Across the two stories, the main dissonances described fell into these two categories. The teacher educators telling the stories emphasised the challenges faced in responding personally to the dissonance between their knowledge about the processes and practices of teacher preparation and the level of power they had to enact their preferred actions, and socially to the task of promoting those preferred actions in communicating with others.

The third type of dissonance present in the stories were dissonances experienced between the internal and external positions of a particular individual. An internal-external dissonance occurred when an individual’s position within an institution necessitated support for a perspective that conflicted with personal preferences. Across the stories there were a number of circumstantial contexts where this type of dissonance was described. In particular, where financial circumstances imposed restrictions on the level, length, type or resourcing of teacher preparation to the frustration of both teacher educators and bureaucrats alike. While these dissonances were fleeting, disappearing as the financial circumstances changed, there was one longstanding internal-external dissonance described in the stories.

The most significant internal-external dissonance across both of the stories related to the role played by Frank Tate in the development of teacher preparation in Victoria prior to the crisis years of the 30s and 40s. During this period, Tate’s ideological support for teacher preparation, grounded in his experience as a teacher educator during the depression of the 1890s and then as the first Principal of the teachers’ college following its re-opening, coupled with his political and financial backing as the head of the department was a critical factor in the advancement of teacher preparation in Victoria at that time (Anchen, 1956; Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939). His impact on that advancement was defined by his political support for educational ideology that saw him take steps to promote teacher preparation and education in Victoria in ways that were unprecedented in the Australian context at that time. The depth of the dissonance between his ideologically driven actions and his bureaucratic position was then brought into focus by the actions of his successor, John Seitz, in reasserting political
control of the processes and practices of teacher preparation (Garden, 1982). The story of this particularly unique internal-external dissonance, alongside the descriptions of the more common internal and external dissonsnces, described the importance of the presence of conflicting perspectives on the social process of change and continuity in the field of teacher preparation. In doing so, they highlighted an important relationship between the spheres of negotiation and the dimensions of negotiation.

**Sub-category 2.3: Inter-relationship between spheres and dimensions.**

The interrelationship of the spheres with the dimensions of negotiation that formed the negotiation matrix played an important role in theorising the nature of the social process of change and continuity in the development of this thesis. While the spheres of negotiation identified privilege as pivotal to the outworking of the social process of change and continuity, the dimensions of negotiation brought into focus the role that dissonance played in that social process. When these two sub-categories of the negotiation matrix were considered in combination with each other, the interrelationship provided a greater depth of explanation because it facilitated a consideration of the consequences of the combining of dissonance with privilege. As labelled in Figure 5.4, above, the outworking of these inter-relationships could be identified. In the sphere of knowledge these were ‘ideology’ in the social-external dimension and ‘goals’ in the personal-internal dimension. Similarly, in the sphere of power these were ‘control’ in the social-external dimension and ‘responsibility’ in the personal-internal dimension.

**Intersecting conceptions in the sphere of knowledge.**

The conception at the intersection of the sphere of knowledge with the social-external dimension was identified as ideology. Ideology incorporates the principles and assumptions that underpin the development of the discourses identified on the abstract positional maps (Figures 4.3 and 4.6). In the development of these ideological positions, assumptions served to ground the principles that were outworked in practice. In essence, the ideologies present in teacher preparation were alternative perspectives that drove the formation of ideas about and actions taken in relation to change and continuity in teacher preparation.

In the stories two broad forms of ideology, educational and political, emerged from the relationship between the participants and ideological drivers as identified by the continua that frame the abstract positional maps (Figures 4.3 and 4.6). Educational ideology focussed its principles and assumptions on what education can do in providing and developing teacher preparation. From this position the purpose of teacher preparation was to improve educational outcomes for individual teachers, their students, the state, or any combination thereof. This was evident in the focus on the educational expertise in the Victorian story (x-axis of Figure 4.3), and the contribution of teacher education in the Western Australian story (y-axis of Figure 4.6). On the other hand, political ideology focussed on what was politically supportable in the broader sociocultural and economic context. The principles and assumptions of political ideology considered the cost benefit of educational practices in relation to the political and economic needs of the state and the personal needs of the political leaders. This was evident in the influence of colonial/state realities on decision-making in Victorian story (y-axis of Figure 4.3), and the dissemination of responsibility in Western Australia (x-axis of Figure 4.6).

Similarly, the conception at the intersection of the sphere of knowledge with the personal-internal dimension was identified as goals. Goals were the ideals that motivated participants to contribute to change and continuity in teacher preparation. They were built upon the values that underpinned the positions identified on each of the abstract positional maps (Figure 4.3 and 4.5). As such, they were
mapped to the ideologies that framed those positional maps. The different positions, identified on the positional maps, as held by the various educational, bureaucratic or political participants resulted in the articulation of different goals that reflected alternative approaches to the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

The outworking of these goals was also tempered by the realities of context, as described by the politically derived continua that framed the positional maps. For many participants, their actions in the provision of teacher preparation did not align consistently with the goals they articulated. That is, most participants set goals for teacher preparation that sat outside of the capabilities of the current context. This was specifically evidenced in the positions outlined in the Western Australian story that described what should be in comparison with those that described what is already present in teacher preparation (Figure 4.6). As such, the goals espoused by participants were aspirational. In effect, it was this setting of ideologically driven aspirational goals for teacher preparation that underpinned perceptions of progress, development and improvement.

Across the two stories used in this historical phase, patterns of both the ideology and goals of participants and their contexts were identified. Three such ideological patterns or orientations were identified; namely classical/liberal, colonial and practical/vocational orientations. Two foci for the goals of teacher preparation were also identified. These foci concentrated the goals of teacher preparation on either the needs of the individual teacher or the collective social needs of the community. While a critical analysis of these patterns would be enlightening in relation to understanding the outworking of the stories, further analysis in this manner is beyond the scope of the theorising relevant to change and continuity in teacher preparation. Attention is therefore turned to the second pair of intersecting conceptions relating to the sphere of power.

**Intersecting conceptions in the sphere of power.**

The conception at the intersection of the sphere of power with the social-external dimension is identified as control. This was evidenced in the identification of an externalised locus of control as one of three themes common to the two stories. Significant to understanding the nature of control in teacher preparation is the dissemination of power amongst the participants or key actors in change and continuity. While the participants who make or influence decisions control the direction of change and continuity, the participants responsible for enacting those decisions controlled its outworking. As such, the control of change and continuity in teacher preparation was dependent upon the participants who held the balance of power in making decisions garnering the cooperation of the primary participants who enacted those decisions.

In seeking to maintain support for or have an impact upon decisions being made, participants employed two types of control; namely, direct and indirect control. Direct control occurred when a participant has direct responsibility for either making or enacting decisions about teacher preparation. While the teacher educators controlled the enacting of decisions, direct control of decision-making was largely invested in the political and bureaucratic leaders. In contrast, indirect control was present when a participant could influence decisions without necessarily taking direct action. The main means used by participants to influence decisions was to give voice to their ideals, goals and perspectives. As such, the capacity or right to voice one’s perspectives on change and continuity was critical to indirect control.

While political and bureaucratic leaders held the balance of power to maintain control they did not always exercise it. Across both stories, there were examples where political and bureaucratic leaders either disseminated direct control to educational participants or developed formal channels of
communication to facilitate indirect control. As such, the key to educational leaders exerting some control over teacher preparation lay in their capacity to successfully negotiate a position from whence their educational voice held some degree of political sway. Political power, rather than educational knowledge and expertise, held the upper hand in the control of change and continuity in teacher preparation, but this did not dampen the pursuit of educational goals and ideology for that preparation.

The conception at the intersection of the sphere of power with the personal-internal dimension was identified as responsibility. Responsibility was concerned with the ways that accountability for the processes and practices of teacher preparation was disseminated amongst participants. As such, responsibility was a reflection in the personal-internal dimension of the outworking of the control exercised in the social-external dimension. This was particularly evidenced in the Western Australian story where the dissemination of responsibility was identified as the key political perspective that differentiated between positions mapped to the abstract positional map (Figure 4.6).

Two alternate approaches to this dissemination of responsibility were identified from a critical analysis of the narrative plots of the stories; namely, autonomous and managed responsibility. Autonomous responsibility occurred when accountability for both the provision of and decision-making about teacher preparation was given to the primary participants in that preparation. In contrast, managed responsibility occurred when the primary educational participants were only granted responsibility to enact decisions about teacher preparation. In the managed approach, bureaucratic and political participants took responsibility for resourcing, organising and managing decision-making in teacher preparation, though they sometimes allowed primary participants some influence in these processes. Irrespective of the approach to responsibility, the political and bureaucratic participants always regulated its dissemination in line with their political control of teacher preparation. That is, the participants holding political and bureaucratic positions determined the nature and degree of responsibility granted to educational participants.

Across the two stories, the two main drivers of control and responsibility were pragmatic and ideological drivers. Pragmatic drivers were linked to the circumstances of context that influenced the making and enacting of decisions. They included the sociocultural and economic factors that constrained or limited the available resourcing or funding for teacher preparation. Ideological drivers were the hegemonic traditions and ideas that held sway in the various institutional contexts involved in teacher preparation (Gramsci, 1992; Howsbawm, 1993). Issues surrounding the specific use of these drivers in the historical stories could be identified and analysed, but this also goes beyond the scope of the theorising relevant to change and continuity in teacher preparation. Rather, the critical theorising of change and continuity now returns to focus on the final category relevant to articulating the core variable of negotiation. This relates to an analysis of the two practices that were identified as critical to the process of negotiation.
**Category 3: The Practices of Negotiation**

The final category of analysis of negotiation as the core social process of change and continuity is focussed on the actual activity of negotiating. The practices of negotiation are the actions undertaken by participants in negotiating about the processes and practices of teacher preparation. In the analysis described above, the two interrelated practices identified in the negotiations present in the stories have already been identified. These are a psychological act and a communicative act connected to the two dimensions of negotiation in sub-category 2.3, as explained above. These two acts or practices are integrally supportive of each other, such that they cannot operate separately in their outworking in the process of negotiation as shown by there combined relationship to the metafunctions of language (Halliday & Matthiesson, 2013), as discussed above. They are, however, distinguishable because they operate in two different dimensions; the personal-internal and the social-external. While the negotiation matrix that identified these two practices was theorised out of a critical comparative analysis of the abstract positional maps (Figures 4.3 and 4.5), further theorising of these practices has focussed on a critical comparison of the actions of the characters in the outworking of the narrative plots that framed the two stories told in Chapter 4.

The distinction made between these two practices is predicated on the presence of dissonance in and across both of the dimensions of negotiation. As has already been noted, negotiation is only necessary where there is something to negotiate. This points to the critical nature of dissonance or disjuncture in the social process of change and continuity. In the stories prepared and analysed in Chapter 4, dissonances manifested as disjunctures between the preferred and the actual processes or experience of teacher preparation for a specific individual. While particularly dramatic examples of these types of disjunctures were seen in the nature of teacher preparation offered during the depression years as compared to the preferred forms espoused by the leading teacher educators of the time, more subtle disjunctures underpinned all of the goals that participants expressed about changes necessary to improve teacher preparation.

While the presence of disjunctures has been shown to be critical, active participation across the two dimensions of negotiation is equally significant to explaining the practices of negotiation. Negotiations are typically defined as ‘mutual discussion and arrangement’ (Delbridge et al, 2001, p.1281), which effectively assumes the involvement of more than one person. This definition correlates with the practice identified as the communicative act of negotiation in the social-external dimension. However, the critical analysis of the discourses of participants in relation to the metafunctions of language (Halliday & Matthiesson, 2013), identified a second practice involved in negotiations. This was the psychological act that individuals employed to deal with conflicting perspectives about what was desirable and what was possible from their particular ideological point of view. As such, there are two practices of negotiation present in the social process of change and continuity in teacher preparation. These are the: intra-personal practice of negotiation evidenced by the psychological act of negotiating in the personal-internal dimension, and the inter-personal practice of negotiation evidenced by the communicative act of negotiating in the social-external dimension.

**Sub-category 3.1: Intra-personal negotiations.**

Intra-personal negotiation is a psychological act practiced by participants in connection to the personal-internal dimension. In the stories constructed and analysed in Chapter 4, a three-fold purpose for this personal and internal thinking was evidenced. Firstly, participants had to consider the perspective or point-of-view that they were going to take in relation to a proposed change or continuity. Secondly, participants had to assess the implications of the context that surrounded a
proposal and the likelihood success of any negotiations employed. Thirdly, participants had to
determine a course of action to either; comply with proposed changes and continuities, or initiate the
communicative act of negotiation. In essence, across each of these purposes, intra-personal
negotiation is negotiating with oneself around what to do about disjunctures between expertise and
experience in teacher preparation.

In the outlining of the negotiation matrix, in category 2 above, disjunctures in the personal-internal
dimension were identified as a consequence of dissonance between one’s goals for with one’s
responsibility in teacher preparation. All individuals who held educational goals, across both the
educational and political participants mapped in Figure 5.2, experienced disjunctures as a consequence
of power relations. Power dissonances were experienced by participants because of the differences
between the hegemonic power (Bourdieu, 2010), of their knowledge held about teacher preparation,
and the political power associated with the responsibility bestowed on them. Intra-personal
negotiation is influenced by these disjunctures that originate in both the broader sociocultural context
and the institutional relationships that frame teacher preparation. It involves the determination of a
preferred future whilst continuing to work with and within the possibilities of present circumstances.
As such, it needs to take a stance of hopefulness about the likelihood of success if a participant is going
to choose to negotiate with others.

Across the two stories, these purposes for the psychological act of negotiation were evidenced in the
actions and discourses of the key actors identified as participants in negotiating change and continuity
in teacher preparation. One example that was present in both stories was the negotiation of responses
of the leading teacher educators to the closing of the teachers’ colleges as a consequence of a
depression (Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939). The disjunctures experienced by Tate, in Victoria in
the 1890s, and Cameron, in Western Australia in the 1930s, related to the challenge of preparing
teachers through a truncated apprenticeship model whilst maintaining their commitment to teacher
education as the future for teacher preparation. The outworking of the intra-personal negotiations
undertaken by these teacher educators in these circumstances is evidenced by the differences seen in
the discourses they espoused as compared to their actual actions in preparing teachers. Both Tate and
Cameron maintained discourses that promoted teacher education as the future of teacher preparation
whilst energetically working under the minimal apprenticeship and training models that were
politically and economically supported at the time (Mossenson, 1955; Sweetman, 1939).

The ability of these teacher educators to keep working for and promoting teacher preparation despite
the dire circumstances they found, demonstrated an internal capacity to hope for a better future.
Hope in this context is defined as an expectation for or about the future (Virkler, 2004), and is more
than mere wishful thinking. This psychological act of hopefulness, which was identified through points
of crisis such as those experienced by Tate and Cameron, can also be shown to be significant in more
amenable sociocultural contexts. The expression of hope as an expectation took on a number of
different forms or types in the discourses of the stories. These different types of hope described
different levels of expectation about the likelihood of success for educational perspectives in the
outworking of change and continuity in teacher preparation. Two factors contributed to the formation
of these different levels of expectation for the future of teacher preparation. These factors were the
participants involved in and the sociocultural context of teacher preparation.

Effectively, the nature of the hope held by an individual was based upon assessments they made about
the amenability of the participants and the context towards accepting an educationally derived
preference for a particular change or continuity. When considered in combination these two factors
work to identify the different types of hope that were present in the stories. *Figure 5.5 Types of Hope for the Future of Teacher Preparation*, below, maps three types of hope that can be identified at the intersections of these factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenability of Context</th>
<th>Amenability of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope without Despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope for Better Times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.5 Types of Hope for the Future of Teacher Preparation*

The stories of Tate and Cameron and their discourses and actions during the depressions, as described above, showed a hope for better times. They recognised that the economic and resource constraints that were truncating teacher preparation were a consequence of contextual rather than personnel factors. As such, they held onto a belief that the constraints were temporary and that improved contextual circumstances would lead to an improved outlook for teacher preparation. On being asked the question, ‘Is it essential in your mind to re-open the Training College?’, by the Royal Commission on Technical Education (1989-1901), Tate (as cited by Sweetman, 1939, p.98) responded,

*I cannot conceive how you can ever hope to make a large system thoroughly efficient without a well-organized system of training... The greatest benefit of the system would accrue from a well-organized, well-equipped College sending out about fifty students a year, carrying the newest and best methods to remote parts of the colony. The function of the College should be to oxygenate the circulation of the educational system.*

Frustrated hope was evident in circumstances where the issue of the lack of amenability was attributed to personnel. This was most clearly expressed by Professor Gladman (as cited by Garden, 1982, p.40) in his 1884 report to the Minister, when he stated,

*for seven years I have now spoken as plainly and earnestly as I have been able about the fundamental weaknesses which are evident from my standpoint hoping to drive the truth home by repeated blows.*

While Gladman’s tenure as the leading teacher educator was long before the main time period of the stories, the nature of this frustration was also reflected in the discourses and actions of Professor Browne over his relationship with Seitz. Furthermore, this perspective was foundational to the stories that were told about teacher preparation. That is, frustrated hope thematically underpinned the narrative plot of the stories told of teacher educators making progress in the face of political opposition.

In contrast, the conception of hope without despair was not clearly evident in the actual discourses of the teacher educators that were reported in the stories. It was, however, still present in the stories and can be inferred from the underlying assumptions that framed the chosen narrative plot and its themes. Hope without despair was expressed in the unerringly positive, modernist perspectives that garnered belief in the inevitability of the success of the educational agenda in the future of teacher preparation. That is, the possibility of a hope without despair underpinned the very foundations of
the stories that worked to frame the characters, plots and themes. This positivity also meant that a fourth form of hope, where the amenability of both contexts and participants was negative, was never expressed in the stories. As such, it was a gap in this frame of reference. It would seem that the teacher educators who told these stories either could not or would not give voice to the possibility of a future in this quadrant, which might be inferred to be a position that is without hope.

**Sub-category 3.2: Inter-personal negotiations.**

Inter-personal negotiation is a communicative act involving multiple participants in seeking to negotiate outcomes for teacher preparation with each other. It involves two or more participants communicating around the disjunctures present between ideological perspectives and actual practices in teacher preparation. In the stories told in Chapter 4, the purpose of inter-personal negotiation was to influence decision-making towards preferred outcomes in the consideration of change and continuity in teacher preparation. The key actors, on behalf of the institutions they represented, undertook these negotiations by giving voice to preferred perspectives through whatever formal and informal avenues were available at the time. As such, the communicative act of inter-personal negotiation is a key practice in aligning expertise with experience in teacher preparation.

The communicative act of inter-personal negotiation focussed on giving voice to either hegemonic or counter-hegemonic orientations (Bourdieu, 2010), as held by the key actors working for different institutions. Across the stories, voice (Belenky, Clichy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1997) was exercised through both formal and informal channels, and was either granted to or taken by a particular participant. Formal channels of communication were those established to facilitate inter-personal negotiations between the various institutional participants. In the stories these were evidenced by strategies such as; annual reports, advisory board and submissions to political reviews and reports (Garden, 1982; Gardiner, 2004). Informal channels were generally undertaken by direct personal communication between teacher educators and key political or bureaucratic participants. The informality of these channels make them more difficult to trace in the stories, but they were regularly referred to in the descriptions of the relationships between various key actors. For example, communication between Smyth, as the leading teacher educator, and Tate, as the leading bureaucrat, was outlined in setting the scene of the story in Victoria (Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939).

The impetus for voicing alternative orientations was the space created by relational dependence. The pattern of relational dependence between different institutions was identified, in the negotiation matrix described in category 2 above, as mutual dependence on each other in the making and enacting of decisions. While the political institution of government in each story held control over the decisions made, the bureaucratic and educational institutions and the individual they employed controlled the fulfilling of those intentions. The teacher educators, in the telling of the stories, framed political orientations as hegemonic and educational orientations as counter-hegemonic. The framing of the control held by political participants as hegemonic (Bourdieu, 2010) meant that political decision-makers were never compelled to listen to or heed educational advice. In some situations this played out in practice, as evidenced in the silencing of Browne, the leading teacher educator, by Seitz, the leading bureaucrat, in the continuity of teacher training in the Victorian story (Garden, 1982).

Consequently, the possibility and practice of inter-personal negotiation was particularly important to the educational participants who did not directly control the decision-making that led to change and continuity in teacher preparation. The nature of the inter-personal negotiations between individual participants representing various institutional participants was critical to the outworking of the social process of change and continuity in teacher preparation. Ultimately, the key to successful negotiations
for educational participants was finding ways to mediate disjunctures without ostracising political participants. This involved forming positive relationships between individuals, listening and compromising, and responding to political needs and expectations in the development of educational perspectives.

Maintaining productive engagement with others when negotiating required positive relationships between the individuals involved. Given that dissonance or disjuncture are necessary pre-conditions, the very foundation of negotiating is oppositional in nature. Yet, it is important to avoid conflict while negotiating disjunctures. Thus, inter-personal negotiation is in essence an adversarial process, but educational participants must avoid an adversarial approach by building positive and productive relationships with their bureaucratic and political colleagues in the field of teacher preparation. If they do not, they run the risk of being shut out of negotiations. This process of exclusion was exemplified in the strained relationship between Professor Browne and Seitz implicit in the severing of the relationship between teacher education and teacher preparation in Victoria in the 1930s. Browne expressed the depth of this rift when he described his attitude towards Seitz’s ‘token effort to arrange some continued co-operation’ (Garden, 1982, p.161) after separating the university from the teachers’ college. Browne (as cited by Garden, 1982, p.161) stated in a letter in 1939,

*If there were, next week, another Minister and another Director of Education, it is possible that the whole proposal would be abandoned... My own feeling in the whole affair is that there is a distinct resemblance between the proposed agreement and the one recently made at Munich.*

The inter-personal negotiations included in the narrative plots of the selected stories typically resulted in a compromise, usually from both sides of the negotiation. Whilst the content, quality and clarity of communication were important, the relational connection that facilitated listening and compromising was the pivotal factor in the outcome of inter-personal negotiations. The success of teacher educators in negotiating towards preferred practices in teacher preparation was chiefly dependent upon the nature of the relationships and the capacity to identify and take steps towards educationally preferred practices. The relationship between Professor Smyth and Tate prior to the 1930s exemplified this process of listening and compromising in taking incremental steps towards as educational goal (Garden, 1982). Across the 1920s teacher preparation in Victoria was, ostensibly, the most advanced in the country. Propaedeutic teachers, if capable, were able to complete university-level education and a five-year education model of preparation was already being offered. This early offering of teacher education in Victoria was the culmination of incremental steps taken across the entire period of the relationship of Smyth and Tate, that were commenced by Tate during his tenure as the college principal at the turn of the century (Garden, 1982; Sweetman, 1939). As described by the Minister (as cited by Anchen, 1956, p.169), in his report of Tate’s retirement as the Director in 1928,

*For twenty-five years, as the first Director of Education in Victoria, Mr Tate guided the progress of state education, and he will always be remembered as an outstanding figure in the history of education in Victoria by reason of his many notable achievements. Among these are his work in ... the development of closer relationships between the Education Department and the University, [and] the vastly improved status and professional training of teachers, ...*

The outworking of compromise through inter-personal negotiation was effective when educational ideology was promoted in reference to political needs and expectations. Whilst the success of the negotiations between Smyth and Tate can largely be attributed to Tate’s personal experience of and commitment to teacher preparation, educational participants drove other successful negotiations. This was seen in the relationship between Professor Cameron in Western Australia in the aftermath of
the depression of the 1930s (Gardiner, 2004). In contrast to Browne in Victoria, Cameron actively participated across a range of formal channels of communication about both teacher training and teacher education throughout this time. In doing so, he negotiated to ensure the best possible educational opportunities were offered despite of the economic constraints of the time. As Cameron (as cited by Gardiner, 2004, p. 76) wrote in The Educand 2(3) in 1956,

*Today there is a new spirit abroad. Not the training of the teacher, but the education of the teacher – and of the whole teacher – is being undertaken. It is now recognised that ‘he who would educate must himself be educated’. What is aimed at is the enlightenment of reasonably cultured people about the principles underlying their profession, which incidentally includes much more than teaching.*

**DRAWING THEORETICAL CONCLUSIONS**

In this chapter, the historical stories analysed for the second phase of this study have been used to theorise the nature of change and continuity in teacher preparation. The identification of the nature of the relationships between educational and political participants in the communication surrounding significant decision-making events has shown that change and continuity is a social process. Within this social process, negotiation has been identified as the core social activity. Negotiation involves the brokering of the relationship between knowledge and power in the light of the sociocultural context surrounding teacher preparation at any given time. Its purpose is to influence decision-making in order to seek a change or continuity in the pattern of action present in the processes and practices of teacher education. As such, the social process of change and continuity reflects the conception of invented tradition (Giddens, 1999; Hobsbawm, 1993), whereby continuities represent invented traditions and change requires a break in that tradition. Given the strong relationship between educational ideology and change as a necessary factor in improving educational outcomes for teachers and students, the challenge of breaking with an invented tradition closely resembles the challenge of brokering a change in the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

Throughout the selected stories, a participant’s experience of traditions and as a result change and continuity was dependent upon their positionality in teacher preparation. Political and bureaucratic leaders had the power to make and enforce changes without reference to other participants. This balance of power, which they held over decision making in teacher preparation, facilitated both the guarding and the defying of tradition (Hobsbawm, 1993). Despite the capacity to wield power over the traditions of teacher preparation, political and bureaucratic leaders rarely used it to effect a change. When this did happen, it was generally done in the face of pragmatic necessity brought on by a crisis.

In contrast, teacher educators must interact with others in seeking to effect a change in teacher preparation. Their experience of change was dependent upon their success in negotiating with political and bureaucratic participants in relation to goals and ideologies. Their role, to enact rather than make decisions, limited their control over the traditions of teacher preparation and they were forced to negotiate with others if they wished to seek a change in the processes and practices of teacher preparation. In other words, political participants experienced control over the traditions of teacher preparation while educational participants experienced those same traditions hegemonically. For teacher educators, tradition acts as a dominating influence on the processes and practices of teacher preparation and promoting change was a counter-hegemonic act.
Despite their lack of control over change, teacher educators initiated the vast majority of the changes described in the stories of teacher preparation in both Victoria and Western Australia. This can largely be explained by the tendency of teacher educators as story-tellers to narrate their own perceived triumphs against the hegemonic power of tradition. Given that the discourse analysis used for this study has exclusively used texts framed by the voice of teacher educators, the perspectives held by these participants have framed the resultant perspectives of change and continuity. The critical analysis of these discourses specifically highlighted the investment of knowledge of teacher preparation with the teacher educators as evidenced by the qualifications they held, which were contrasted with a typical lack of knowledge evident in the qualifications held by bureaucratic and political participants. This was then contrasted by the teacher educators lack of power to make decisions and their dependence upon negotiating with the political and bureaucratic participants in seeking to make a change to the traditions of teacher preparation. Both stories were entirely framed by an interpretation of the sociocultural context that emphasised the separation of knowledge and power in the experience of teacher educators, thus, constructing a story of these teacher educators overcoming tradition for the benefit of teacher preparation.

This is not, however, a construction that celebrates the work of individuals independent of their context. Rather, the process of change and continuity in teacher preparation was impacted by both the personal-internal and social-external dimensions through the relationships formed amongst the individual and institutional participants. Thus, the distribution of knowledge and power across both the personal-internal and the social-external dimensions served to break down the mythical construction of the heroic individual genius. Rather, provision of and change and continuity in teacher preparation was predicated on the social work of negotiating roles and relationships amongst the many educational, bureaucratic and political participants. Given that knowledge and power were distributed differentially according to the positions and roles of the various participants, the significance of the social process of negotiation was also differentiated. For teacher educators, and the educational ideologies they promote, the outworking of these negotiations was most paramount. From this point of view, the critical significance of the theorising of change and continuity as a social process to the development of this thesis was expressed in the capacity for negotiations to bridge the gap between the participants with responsibility for decisions and those that held the knowledge to make quality decisions.

The completion of the second phase of this study, investigating historical contexts, has incorporated two distinct stages. The first analytical stage followed Clarke’s (2005) methods for the deconstruction of discourses and was reported in Chapter 4. The stories, categories and themes that emerged from this first stage were then analysed comparatively in the theorising that comprised this second stage in the analysis of textual data from historical contexts. This process, as discussed here in Chapter 5, used Charmaz’s (2006) constructive analytical processes. It has resulted in the theorising of change and continuity in the history of teacher preparation as a social process. Change and continuity is differentiated in this context from both objective modernist and subjective postmodernist conceptions of change and continuity as either evolutionary or revolutionary processes (Delanty, 2009; Pakulski, 2009).

This theorising of change and continuity has identified, articulated and critically analysed hegemonic relations (Gramsci, 1992) in the historical processes and practices of teacher preparation. The core variable in the social process of change and continuity was then identified as negotiation, a concept that arbitrates decision-making in the processes and practices of teacher preparation. Lastly, the core categories that were identified to articulate the nature of the core variable of negotiation described
the who, what, where and how of that negotiation. This theorising has highlighted the critical nature, within the historical context, of the relationships that teacher educators build with political participants in seeking to meet the educational needs of the community, teachers and students through the provision of teacher preparation.

Alongside the investigating of historical contexts, the third and final key phase of this study incorporated the interrogation of contemporary contexts in relation to the key research question. This final phase also comprised two stages. These were; i) the collection and analysis of contemporary interviews, and ii) a second substantive theorising of change and continuity across the selected contemporary contexts. As such, Chapter 6 changes focus from the historical phase that have been reported across Chapters 4 and 5 to consider the findings of the contemporary phase and future hopes of this study.
CHAPTER 6: THEORISING CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN CONTEMPORARY CONTEXTS

The second phase of this study, reported in Chapters 4 and 5, deconstructed historical discourses and theorised change and continuity as a social process. The substantive theoretical model developed out of the critical analysis of the selected historical stories identified negotiation as the core variable in the social process of change and continuity. This theorising of the social process of change and continuity explained the knowledge and power relations that effected paradigmatic change and continuity in the historical context of teacher education. As such, it responded to the first of two key analytical principles of a critical orientation to research; namely the unmasking of power relations in the context of this study (Kinchloe & McLaren, 2008). For this study to thoroughly integrate a critical approach with grounded theory a further research phase was necessary to focus on the second principle of critical research, the promotion of social change (Harvey, 2011). The third phase of this study, investigating contemporary contexts, was undertaken to specifically incorporate the need for critical grounded theory to consider the future in terms of emancipatory change (Harvey, 2011; Kinchloe & McLaren 2008).

The purpose of the third phase of the study, as reported here in Chapter 6, is to consider how knowledge/power relations might contribute to understanding and influencing change and continuity into the future. It focuses on the second part of the main research question; How might emerging paradigms for teacher education respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future? That is, this third phase was designed to identify and then analyse how change processes in contemporary contexts might work for the future of teacher education.

Consequently, the focus of the third phase of this study was on the identification, articulation and critical analysis of change processes working towards preferred futures in contemporary contexts of teacher preparation. Three questions were developed and used as an interview protocol to provide the focus of this phase. These three supportive questions were:

• What are the main principles of teacher preparation currently at work in ... (enter name of country/state)?
• What new principles or practices in teacher preparation are emerging in ... ?
• What would you consider to be the foundational or critical principles and practices of a preferred future for teacher preparation?
  o If you were able to develop teacher preparation in ... unhindered, what would you like to do or to see happen?
  o How might quality be assured in your preferred future for teacher preparation?
  o How might relationships with other organisations and bodies be involved?

These questions provided for a contextually situated analysis of how the systems and structures that teacher educators work with and in have shaped perspectives on the future of teacher preparation. A series of interviews was conducted with influential teacher educators across a range of international contexts that reflected similar processes and practices for teacher preparation to that available in the contemporary Australian context. The intention of the dialogical interview process was to give purposeful voice to the perceived counter-hegemonic perspectives (Gramsci, 1992) of teacher educators as the experts in teacher education. This chapter explores the findings from these
interviews using Charmaz’s (2006) constructive analytical processes. These processes reflect back to Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) original description of grounded theory.

In keeping with the principles of grounded theory, this data was analysed using a comparative analytical approach that involved continuous coding and memo writing that treated the interview data as an entirely separate entity from the historical discourse data used in the second phase of the study and reported in Chapters 4 and 5. The two data sets were separated in this way as a means of ensuring that the analytical processes used in this third phase were thoroughly grounded in the data and not unduly influenced by the theorising that emerged from the first phase of the study. This chapter commences with an overview of the interviews held across the selected contemporary contexts and then describes a theoretical model that emerged from the analysis of the data collected. This theoretical model is the second core model contributing to the development of this thesis. This is then followed, in Chapter 7, by a comparative analysis of the theorising that has emerged from both the historical and contemporary contexts in order to draw conclusions about preferred futures for teacher education.

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTEMPORARY INTERVIEWS**

The third phase of this study incorporated dialogical data generated from leading teacher educators from across contemporary international contexts. Between phases two and three, the collection of data shifted from the historical Australian context to contemporary international contexts. While the historical data was useful for understanding the contextual factors that have contributed to current processes and practices, it was envisaged that a broader perspective in the contemporary context might facilitate identifying potential future action in teacher preparation in the Australian context.

The six interviews that were included in the final data analysis came from Europe (3), North America (2), and New Zealand. Three key criteria were used to select the participants. The two criteria that related to the actual participant selected were that the participant needed to identify as a teacher educator and there had to be evidence in the literature that they were an expert or leader in the field. The third criteria related to their jurisdiction. Interview participants were selected from international jurisdictions that were identified as potentially instructive to the processes and practices of the Australian context. This meant that they were identified as having some contextual and or educational similarity to the Australian context.

For each interview a series of analytical activities were undertaken that incorporated coding and memo writing. Across the period of data collection this included the taking and keeping of notes for each interview and the writing of reflective interperspectival memos in between them. Once the interviews had been completed, Charmaz’s (2006) analytical processes for both coding and memo writing were used for Carspecken’s (1996) third stage of ‘dialogical data generation’ (p.43). This involved a two-part coding process, using initial and focussed codes, and two different types of memos, reflective and conceptual, as described in Chapter 3. Each interview was processed separately in this way. The culminating analytical activity for each interview involved the preparation of a conceptual memo that included a diagrammatic model that conceptualised the focussed codes and categories that emerged from the data, alongside descriptive analyses of each.

Significant to these analyses and culminating diagrammatic models was the close identification with the unique context of the interview participant. The rich description of the sociocultural and political context that surrounded the educational practices of teacher preparation in each context was integral to the model that emerged as part of the conceptual memo. Figure 6.1 Two Exemplar Conceptual
Models from Contemporary Interviews, below, provides two contrasting models taken from two interviews. The model on the left comes from the conceptual memo included as an example in Appendix 3. Side by side the tenor or tone of the relationship between the political and the educational fields in each context is made clear. While the first participant was working in a context where there is open and productive dialogue between regulatory political forces and educational institutions the second participant is not. The second model emerged out of an interview in a context where strong political forces have been working against the promotion of university-based teacher preparation. In total, there were six such models developed, one for each interview.

![Figure 6.1 Two Exemplar Conceptual Models from Contemporary Interviews](image)

Individually, the models and their resultant conceptual memos are instructive within and about the context they represent. Their usefulness outside that context is questionable at the level of abstraction that has been applied to the writing of the memos. Therefore, these models and memos formed the dialogical data that was then further analysed in the second part of this third phase. The second component of phase three of this study sought to theorise out of the conceptual memos for the purpose of describing the systemic relations at work across contemporary contexts. This stage was modelled on Carspecken’s (1996) fourth stage of ‘describing systemic relations’ (p.43).

In other words, the usefulness of the interview data and the conceptual models and memos to the Australian context and each other lies in the capacity to find points of commonality from which a theoretical framing of context can be applied. Given the theoretical focus of the research question, a complete explication of the analysis of each interview, while possible, would not make a productive contribution to this study. Rather, the focus of this chapter is on the theorising that emerged out of the coding, memo writing and theoretical sorting that was undertaken with this dialogical data to describe the system relations at work across contemporary contexts.

Two practices have been used to demonstrate how the analysis links back to and is grounded in the data. Firstly, examples of the coding and memo writing processes have been provided in Table 3.2 Example of Initial and Focussed Coding of Interview Data, as included in Chapter 3, and Appendix 3. These exemplify the analytical process undertaken and demonstrate how connections to the interview data were maintained across the analytical activities. Secondly, links back to the interview data were provided through the emic voices of teacher educators. In the presentation of the theorising of the social context of change and continuity in teacher preparation these emic voices have been indicated by the use of blocked quotes in italics. For ease of reading, these quotes have been edited to remove
redundant words and phrases that reflected the oral nature of the interviews. Some details, as noted, have also been withheld to ensure the anonymity of participants and contexts.

**Themes in the Interview Data**

Effectively, the points of commonality identified across the interviews worked in the same way as the themes that emerged in the narratives used in the second phase. They served to focus the analysis of the system relations towards a core conception and its outworking in the processes and practices of teacher preparation. The thematic issues that were held in common across the interviews related to the use of the discourse of reform, relationship of political context to educational practice, presence of disjunctures between political and educational perspectives and foregrounding of the imminent or immediate future. Together, these thematic issues linked to a theoretical conception of the social context of change and continuity in teacher preparation. Each of these themes are dealt with in turn.

**The discourse of reform.**

The interview participants used the discourse of reform consistently across all selected contexts. They acknowledged that the complexity of the practices and variables that intersect in the educative process make it impossible to perfect the art or the science of teaching. Consequently, all participants readily acknowledged that change was a constant in teacher preparation. Even in contexts where there were positive perceptions in relation to both education and teacher preparation, changes were occurring without the presence of a perceived crisis. Furthermore, it was also acknowledged that changes made to educational processes and practices would not necessarily make improvements and that sometimes they actually make things worse.

Against this postmodern appreciation of the vagaries of change, the term reform is defined as change that seeks to improve a system in response to its failings or shortfalls (Delbridge et al, 2001). In contemporary postmodern contexts where the assumption that change is progressive has been problematised, the discourse of reform seeks to reconnect change with improvement or development. While the discourse of reform was hopeful and optimistic, positive perspectives on educational reform were juxtaposed against more nuanced perspectives of political reform. As one participant described,

*This was all really part of this growing neo-liberal view of politics and the economy and education and how education is all linked in with that. So this is not just something happening in teacher education, it is a much bigger political scene, this whole push for these neo-liberal market-based reforms and the whole push, the growing push for outcomes.*

All participants readily critiqued the political agenda in teacher preparation in relation to its over-stated assumptions about the benefits of political reforms. As another participant stated,

*It’s just another change. I think that you get so used to it in education. If it were really, really horrific I imagine you’d have a great big hue and outcry. It is more structural than anything else. You know, it’s like changing the timetable. Just let them do it.*

In the references to reform expressed by the interview participants, a positive outcome was seen to be dependent upon the capacity to connect the reform agenda with disciplinary knowledge. The effectiveness of change was described as dependent on constructing a reform agenda from a position of knowledge about what needs to be changed and how that change might best be effected. This was often juxtaposed against over-simplified conceptions that underpinned political reforms. As one participant described the commonly experienced over-emphasis on teacher preparation in the reform of teacher education,
I think one of the problems we are facing, and I think it is in many countries, that we treat the teaching profession as a profession where you have to develop during initial teacher education and once you are a teacher you are ready. And that's the culture, in teacher education we have to prepare them for graduation and then they should be perfect teachers. That's how the Ministry looks upon it, if there is a problem we have to solve it in initial teacher education.

For the teacher educators selected as participants, the descriptions of the challenges faced in the political reform of teacher preparation necessitated the integration of their work with political perspectives.

The significance of political context.

In all jurisdictions represented consideration of the political context was fundamental to discussions of change and continuity in teacher preparation. All interview participants were critically aware of and intimately cognisant of the influence of the political context and its bureaucratic and economic factors on educational processes and practices within their own jurisdiction. It each interview, discussion of contemporary political and bureaucratic interactions was a core component of describing the principles at work in their context. For all participants this involved the regulation of teacher education by some bureaucratic means. This was exemplified by one participant who stated,

*The [name of regulator] was set up ... It marked teacher education as quite separate from anything else in higher education and gave government very significant control in controlling the agenda. That's where, more and more this turn to the practical, as we would call it, became mandatory. It was a strong political move.*

In effect, the interview participants were not able to respond to questions about an unhindered future without first rehearsing political implications and complications in their own context. Much of this discussion was also tinged with frustration at the nature of political decision-making. One participant, who described a political decision to withdraw funding for a new postgraduate program for teachers on the basis of public opinion exemplified this when they stated,

*There was such a reaction to the class size announcement that the government reversed its announcement and therefore withdrew the money from post graduate. So, I think you could probably say the government's preference would be to shift teacher education to a postgrad qualification, but, it's not backed by any funding.*

For the teacher educators interviewed the nature of the political context in which they work was a constraining factor in their thinking about their preferred future for teacher preparation.

Disjunctures in teacher preparation.

The interview participants used their understanding of the influence of the political context as the background for identifying and articulating educational perspectives. As the descriptions of the political context in each jurisdiction clearly described, the default approach to organisational management in teacher preparation is the continuity of current practice by political means. As one participant described,

*We are kind of fossilising the system that was developed from late 80s onwards and its been refined and refined but it hasn't changed.*

---

3 The words ‘they’ and ‘their’ have been used throughout this chapter as non-gendered singular pronouns as recommended by the Oxford and Merriam Webster dictionaries.
For a change to be effected, participants recognised that there has to be mediation between themselves and the political powerbrokers about the need for and likely outcomes of that change. This focussed participants’ discussion on the presence of dissonances or disjunctures in the discourses of the different participants involved in teacher preparation in their context.

A disjuncture in the processes and practices of teacher preparation is a specific area where there is a separation or disconnection between the views held by various interested parties. The majority of the disjunctures described by the interview participants crossed the divide between political and educational perspectives. One key example, which was expressed across jurisdictions, related to the impact of teacher education as opposed to other forms of preparation on the outcomes for propaedeutic teachers. For one participant this disjuncture was described in terms of a battle when they stated,

*Linda Darling-Hammond was the chief crusader. I use the word deliberately, along those lines. She would argue that we have 200+ studies that show us in a variety of ways that teacher education matters. She meant teacher education in a broad sense, so it didn’t just mean you went to this program, but it meant you got certified, you had student teaching experience, you know, all of the things that sort of go with it. So she claimed there was this very, very strong empirical base, 200+ studies.*

*On the other hand there were others, primarily economists, who were claiming there were 400+ studies that showed that teacher education doesn’t matter at all, or matters almost not at all. We can’t find this evidence that says people will, students will do better if their teachers go through teacher education programs. So that battle was being waged.*

These disjunctures were shown by the interview participants to shed light on areas where change and continuity have the greatest possibility of impact, either negatively or positively. As such, the participants described disjunctures as areas in need of either better understandings or better practices, thereby highlighting areas that might be fruitful in research and innovation. As another participant articulated the role of higher education in teacher preparation when they described,

*We’ve also been suffering an anti-intellectual agenda, and the real question, it’s about how you then do that and build in research-informed knowledge so that the sorts of critical practice that you could develop inside the school actually is also informed by research, by sharing, by reflection, by interrogating data, by all those sorts of principles.*

As such, the participants recognised that clear communication or mediation was a critical component of effecting educationally driven change and continuity, and that without it the continuity of political practices was assured.

**Working in the imminent future.**

The conception of a preferred future for teacher preparation that was unhindered by political intervention was focussed on the immediate or imminent future. In so doing, the future was also linked to responding to the constraining nature of the political context. In effect, the participants could not escape from the impact of their political context in considering the future of teacher education. This resulted in the expression of ideas for the future that reflected the present context. One such idea, that was common across most interviews, was the integration of the relationship between higher education and schools in the provision of teacher education. One participant expressed this as,

*One of them [ideas for the future] is, one which is not happening yet in so many cases, is where the theory of activity systems of schools and initial teacher education are much more merged into each other. Because you can educate*
teachers in a certain way, get them to do things, and when they come to schools, the school climate is not supporting this specific way then you can’t expect them to behave in a way, or to have a professional identity in a way that's not supported. So, it's the traditional transfer problem, you've learnt something which you have to apply in another context. If these two contexts are separated and do not interact then we will have a transfer problem. My view is we can only solve this transfer problem if there is two contexts that are integrated.

Consequently, there were very few ideas expressed about the future of teacher preparation that could be considered entirely innovative. In fact, one participant even went as far as critiquing the lack of innovation in a supposedly innovative program when they stated,

Without doing a disservice to my colleagues, it is not always as high quality as that … I mean they’re always crowing about it but actually the bits I picked up about the [program name], it didn’t seem terribly innovative to me.

As such, the discussion of the future was connected to the plausible rather than the possible or preferred future of teacher education.

Given the key role of innovative thinking in the development of productive ideas for the future (Dator, 2010), the hegemonic influence (Gramsci, 1992) of the context of teacher preparation on the thinking of these leading teacher educators was significant. It contributed to the identification of change and continuity as processes that were integrally linked to the context of the activity of teacher preparation. Each of the four themes found in common across the interviews; namely reform, political context, disjunctures and imminent futures; contributed to the identification of the social context of change and continuity as a pivotal factor in its outworking across contemporary contexts. While the contexts were very different, the impact of context on the outworking of both processes and practices was substantial. As such, theorising the principles that underpin the influence of context on change and continuity in contemporary teacher preparation was identified as productive for furthering the thesis being developed through this study in about the social nature of change and continuity.

**The Social Context of Change and Continuity**

In this third phase of this study, the nature of change and continuity in teacher preparation was theorised in terms of its relationship to social context. In a comparative analysis of the dialogical data collected across contemporary international jurisdictions, change and continuity were taken to be the product of dissonance or conflict within a specific social, linguistic and cultural context that resulted in either the continuation or modification of a practice. These changes and continuities may or may not represent an improvement to that practice. The dissonances present within a particular context demonstrated that a range of contextual factors influenced conceptions of the processes and practices of teacher preparation. As such, the social context can be described in relation to the different arenas that work across the field of teacher preparation and the knowledge and power relationships that form around the discourses used within and shared across those arenas. The relationship between knowledge and power within a specific context is identified in the disjunctures that emerged as a consequence of these dissonances. The disjunctures in the field of teacher preparation also point to the key factor or core variable in its social context, namely reform in teacher preparation. The critical analysis of the discursive choice of reform highlights a nuanced approach to both the processes and outcomes of change and continuity in the light of the postmodern framing of contemporary teacher preparation.

While a repetition of the analysis of modernist and postmodernist explanations of change and continuity provided in Chapter 5 is unnecessary, it is important to reflect upon the influence of
postmodern perceptions of change and continuity on this third phase of this study. Given the contemporaneous nature of the interview data collected and analysed, the underlying assumptions about change and continuity present in the interviews reflected postmodern perspectives. These perspectives acknowledged change as a constant but challenged the externalised, positive conceptions of change that were prevalent in the historical texts.

The post-structuralist, relativistic approach to change and continuity opened a space to evaluate both the outcomes and perceptions of change and continuity. In making judgements about change and continuity within their contexts, the interview participants assessed both the perspectives of change and continuity held by various other participants involved in teacher preparation and the effectiveness or impact of change and continuity on the processes and practices of teacher education. In doing so, they highlighted the continuing presence of both modernist and postmodernist understandings of change and continuity in the contemporary context and the tenuous nature of the correlation between change and progress. As such, change and continuity were recognised by their chaotic, fragmented, discontinuous and ephemeral conditions (Flanagan, 2012). As with the postmodernist reframing of the historical stories, the postmodern assumptions of all of the teacher educators who participated as interview participants approached change and continuity as a predictable but not predetermined decision-making process situated in the context of the moment.

A broad array of concepts emerged while discussing the role of change and continuity in context, ranging from a critical analysis of the arena and discourses involved to an identification of processes and practices for effecting reform, or change, towards preferred futures in teacher education. A theoretical model of the critical analysis of the interviews, included below as Figure 6.2 Change and Continuity for Preferred Futures in Teacher Education, outlines the breadth of this conceptualisation as analysed out of the interview data.

![Figure 6.2 Change and Continuity for Preferred Futures in Teacher Education](image)

This model, as theorised out of the interview data, conceptualised the processes and practices of change and continuity around the core variable of reform for the future of teacher education. The outworking of the core variable of reform is explained by reference to three core categories for action to be undertaken by teacher educators. That is, the work of teacher educators needs to consider the; purposes or goals for educational reform, practices that promote educational reform across the political field of teacher preparation, and principles that apply educational ideology to the reform of teacher education. Together these three activities, when employed within a social context, were
identified as critical to the outworking of an educational reform agenda in the processes and practices of teacher education.

As such, reform for the future of teacher education is shown to be closely associated with its context at three levels; namely the micro, meso and macro level (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Bronfenbrenner (1979) outlines an ‘ecology of human development’ (p.21) that seeks to theoretically describe the ‘interaction between the growing human organism and its environment’ (p. 16). He asserted that, ‘much of contemporary research can be characterized as the study of development-out-of-context’ (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p.21 – italics in original). While his consideration of development was connected to the psychology of the individual, it is used here as a model for understanding the development of social human activity.

The social context of change and continuity at the micro-level considered the relationships and interactions that were in direct contact with the processes and practices of teacher preparation (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). For the interview participants, all of whom were teacher educators, the micro-level was defined by the activities of their work in the reform of teacher education. That is, the micro-level comprised the interactions and relationships required by the three activities of teacher educators identified above as the purposes, practices and principles of reform. In describing the scope of the micro-level, all participants consistently referred to teacher education rather than teacher preparation. While the term teacher education was historically defined as a specific model or paradigm of teacher preparation, that definition did not correlate to the use of the term across the contemporary contexts of this study.

The discursive choice of teacher education was not a reference to a subdivision of teacher preparation, but a direct attempt by teacher educators to both integrally contextualise teacher preparation in higher education and to diversify the role of higher education across the professional lifespan. The superior potential of the practices of teacher education for teacher preparation was exemplified by one participant who stated, when comparing it to government-backed and economically supported employment-based teacher preparation designed for short-term careers in teaching,

But the big beef that I have, in lots of things I think it is a very interesting model, but my big beef is you can’t do stuff in two years [of teaching]. I think if they came to us and said, ‘Devise a program for really, really academically able students; we’ll give them a salary, we’ll give them lots of razzmatazz…’ We could devise them a bloody better program than they currently get.

This commitment to the benefit of teacher education was also reflected in considering enrolment in higher education beyond preparation. As another participant claimed,

So one of the things that really drives us, is trying to think about how we can make our postgrad qualifications relevant to teachers and practice. If you were to press me about where we want to go, I don’t particularly want to increase the number of preservice places. I’d love to increase the number of teachers who advance their professional qualifications by continuing to come back here and do practice-relevant postgraduate qualifications.

In other words, the participants argued that change and continuity in teacher preparation was a process of reform that should be situated in the context of higher education and for the professional lifespan of teachers. An educational reform agenda in teacher preparation should make a direct contribution to and emerge from the context of higher education.

The second level in the social context of change and continuity was the meso-level (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), which looks at the systemic context of teacher preparation. This level takes into consideration
the systems that surround the processes and practices of teacher preparation (Brofenbrenner, 1979). For the interview participants the systems that impacted upon change and continuity were consistently described as political processes and practices across a range of arenas and discourses. As such, the social context of the meso-level was defined as the political field of teacher preparation. While teachers and teacher educators were described as participators in the political activity of teaching, politics dominated the policies and practices of change and continuity. Across all contexts, teacher educators listed the arenas of influence in the political field as including government, bureaucracy, economics, educational stakeholders and higher education. These were then related to discourses of influence; which included experience, empirical evidence, stakeholder research, policy and international comparisons thereof.

The relationships between the identified discourses (experience, empirical evidence, stakeholder research, policy and international comparisons) and arenas (government, bureaucracy, economics, educational stakeholders and higher education) were shown to follow predictable patterns. One such pattern was that the most significant arena of influence for a particular individual was a strong determiner of the discourses that underpinned their findings and recommendations about the reform of teacher preparation. As one participant described,

*We came to the conclusion that you could almost tell what the research finding would be in these syntheses of the literature, supposedly, by looking at who did them before you read them. So if you looked at who the author was you would know what the conclusion was going to be.*

Another pattern related to the relationship between the experience base of an individual and the actions they supported in the reform of teacher preparation. This was exemplified in relation to the discourse of experience for teacher educators working in the arena of higher education. As another participant explained the preferences of staff employed in the two main preparation courses,

*To some extent our staff, and I find this really interesting, our staff - split is too strong a word - but, are divided between those who teach in the grad program and those who teach in the undergrad. That’s I imagine a commitment or preference … Even for the grad dip, the general pressure would be that we would be prepared to go to an 18-month postgrad Masters qual. Most of our three-year degree staff would prefer it went up to four-years. So most of us would like to increase.*

As such, the influence of political systems on the processes and practices of teacher education was a universally accepted experience based on relational patterns across the various arenas involved in teacher preparation. However, across the different contexts accessed in this phase of the study, the control of teacher education through the political field focussed almost exclusively on teacher preparation. This focus on teacher preparation recognised, on the one hand, the potential for other forms of preparation, and on the other, the lack of political will or impetus towards influencing higher levels of teacher education. This served to differentiate the perspectives of teacher educators, who promoted teacher education for the whole professional lifespan, as found at the micro-level, from perspectives in the political arena that are focussed almost exclusively in the area of preparation. Given the economic significance of initial teacher education to education faculties, teacher educators need to be cognisant of the contexts and discourses, at this meso-level, that dominate agendas in the political field that frames their work.

The outer level of the social context of change and continuity in teacher preparation is the macro-level, which relates to the larger social system and the cultural values and practices surrounding teacher preparation and education (Brofenbrenner, 1979). This took in the broadest context discussed by an
interview participant, which was the sociocultural context of the community, alongside the contexts of education and higher education. Again, the discursive choices of the teacher educators interviewed focussed on teacher education whilst acknowledging the presence of alternative forms of both teacher preparation and continuing professional learning for teachers. Across contexts, the discussions and explanations of the relationship between teacher education and the cultural field always reflected upon the service provided by teacher education to both the educational and broader community. Thus, the cultural field of education identified direct relationships between teacher education and the educational communities and contexts that it purported to serve. Within this frame, issues of the complexity of practice and limitations of context across the cultural field were considered significant to understanding the influence of the macro-level on change and continuity in teacher preparation.

While all of the identified contexts were related to teacher education, the broadest community context was generally described as a step removed from its processes and practices. That is, the focus of teacher education was on its contribution to the educational community which in turn contributed to the broader community. As such, the complexity of and limitations brought to bear on teacher education from the broader sociocultural context were mediated through other educational contexts. Consequently, the potential contribution of teacher education to the broadest sociocultural context was also mediated through and limited by its contribution to education. As one participant stated, when considering issues of social and educational inequity between communities,

*We are saying all this can’t be fixed just by school factors, like teachers. Now there is some irony, I mean there is some tension here. I’ve been in teacher education my entire life so, ‘Do I believe that teacher education matters and that teachers make a difference?’ Of course I do. But I also believe that a lot of other things matter too, and I don’t believe we can fix things just by fixing teachers.*

In contrast to the impact of the broader sociocultural context, the impact of educational contexts was directly related to teacher education.

The educational contexts shown to be influential to change and continuity in teacher preparation were two-fold, being divided into school-based and higher education communities. The relationship with school-based communities was connected to the provision and education of teachers for that community. As one participant described,

*And I think we can connect more closely to the needs of the profession because it is quite clear what’s needed in schools and if your professional profile is very vague it is much more difficult to have a clear focus in your program. … And that’s also the reason for our cooperation with schools, it drives our cooperation with schools.*

The relationship with higher education related to ensuring academic programs and standards reflective of the expectations of higher education. In most contexts this relationship was described in terms of problems and issues with recognition and respect. As another participant acknowledged,

*By and large, cause we’re you know, in all universities education is still… You would have thought the very new universities, many of which have emerged in the last 10 years out of combining three or four teachers colleges and are now diversifying into liberal arts and things like that, I’ve been to several of them recently where education in numerical terms are absolutely dominant in the faculty and things like that and you would have thought there would be a high status for education, and in those places it is not true. … Education is being repositioned, quite interestingly, down the pecking order.*

Together, these two educational contexts represented two repositories of expertise or knowledge in the cultural field; namely, the academic expertise of higher education and the professional expertise
of schools and teachers. The challenge for teacher education was described in terms of bringing these two forms of knowledge together in the processes and practices of teacher education. As one participant identified,

But that comes back to my challenge of how we develop qualifications that are credible both in the university and credible to the profession. Because, it would be not a particularly helpful model to simply say to people roll up and enrol in a Masters degree and we’ll give you a salary increase, knowing that their professional practice in their classroom is hopeless. So, somehow we have to connect the two together.

In doing so, the need to deal with the complexity of teachers and teaching within the cultural context of schools and communities was acknowledged alongside the limitations of the broader sociocultural community and of higher education was identified as important to effectively integrating these two areas of expertise.

To further theorise the social context of change and continuity the micro-, meso- and macro- levels of contextual influence on teacher education need to be further interrogated and articulated. This led to two different approaches to these influences. Firstly, the meso- and macro- levels were identified as contextualising factors to be understood in relation to their impact upon the processes and practices of change and continuity in teacher preparation. Secondly, the micro-level was theorised as the core social process both in and of the social context of change and continuity in teacher preparation. Consequently, the nature of the influence of the macro-level cultural field and the meso-level political field required explanation in order to contextually theorise the processes and practices of the core factor or variable (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of reform in teacher education.

**The Cultural Field of Education**

The influence of the cultural field is theorised in relation to teacher education rather than teacher preparation. This is a consequence of the discursive choices and explanations of the interview participants, all of whom were teacher educators. Across all contexts, the interview participants differentiated teacher education from teacher preparation and then expressed views from inside the context of teacher education. Teacher education was defined as participation in a higher education course that led to either an undergraduate or postgraduate qualification and contributed to the professional learning of teachers. It was further classified into initial teacher education, described as an approach to or model for teacher preparation, and further or continuing teacher education. As such, teacher education was differentiated from other forms of professional development, offered by other types of individuals, organisations and institutions, which contribute to either preparatory or continuing professional learning, but do not lead to a higher education qualification.

Thus, teacher educators identified the cultural field of education important to change and continuity in teacher education. This cultural field included the sociocultural context of the broader community and the educational context of both schools and higher education. Furthermore, for change and continuity to be effective, the influence of these contexts on the processes and practices of teacher education must be understood and then applied to the core social process identified as reform. Across all contexts the interview participants identified the complexity of practice and limitations of context as the two core categories of contextualising influence in the cultural field of education.

The complexity of practice that impacts upon the work of teachers and consequently change and continuity in teacher education was two-fold. It encompassed the complexity of the cultural field that contextualises the educational process and the complexity of teaching practices employed in response
to that cultural field. Education was contextualised, in all contexts, by the social, cultural, economic, environmental and academic communities that interrelate at the school site. One participant described the work of a teacher, as made complex by its context, when they stated that,

The primary process is being a teacher in classes. And of course, it is the core of your profession, working with pupils and their learning process. But if you take this as the core you’re forgetting that there are things around the profession. You can’t, because this can be an isolated process which you do with your students, neglecting the fact that you are working within the community of a school, that school is part of a community which is wider than the schools bit, it’s the neighbourhood and the environment.

If that wasn’t complex enough, this was further complicated by the inclusive nature of schools that integrate multiple communities across each of these factors within a single context. As such, it was acknowledged by participants that the cultural field of each school context is a multi-faceted and complex phenomenon and has become increasingly so as the influence of globalisation, immigration and expectations have grown over time.

In responding to the level of complexity found in the cultural field, teachers must also deal with the complexity of teaching practice. Across all contexts, teaching was identified as a complex practice that integrates a multiplicity of pedagogical approaches to what is to be taught and how to teach it where effectiveness is connected to the peculiarities of both context and students. As one participant noted, 

So, the big idea is what being critical and thoughtful about what it is students need to learn, and drawing from a whole range of evidences for how you make that decision. So, some of that decision will come from curriculum, but some of it comes from your understanding of children, their interests and backgrounds and needs, communities they come from and so on. So, thinking that teaching is a very intelligent, intellectual profession. We actually have to make decisions about prioritising what matters for young people. Trying to move it away from this notion that somehow there is a curriculum to deliver and all teachers really need to do is to read the curriculum, understand the curriculum and just get on and teach it. It’s a much more complex decision making process than that.

Politically popular conceptions of teaching focussed on either the skills of teaching or intuitive acting, failed to reflect this complexity, and were criticised. As one participant described,

The government, they would see, again because they are locked into this new right thinking, neo-conservative thinking, which would argue that teaching is a very practical affair. Our Minister for Education [name withheld] said it, you know, what you need is good subject knowledge, loving the kids and then just being in the classroom, being observed and that’s all it is.

While teaching is a skilled activity that is undertaken intuitively, these conceptions fail to encapsulate the totality of thinking that is required for quality teaching. Rather, interview participants described the complexity of the practice of teaching as predicated upon complex decision-making dependent upon both a depth and breadth of applicable knowledge and understanding of the complexity of both the context of and practices in teaching. In antithesis to the tendency of the political agenda towards the over-simplification of teaching to issues of basic skills and good teachers, teacher educators pointed to teaching as a complex, intellectual practice that needs to be interrogated within the context of higher education.

Alongside this understanding of the complexity of practice, change and continuity in teacher education was also described as needing to recognise and mediate limitations placed on its processes and practices by various contexts. While the limitations of regulatory processes supported by politics and bureaucracy were often discussed and critiqued by interview participants, the most significant
limitations they described emerged from the nature of higher education itself. These limitations encompassed economic, structural and hegemonic (Gramsci, 1992) factors that influenced the practices and impacts of teacher education.

Firstly, economic factors limited teacher education. The expense of many of the most innovative programs and reforms being trialled in teacher education across the contexts in this study precluded them from gaining traction across other institutions providing teacher education. The success of other changes was also impacted by the economic costs to students. As one participant described, the impact of the cost of higher education in programs designed to culturally diversify teacher education was often a significant detractor to students from under-represented cultural groups. They said,

*We lose Indigenous students. We get them into the programs, and, there are a whole range of reasons why we lose them. But, one of them is just the sheer cost of continuing on. I don’t know how it compares with Australia, but our fees are about [Figures withheld] a year. So that’s, it’s [Figures withheld] over the course. They can put it on student loan, but then they’ve got to pay it back. Sometimes it’s seen, particularly by Indigenous students, as a burden on their families. They are accumulating this loan when they should be earning and giving back to the family.*

Additionally, differential financial support of institutions and courses based on factors such as the nature or tier of the institution also impacted on the viability of change and continuity in particular contexts. Another participant described the positive impact of financial support on teacher education for applied universities when they explained,

*That has been stimulated in different ways. The professional Masters structure, it created the opportunity to also see whether also the universities for applied sciences in [Name of context withheld] would be allowed to offer Masters programs for teachers. And that was allowed and it is financed by the government so its financed like initial programs. So, there was increased offer of Master programs for teachers in schools.*

That is, differentiated support for private compared to state-based institutions and applied rather than academic universities served to limit the nature of the reforms made in the various institutions on the basis of the economic capacity to facilitate innovations.

Secondly, structural limitations to change and continuity in teacher education were related to the organisational and procedural structures of higher education institutions. Across contexts, these were experienced generally in relation to the nature of the higher education sector within that context, and specifically in the nature of a particular institution. Higher education is set up using a wide range of institutional processes and practices, not all of which are conducive to effective teaching and learning. There are rules and regulations about a wide range of factors from the nature of various courses and the different levels of education offered in higher education to other more mundane aspects such as timetabling and the use and integration of technology. Across the contexts included in this study, tensions were shown to develop around aspects of change and continuity that challenged these institutionalised practices of higher education.

For the interview participants, the most significant of these structural limitations mentioned was the challenge of offering Masters level study for teacher preparation. International comparisons in many contexts has encouraged political imperatives towards Masters level teacher preparation. As one participant stated,

*There’s this, well not a strong debate, but there is a debate ongoing. If you look at the governments in Europe, then there is quite a strong tendency to raise the*
qualification level of all teachers to the Masters level. In quite some countries they are taking steps in that direction.

But, achieving this change can be challenging because of the institutional practices and processes of higher education. That is, institutional practices in relation to both Bachelors and Masters courses define the nature and expectations of these courses. Responding to demands for teacher preparation at one or other of these levels resulted in certain expectations that can prove problematic in seeking to meet the demands of teacher preparation within the context of higher education. As another participant argued in relation to the possibility of Masters level teacher preparation,

Yeah, but you can't do that here, because your Bachelors courses all have to be at a Bachelor of Education level. Masters courses are all at a particular level and never the twain shall meet. They are two separate degrees and one can't impinge upon the other.

Similarly, institution-specific structural limitations also impact upon change and continuity in teacher education. Issues such as the stratification of institutions or the size of the institution were identified as potential sources of limitations in the development of practices, innovations and reforms.

Thirdly, hegemonic limitations (Gramsci, 1992), as with structural ones, were the result of biases that were present in the development of educational perspectives on change and continuity in teacher education. They were related to the ways that individuals, rather than institutions, engaged with the reform agenda and the influence of experience in the formation of perspectives on change and continuity. This was exemplified by the conception, commonly assumed by teacher educators, that longer courses provide better preparation for teachers. As reflected by one participant, the evidence does not necessarily support that perspective. They stated,

Interesting enough actually, we have one PhD student here from Finland who came and did some study with us for three months. And his study was around the induction process for Finnish teachers. So even though they have a five-year degree program, they were still faced with the same induction issues that we would have out of the three-year degree program. So, it doesn’t seem to matter how much you’ve front-loaded it, you’ve still got this, you know, shock of the first two years that somehow you’ve got to negotiate your way through.

This evidence did not support the assumption that the lengthening of a course is a change that would make a significant difference to educational outcomes for beginning teachers. As such, creating pressure to increase the length of preparation as an assumed improvement, and thereby retreating into continuity of practice without consideration of the evidence, demonstrated how change and continuity can be limited hegemonically.

Despite the presence of both political and educational limitations, there was evidence across contexts that university-based teacher preparation did make a difference to both its students and the broader educational context. Teacher education has the capacity to make a contribution to the framing and construction of education, the teaching profession and teacher education. However, the situating of the impact of teachers within the broader context of the school and community contextualised the work of teacher education in the same way. As such, the interview participants showed that it is important to maintain a stance that focuses on the capacity to contribute to rather than impose upon the sector and the profession. Teacher education needs to be thoughtful about what it does, how it does it and how it determines its effectiveness in order to ensure effective political participation in change and continuity.
**THE POLITICAL FIELD OF TEACHER PREPARATION**

The political field of teacher preparation was predicated on the premise that teaching is fundamentally a political activity. That is, the work of teachers was contextually framed by a political field that works to influence and thereby control all of the work of teachers, and by relationship the work of teacher educators. As one participant claimed,

> My argument is, teaching is political, period. Whether you like it or not. And because it is, it is unavoidable, it should be by design not by default. We should help people think about it. So I think there ought to be, we ought to be paying a lot more attention to that.

While the interview participants acknowledged the political implications of the whole cultural field, their attention was focussed on the political implications for and of teacher preparation. The political field of teacher preparation encompassed power as influence in the outworking of change and continuity. It was comprised of the arenas that hold a position of influence, the discourses espoused, and the relationships that work to preference particular perspectives or knowledge of teacher preparation.

**Arenas of influence in the political field.**

The arenas of influence in the political field comprised all of the sectors that held some form of power or influence over change and continuity in teacher preparation. For the interview participants, these arenas were public entities that could be differentiated and labelled, and whose perspectives on change and continuity in teacher preparation could be identified, explained and critiqued. As such, they were neither institutions nor individuals, though they were all represented by at least one of these. While all participants identified and named specific institutions and individuals from their own context in their stories about teacher education, they also labelled these arenas conceptually in their analysis of the implications of these stories. Across all of the interview contexts the arenas of influence were listed as the government, regulatory bureaucracy, economics, and higher education.

Interestingly, while other educational sectors were discussed across the interviews they were not considered in relationship to their influence on decision-making about change and continuity. While other educational sectors were identified and described in terms of their contributions to teacher education and their participation in bureaucratic processes, their role in influencing change and continuity in teacher education was generally reduced to enforced participation as stakeholders. As such, their potential engagement in productively influencing change and continuity towards educational outcomes for teacher preparation represented a gap in the data. This ignoring or silencing of educational perspectives proffered by school-based participants in considering educationally derived political influences on teacher education is considered problematic.

The most fundamental source of political influence in change and continuity in teacher preparation was the government. In all contexts covered in this study, the government influenced teacher education through legislation and policy that supported the development of bureaucratic practices and requirements. Policy has increasingly influenced or controlled various aspects of the structures of and infrastructure for teacher preparation, thereby managing the processes and practices of teacher education. The initiatives in and direction of policy were described as influenced by two factors, financial implications and international comparison. The interview participants were critical of the use of both the cost of funding and the appearance of international standings as drivers of policy. As one participant described in relation to funding,
I mean, there was a move here in May this year, in our national budget, to shift teacher education to postgrad. It was subsequently withdrawn when we had a problem with the budget figures. ... If you were to press them for what their preferred model is, that is probably their preferred model, not their preferred funding model.

Similarly, in relation to international comparisons, the critical perspectives of participants were exemplified by one participant who described their government’s use of global monitoring in making changes,

Yeah, like here’s our new ‘[Name of document withheld]’ document. (laughing)

That kind of thing. I think that’s pretty globally monitored, governments do tend to do that kind of thing. They just make changes every now and then, so you’re in good company.

These critiques recognised a lack of appreciation of educational perspectives, experience and evidence in the construction of policy initiatives.

The second key political influence identified by interview participants was the educational bureaucracy. The bureaucracy encompasses the departments, organisations and institutions tasked with the management, organisation or regulation of education. For all interview participants the most significant contemporary bureaucratic entity was the regulator responsible for either the registration of teachers or the regulation of teacher preparation. Across most contexts this was the same organisation or institution. In each context, this bureaucracy was tasked with the role of fulfilling government policy in relation to the regulation of the quality of teachers and by relationship the quality and effectiveness of teacher education. While often a product of conservative governments, both sides of politics have used the machinery of the bureaucracy to enact politically driven agendas for teachers and teacher education across most contexts. As one participant explained the use of a regulator by both sides of government,

So suddenly they could do it, this machinery that had been set up under, of controlling the system, by the [name withheld] government, was really readily embraced by [name of next government withheld] so they controlled everything.

Interestingly, in all contexts this regulation was focussed on teacher preparation.

The approach to bureaucratic regulation across all contexts included in this study has seen the development of a standards model to enact or enforce the policy established by the government about the processes, practices and outcomes of teacher preparation. In this model, bureaucratic bodies, such as the education department and the regulator, work together to establish a set of regulations that establish standards for teachers, teacher preparation courses or both. The standards were designed to ensure appropriate knowledge, skills and practices for teachers and that the processes and practices of teacher education would fulfil these expectations. They were usually designed to acknowledge the developmental nature of the process of becoming a teacher and to provide a clear starting point for working in the teaching profession. This standards-based model used evidence-based processes to enforce compliance. Generally speaking, this involved the collection, organisation, analysis and reporting of evidence that standards have been met. This can involve both the course and the graduates from a course. The use of standards was not necessarily considered to be inappropriate, though they were acknowledged as a significant source of pressure or tension in pursuing change. As one participant described,

However, looking at teacher education, the Ministry, people responsible for the quality of education, is also responsible for the quality of teachers. So, their involvement in teacher education is much, much higher than in other sectors of higher education. The quality measurements, or the quality system around
teacher education is much more tight than in other sectors. So, it involves the development of standards and we have an accreditation system and teacher education has a separate position in the way that the visits of accreditation panels are longer, more intense, etc.

There was also some caution about their effectiveness or usefulness. As one participant described the standards,

*We are accredited on the basis that our program will enable students to reach those standards. And we also have to demonstrate how they have done it. So obviously this e-portfolio is part of the way of demonstrating that. Now you will see that we are somewhat critical of the standards as fairly static and checklist sort of things. Nonetheless, that’s what we have to do.*

As such, across all of the contexts used in this study, both the teaching profession and teacher preparation was described as externally and bureaucratically regulated and this was pivotal to the potential for change and continuity in teacher preparation.

The third arena identified as influential in the political field of teacher preparation was economics. This arena was not connected to specific institutions, but was described as a core driver of the policy and practice promoted by government and bureaucracy. The participants summarised the influence of economics as related to the influence of market-based policies that favour deregulation, performance assessment and measurable outcomes. However, the impact of economics on teacher education is more fundamental than even these contemporary economic principles. That is, the provision of teacher education, either as initial or continuing education, costs the government money. The financial outlay required in providing for teacher education served to create a context where the government assumed an entitlement to influence teacher education as they see fit.

As such, funding is used politically as a means of enforcing particular processes and practices through the regulation of teacher education and thereby bureaucratically controlling change and continuity. Across contexts, economic issues relating to fee levels or student numbers were described as having a significant impact on the activities of education faculties. As one participant described, the link between funding for teacher education and the regulated cost of professional experience to universities in their context is a significant inhibitor,

*The dominant model is one of partnerships in which universities pay schools for their contribution. And they pay, the going rate is about, for a one-year postgraduate course, is about $xxxxx [figures withheld] a year, which is probably now about 20% of the fee income that you get. That position has improved, when it was started it was about a third of the fee income. Quite frankly, really financially crippling for many universities.*

However, the manipulation of funding is not only the purview of the government. Higher education institutions also used economic and business models to identify and support economically viable programs and faculties. As such, there was pressure for faculty leaders to ensure that all available sources of income were accessed. As another participant noted,

*It's not that there’s any great hue and cry about people not being effectively educated or anything of that nature, or being innovative enough, or being creative enough, or sending out people who are as well prepared. That isn’t an issue. What they want here is just an extension of schooling. I personally think it is just, you know, like, the longer the student is in school the longer they are collecting tuition and the longer, you know...*
This created political pressure inside universities to develop a broader perspective of education beyond preparation for the classroom in order to increase the length of courses or potential clientele and thereby increase income.

Additionally, the availability of funds impacted upon government investment in teacher education. This situation that was brought into sharp focus by the most recent global financial crisis. As one participant noted,

> *It never came because they realised if we want to upgrade teacher education for primary education and lower secondary education to the Master level then it's a very costly affair because you have to lengthen the program etc. And with the financial crisis they can't do it.*

In effect, the scarcity of economic resources fostered the development of regulation and regulatory control of teacher preparation designed to ensure efficiency and effectiveness despite the ideological favouring of market-driven policies that promote deregulation.

The final arena with significant influence in the political field of teacher preparation identified by the interview participants was higher education. Given the influence of bureaucratic and economic factors, the importance of the impact of the practices of higher education on change and continuity was strongly described. As one participant articulated,

> *Every course has not constantly struggled to try to find, even though you're doing these practical things, to find the intellectual bite, to find the criticality. To make sure the staff you involve are even on the cutting edge on the frontline, the staff themselves are involved in research and are part of this quality culture. Every institution that hasn't done that has actually kind of undermined us, you know.*

Subsequently, two means whereby higher education makes a contribution to teacher preparation were identified. These were directly through the provision of teacher education and indirectly by educational research. The most significant of these to influencing change and continuity in teacher education was the potential of educational research. As one participant noted,

> *But I've always taken the view, it was quite unpopular at some stages and foolhardy and naive, of making sure that everybody in the faculties that I've run, and I've run three of them, that everybody has to be research active. No questions. There is no where to go. That's it!* (claps hands)

While educational research reflects the entire field of education, the provision of teacher education provided a context for the design and development of research into its effectiveness. Educational research into teacher preparation undertaken by educators with the support of higher education is necessary for the development of educational perspectives in the political field of teacher preparation.

The research relevant to change and continuity that was referred to by the interview participants identified four significant conceptions with political influence in teacher preparation. These related to the length, level, role and exclusivity of teacher education for both the initial and continuing professional learning of teachers. From these conceptions, two core educational perspectives or ideals for teacher education were found to be common across all contexts. These were that the teaching profession should become a graduate profession and that participation in teacher education beyond the preparation phase is needed. The political influence of these educational principles was evident in each context, though the outworking of this into practice was socially and contextually mediated. While in some contexts this has seen the development of graduate-level initial qualifications, other jurisdictions have distinguished between undergraduate preparation for and postgraduate continuing development in teaching. Different processes and practices in different contexts have emerged in
response to the same educational ideals, thereby demonstrating the political nature of perspectives in the teaching and research practices of teacher education.

This political influence was exemplified in the assumption that a longer and higher level of teacher preparation would improve the quality of that preparation. Across contexts this was an almost universal assumption described by the participants in their own reflections about teacher preparation and in relation to the views of other stakeholders and participants, though the grounds of the assumption were questioned. As one participant noted,

But you know you never really get a straight answer as to why they come up with these changes, and why they think it is essential that these things take longer.

Despite this questioning, the international trend has been towards longer graduate-level preparation. As one participant explained,

There’s this, well not a strong debate, but there is a debate ongoing. If you look at the governments then there is quite a strong tendency to raise the qualification level of all teachers to the Masters level. In quite some countries they are taking steps in that direction.

However, in one context this trend has been ignored and the length of its teacher preparation was recently reduced. At the time, this reduction was driven by teacher educators and not, as might be expected, the political need for economically efficient preparation. It was motivated by research findings about limitations in the learning that can take place prior to sustained experience in teaching and the negative social consequences of high obstacles at the preparation phase of the profession. This then created space for teachers to participate in graduate-level studies as continuing teacher education and for alternative pathways into the profession without reducing the significance or impact of teacher education and high-level academic study. In effect, the outcomes in this context highlighted the hegemonic nature of assumptions that drive discourses in change and continuity in teacher preparation, even in the wake of evidence to the contrary.

**Discourses of influence in the political field.**

Within the political field of teacher preparation, the discourses of influence were the drivers of change and continuity. Discourses are the ideas and language (Halliday & Hasan, 1985) that shape the values, beliefs about and actions taken in change and continuity in teacher preparation. Since teachers, teaching and teacher education were understood to be political, the perspectives and language used to promote or encourage one practice above another were also taken to be inherently political. As has already been noted, the different ways that research into the effectiveness of teacher education was viewed was a powerful indicator of the political nature of approaches taken in the setting of agendas in teacher preparation. As one participant argued,

We came to the conclusion that a lot of this was political and people came to different conclusions. Partly because they sometimes looked at different research, partly because they looked at the same research, some of the same research, but had different ways of looking at it – different kinds of critique of the research. But there is no question that this was a political agenda.

Fundamentally, the interview participants all readily acknowledged that the perspectives promoted by participants through their connection to the various arenas led to different agendas for change and continuity as reform.

While different agendas were acknowledged and discussed in each context, a pattern of discursive influence was also identified as common across the selected contexts. This pattern related to both the content of and justification for discursive choices in reform agendas for teacher preparation. Firstly,
the content of discourses used to promote changes and continuities followed ideological patterns that traversed the border between educational and political perspectives. A potentially confusing discursive choice used by interview participants described all perspectives on change and continuity as political, while also referring to those viewed as alternatives to educational perspectives as political perspectives. Across all contexts, this political sub-set of political perspectives was identified as a political ideology that was labelled as neo-liberalism (Torres, 2009). As one participant defined it,

*This was all really part of this growing neo-liberal view of politics and the economy and education. And how education is all linked in with that.*

This was then contrasted with educational ideology, equally acknowledged as political. The educational ideology described across contexts was constructed out of three core conceptions; namely that, teaching is a socially and contextually mediated activity, teaching is also a complex activity that cannot be simplified, and teacher preparation is necessary for effectiveness and longevity in the profession.

Across all contemporary contexts, the interview participants identified the current political ideology as neo-liberal. This ideological stance was described as a global phenomenon that is economically framed and outcomes-oriented and being increasingly applied across social fields (Torres, 2009). As one participant described,

*So this is not just something happening in teacher education, it is a much bigger political scene. This whole push for these neo-liberal market-based reforms and the whole push, the growing push for outcomes.*

This served to conceptualise change and continuity in relation to economic rather than human terms. That is, change and continuity were reconstructed around economic rather than humanistic discourses. These discourses measure value in education on the basis of measurable educational outcomes and use demand-driven market-based drivers as the key means to manage the risks of supporting various changes and continuities. Despite their economic focus, neo-liberal perspectives on teacher preparation were shown to focus on the teacher as the core capital in the reform of education. As one participant noted,

*But the whole idea that teacher and schools are going to make the difference in student achievement and that will make the difference to compete in the global economy, that's all part of this big human capital idea.*

Interestingly, despite referring to the influence of the same neo-liberal political ideology the outworking of these political influences on teacher preparation was not consistent across contexts. While in some contexts neo-liberal political perspectives in teacher education have focussed on deregulation and privatisation, in others it has been used to support bureaucratisation.

In contrast to this economically driven political ideology, the educational ideology used to promote change and continuity served to humanise the processes and practices of teacher preparation. In taking a humanistic stance in teacher preparation the social nature of teaching as a complex activity requiring significant intellectual effort was emphasised. As one participant outlined,

*So, the big idea is being critical and thoughtful about what it is students need to learn. Drawing from a whole range of evidences for how you make that decision. So, some of that decision will come from curriculum, but some of it comes from your understanding of children, their interests and backgrounds and needs, communities they come from and so on. So, thinking that teaching is a very, is an intelligent, intellectual profession, we actually have to make decisions about prioritising what matters for young people.*

Change and continuity in teacher preparation must take account of this complexity as over-simplified solutions to preparing to teach were shown to create unnecessary risks for those teachers and to the
provision of quality education for all students. Consequently, the political focus on the individual teacher as the key human capital in quality educational outcomes was described as insufficient. The educational perspectives discussed highlighted the need to make room for a broader social capital approach to attaining the goals of education whilst also maintaining the importance of teachers, teaching and teacher preparation. As has already been quoted, one participant argued that,

_We are saying all this can’t be fixed just by school factors, like teachers. ... I also believe that a lot of other things matter too, and I don’t believe we can fix things just by fixing teachers._

Secondly, the justification of discourses was related to the evidentiary patterns that were used to defend an ideological position. Across contexts the two forms of justification identified were defined as experience and evidence. Experience related to actual participation in the processes and practices of education and specifically teacher preparation. Evidence, in contrast, considered forms of data that can be collected about that experience. As one participant pointed out,

_We have, there’s a fair amount of good research evidence that says that experience does matter._

While only one key form of experience was described as important by the participants, namely participation in the provision of teacher preparation, there were three different forms or perspectives of evidence. These were stakeholder evidence, accountability evidence, and empirical evidence. Interestingly, these different approaches to experience and evidence were identified by participants as the key points of departure that underpinned disjunctures in the reform agenda.

The importance of experience as a source of ideas and perspectives about the processes and practices of teacher preparation was clearly identified. It was shown to have a role in the formation of tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1962) of what might and might not be effective. This was, however, described as having both positive and negative implications. While tacit knowledge underpinned better or more useful assumptions, it was also identified as potentially stifling. This was exemplified by one participant who described the disruption of one experience, and its underlying assumptions, by further experience. They stated,

_I think it would be fair to say that most schools would say, the folklore is that the BEd, the degree, is better. I think that would be the folklore. The exception to that is people who have had or employed the one-year graduate students, whose folklore is somewhat disrupted by the experience of working with someone whose been through a one-year program._

While some experience was always taken to be better than none, its use as justification was problematised. In other words, experience was identified as a useful, almost critical, component in the formation of effective educational perspectives on change and continuity. But, it was criticised in relation to its validity and reliability in forming an argument to promote a particular practice. For this, it was acknowledged by all participants that evidence was required.

Across all contexts, the contemporary influence of neo-liberal political discourses and their economic imperatives for outcomes has focussed attention in change and continuity very squarely on the need for evidence (Torres, 2009). The need for evidence is driven, across all contexts, by a standards-based model of regulation. The standards model uses evidence-based processes to enforce compliance under the assumption that the standards applied will ensure quality in teacher preparation. As one participant explained,

_However, looking at teacher education, the people responsible for the quality of education are also responsible for the quality of teachers. So, their involvement in teacher education is much, much higher than in other sectors of higher_
education. The quality measurements, or the quality system around teacher education is much more tight than in other sectors. So, it involves the development of standards.

This involved the collection, organisation, analysis and reporting of evidence that standards have been met. This can involve both the course and the graduates from a course. Generally, this regulation of teacher preparation relied upon the accrediting of courses based on the capacity to provide evidence that demonstrated that whatever regulations were applied have been or will be met by that course. For example, graduates may be required to provide evidence against graduate level professional standards when completing a course, and faculties may have to garner evidence of the quality of the course against program or course standards. While the standards approach to ensuring quality was not in itself considered problematic, the approaches described across the various contexts were plagued by issues relating to the collection and interpretation of evidence of standards.

Effectively, three different discourses pertaining to evidence were described by the interview participants. These represented different interpretations of what constitutes suitable evidence for demonstrating standards and thereby quality in teacher preparation. Stakeholder evidence incorporated feedback from a range of participants involved in education through political, bureaucratic and educational contexts in making suggestions about, assessing and then approving either standards or courses or both. In this process teacher educators had only one voice amongst a multiplicity of perspectives and this had consequences for the way that the evidence was worked out in practice.

Fundamentally, the use of stakeholder evidence was critiqued because it failed to provide a level of conceptualisation about the bigger ideological picture involved in the provision of teacher preparation. As one participant reflected,

*It’s that same sort of accumulation of stuff that programs have to do, not really deep conceptual thinking about the big ideas that teacher education should try to develop.*

At one level, the use of a wide range of stakeholders created a level of complexity through the inclusion of a multiplicity of standards that reflect the multiplicity of perspectives the stakeholders represent. At another level, lobby groups or individuals that have been disaffected by educational processes and outcomes can have a negative impact of the development of standards. As one participant noted,

*We’ve also got program approval standards, which have pretty much come from consultation with stakeholders. What happens with that, everybody whose got a particular view of what teacher education should do chips their idea in so you get very complex requirements, and sometimes quite quirky requirements.*

This resulted in the accumulation of standards that can be used as a static checklist that holds teacher preparation in a pattern that potentially avoids or discourages innovation. As another participant noted,

*But it’s become kind of bureaucratised in most other places. In that there is a checklist, there is a list of things you’ve got to do, you’ve got to jump through these hoops. ... It can be interpreted there being little opportunity for critical reflection.*

In effect, the bureaucratic processes surrounding stakeholder evidence used that evidence to place limitations on teacher preparation by restricting practices to already established patterns, whether there is other evidence of the effectiveness of those patterns or not.

In response to these criticisms of stakeholder evidence as a means of determining and measuring standards, focus in some contexts has moved to accountability evidence. This form of evidence looks
for other external measures of standards that can be used as evidence of quality for accountability purposes. This shift from stakeholder to accountability evidence was described by one participant when they stated,

But we’ve really shifted to this focus on outcomes, outcomes-based accountability. It is part of a larger sea change, again, it didn’t just happen in teacher education. You know, we’ve really shifted toward educational outcomes defined in terms of test-like information. ... We ought to be able to link student data in schools; K-12 student data, to teacher data, to teacher education data.

While accountability was not challenged by the interview participants, the capacity to identify appropriate evidence for accountability was questioned. Foundational to this questioning was a critique of the use of evidence that was not directly related to the actual processes and practices of teacher preparation. In particular evidence about students, rather than teachers or courses was compared critically.

And we ought to be able to see that those prepared in various teacher education programs, do they do better or not as well as each other in terms of the K-12 students, their eventual students. Not in terms of what did the teachers in this program learn. Now there is also a push for performance assessment, which is different because that is looking at teachers.

Both stakeholder and accountability evidence was contrasted with empirical evidence. Empirical evidence was defined as evidence that emerges from research practices designed with reference to accepted academic standards of inquiry in terms of its validity, reliability and usefulness (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Boyer, 2015/1997). It was argued that the use of stakeholder and accountability evidence is underpinned by bureaucratic practices and perspectives that avoid or deny employment of empirical evidence. As a result, they may not reflect understandings of quality practice as held by teacher educators. As one participant expanded,

Yeah. You’ve got a very bureaucratic system where you’ve got to tick boxes all the time and get people to jump through hoops. I think the daftest thing is where teacher educators say, 'We’re doing well, 80% of our provision is good or very good, according to [name of regulator withheld]'.

But on [name of regulator] criteria now 50% of the school-based systems are very good and they’ve learnt. It’s all a lot of crap, but they have learnt over time to actually do what the government wants perfectly effectively.

It was argued that empirical evidence might be used to develop a reasoned and evidence-based platform for identifying productive practices in teacher preparation. For example, one participant identified the presence of empirical evidence that teacher preparation needs to be contextualised to be effective. They identified,

... two really good reports that sort of lay out these viewpoints ... reports based on studies and evidence that says we have to have a broader and bolder approach, it just can’t be teachers. We are not going to fix all this inequity just by fixing schools.

Though, it was also acknowledged that research did not provide a guarantee of success for either teachers or teacher educators. As one participant cautioned,

The notion we are trying to develop is that, for new teachers to understand that research helps you understand the likelihood that something will improve learning but it doesn’t give you the guarantee.

Yet, empirical evidence constructed out of educational research was preferred by all interview participants in selecting and justifying an agenda for change and continuity in teacher preparation.
Despite this preference, all interview participants also recognised the influence of these different ideological and evidentiary discourses on change and continuity in teacher preparation. The different views on both ideology and evidence point to contentions and contestations amongst the participants from across the arenas of influence in teacher preparation. The presence of evidence, of all forms, that argues that teacher quality is significant was readily accepted across the arenas. In contrast, evidence that both initial and continuing teacher education is significant to teacher quality was contested. As one participant explained the move away from teacher education as the core form of teacher preparation in their context,

_We don’t have empirical evidence that there’s one best way, the argument went, we should try out a lot of different ways._

However, attempts to deny the positive impact of teacher education are a consequence of alternative discursive approaches to evidence. Economically mediated analyses of the impact of teacher education focus on stakeholder and accountability evidence that is only indirectly related to the processes and practices of teacher education (Torres, 2009). In contrast, educationally driven analyses promoted evidence of the actual processes and practices of that teacher education.

Therefore, the issue of what constitutes valid, reliable and useful evidence in the reform agenda for teacher preparation was shown to be the critical question for the future of teacher education. As one participant explained,

_I mean, I’ve found here, certainly they [the regulatory body], I think if you can present evidence that what you are doing is going to achieve what they want it to achieve they’ll listen to it. Where you simply, sort of retreat into the fact that we just want to keep doing it in a different way, that’s where we don’t have a lot of success._

This points to the need for relational structures that facilitate connections and communication across the divide constructed by these alternative ideological approaches to the identification, collection and analysis of evidence.

**Relationships of influence in the political field.**

The relationships of influence in the political field were predicated upon the distribution of control of teacher preparation. Across all contexts, the ultimate seat of power in teacher preparation lay with the government, who established regulatory authorities for education, teachers and teacher preparation. Bureaucratically, international comparisons have resulted in increasingly similar standards-based models of regulation constructed out of selective engagement with political reforms and recommendations from across political jurisdictions. As one participant criticised,

_Their latest prospects on all this stuff is actually saying that strong clinical practice is vitally important, but they are also arguing for a very strong engagement with research, and therefore a strong engagement with universities. That seems to have passed by our current government, they cherry pick. They quote them in their documents, they cherry pick the bits that clinical practice is really important, fine. But the next paragraph, the best systems are teaching people about research?_

Whether international comparisons were considered or not, the conclusions reached about the viability and applicability of various processes and practices in teacher preparation were always driven by political factors linked to national or state-based contexts.

These contextualising factors have seen the growth of a regulatory climate built upon political analyses of educational evidence. Interestingly, all except one interview participant described how these analyses called into question positive interpretations of the outcomes of both education and teacher
education and then used the resultant negative perceptions to justify regulatory control of teacher preparation. As one participant noted in their context,

Yeah, and the last type [of standards], with respect to knowledge is rather new. It is a national development because of the discussions we had, and complaints we had about these teachers. So, let's look at teacher education because that's where they have prepared the teacher, so the fault is teacher education. So we need to introduce national knowledge standards for teachers and teacher education. So, the intention is even to come to some national tests at the end of teacher education to make sure that every graduating teacher masters this knowledge base.

These discourses constructed from the interpretation of the various forms of evidence in both political contexts and the media, consistently and simultaneously endorsed the presence of evidence for the importance of the quality of the teacher as the most important capital in education while also calling into question the quality of teachers and of their education. Both political and departmental leaders have used this tautology as the impetus for the continued and growing external regulation of both the teaching profession and of teacher education. The participants identified that a political sense of responsibility served to motivate policy development towards the bureaucratic regulation of teaching and teacher education as a means of demonstrating to the public that the government is in control of ensuring the quality of teachers.

However, across contexts this political support for initiatives in teacher preparation was described as economically driven. Despite the presence of educational perspectives and claims about the imperative of quality in the discourses that surround the development of policy, the key factor in either garnering or losing political support for a change of practice was its economic viability. As one participant identified the situation,

With the financial crisis they can't do it. I am quite certain that they have the wish to do it, but it is not possible at this moment.

In other words, politicians have been prepared to support a range of regulatory and educational ideas in as much as those ideas are economically sustainable. As such, the political policy making described by the participants lacked the ideological purpose or direction required to both identify and then support initiatives focussed on change and continuity that preferences educational outcomes for teacher education.

Beyond the identified economic factors, there was not much clarity about the influences taken into account in setting policy direction for teacher preparation. As one participant interpreted the underlying political influences on teacher education,

I don't think there are any particular principles or practices in teacher preparation. I think that what we have is a new infrastructure and a new governmental wedge in what's already been there.

Politicians were described as being reticent to adhere to or specifically discuss particular ideas or preferences about directions for teacher education, and sensitive to individual issues and questions such as the consequences of the over-supply of graduates and employment prospects. As one participant explained,

In the end a money game, it wasn't about teacher education, it was a political game to stop Mums ringing up the Minister.

As such, the interview participants described a lack of political will and a weakening of political ideology that has resulted in contradictory and reactionary political reforms and agendas that are no longer differentiated along traditional political divides. As another participant observed the push towards the teacher as the key factor in the improvement of educational outcomes,
As a matter of fact, the whole human capital perspective is neither a liberal nor a conservative agenda.

The lack of consideration of long-term perspectives in the development of policy for teacher preparation was shown to potentially be a consequence of the issue of re-election.

This has been exemplified recently by political commitments across many contexts to the transference of teacher preparation places to employment-based providers and the development of a competitive market between higher education institutions and other private providers. These initiatives have been framed as proactively responding to issues with the quality of teacher education and juxtaposed against outdated university-based teacher education. As one participant noted,

Reform in education is getting constructed as getting away from the unions, teacher unions. Getting away from the universities who are seen as just sort of doing what they always do and not preparing people ready to teach in classrooms; heavy on theory, light on the real work of teaching.

Yet, the evidence of the effectiveness of these initiatives is strongly contested by interpretations of that evidence. As another participant observed,

What’s wrong with it really is they get six weeks training and then get some generic support when they are in schools. They don’t have to stay. It is expected they’ll stay if they want to and about 45% are staying on to their third year, which if we had that we’d close down. We have to, we are accountable for a percent. One of our performance criteria is how many people stay on in the teaching profession and that’s all accounted for, its all measured.

The impact of these policies included the destabilisation of education faculties and the thwarting of research and innovation in teacher education. That is, the participants identified that the threat to funding of deviating from the politically mandated agenda in teacher preparation served to compromise any innovations of and research about teacher preparation, particularly if that research sought to question that agenda.

Despite wavering political will, when pushed for a perspective, politicians across most of the selected contexts appeared to prefer a model for teacher education that moved the teaching profession towards becoming a graduate profession. Interestingly, this was not necessarily viewed as a requirement for teacher preparation. Rather, political directions in a number of contexts promoted the goal of postgraduate qualifications for all teachers as a role for continuing teacher education. An example described by one participant stated that,

The Ministry for Education has stimulated teachers to engage in Masters programs, which are typically two-year Master programs on a part-time basis, by giving study grants for teachers. ... And the school has the opportunity to replace that teacher for one tenth of a week, so that is 160 hours a year, and again for a period of two years. So both, it’s study leave and it’s covering the study costs. And many, many teachers have applied for the opportunity, so many teachers are taking Masters programs.

The occasional emergence of contradictory policy directions in support of these types of educationally derived ideas for teacher education demonstrated that the ideological basis of decisions was inconsistent and open to influence from educational perspectives. As such, educational ideas and perspectives need promotion and justification and this was dependent upon relationships where educators were productively engaging with the needs of government and regulators.

While the potential of relational influence was acknowledged by all of the interview participants, the tenor of the relationships described was influenced by contextual factors. Across the contexts there were a range of relational tenors expressed, from cynical to hopeful. At one end of the spectrum one
participant was encouraged by recent political developments that promoted the role of higher education in teacher education,

Now research is more introduced into daily work of people but it hasn’t been for a long time. But now there, there is hope. So if you look at reports into strengthening the quality of teacher education it is more focussed on the academic traditions and getting them involved in research than on strengthening practice orientation.

At the other end of the spectrum, another participant described destabilising responses to political initiatives towards school-based teacher preparation,

Well it will certainly disrupt the system. Eventually, it’s going to destabilise the system. Universities across the country are reviewing yet again whether they should get out of this whole system.

As such, contextual factors in the political field were also shown to have an influence on the nature and outcomes of these relationships. Across most contexts, the consequences of the use of funding arrangements to grow the regulatory climate was that the work of education faculties was increasingly being controlled by a bureaucratic government body that significantly limited the academic freedom of teacher educators in the performance of their responsibilities in the provision of teacher education. This has a direct impact on the outworking of change and continuity in teacher preparation and has done so for a long time.

There was also an acknowledgement that the contemporary political agenda and its reforms developed progressively over time and that the implications of the developing discourses had not been automatically evident. As one participant explained,

Despite the longstanding influence of politics on teacher education, it was also acknowledged that teacher educators have not necessarily been cognisant of or engaged effectively with the political forces influencing the work of teacher education.

As the consequences of contemporary neo-liberal market-based drivers and accountability measures have progressively taken a hold of teacher preparation, there has been an increasing alarm on the part of teacher educators at the consequences of these economically driven political perspectives and policies. In the light of this, the interview participants identified the need to unpack the contemporary political agenda as part of their work in seeking the development of educational agendas for change and continuity in teacher education. As another participant noted,

But then what does that look like and how do we help people who are beginners, what does it look like to try to challenge the things about schools and schooling that reproduce these inequities? And it, it can’t be the lone ranger, the teacher, you know the teacher saviour, the movie star. It can’t be that, so what does it look like? How do we help people think about teachers being part of larger social movements? We don’t do that in teacher education. And a lot of people would object to it. It’s too political.

This involves developing an understanding of the roles of both the government and bureaucracy, and the influence of economics in the outworking of reform as the key to change and continuity in teacher education.

Reform as the Core Variable in the Social Context

Reform was identified as the core variable or central process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Stern & Kerry 2009) necessary for the outworking of educational ideology for change and continuity in teacher preparation. It was defined as political activity undertaken by teacher educators within their specific
cultural and political context for the purpose of promoting educational perspectives and outcomes. That is, the proactive engagement of teacher educators in the political activities of reform was the key contribution theorised out of the contemporary interview data in the development of this thesis. The purposive selection of teacher educators as interview participants lead to the identification of reform as a central process because of its capacity to leverage change and continuity on the basis of ideology. For the interview participants, reform was the key social process available for manoeuvring political directives towards educational perspectives.

The social process of reform comprised three key activities important to the development, promotion and implementation of educational perspectives. These are exemplified as three core categories. The categories and related sub-categories are as follows:

- **Category 1: Purposes; Goals for the Educational Reform of Teacher Education**
  - Sub-category 1.1: An Educational Mandate for Teacher Education
  - Sub-category 1.2: Educational Goals for the Reform of Teacher Education
- **Category 2: Practices; Promoting Educational Reform of Teacher Education**
- **Category 3: Principles; Applying Educational Reform to Teacher Education**

Across these categories, reform was conceptualised as change that makes alterations to a system or practice in order to correct problems. Its intention was to improve processes and practices by making changes from a position of knowledge about what needs to be changed and how that change might best be effected. However, this intention of improvement did not always work out in the change and continuity evident in particular contexts. As one participant noted,

> There's a lot of contradictions and tensions in all this and so it's not like one long story you can just sort of tell somebody.

Therefore, the reform activities of teacher educators were identified as requiring involvement with change processes from an educational position in order to disrupt the tendency to default to a politically generated agenda.

While reform was clearly identified as a political activity, the nature of the activity of reform was always directly connected to reform agendas. Across contexts, reform agendas were identified and defined as the ideologically derived plans or ideas that underpinned change and continuity in teacher preparation. While multiple reform agendas were described across the various study contexts, they were categorised as either political or educational in their focus. In one context this was defined by one participant in relation to educational autonomy and political regulation when they stated,

> At the same time the Ministry is responsible for the quality of the education. So that, anytime that there's a problem somewhere, then the Parliament looks at the Ministry, 'Ok, but you'll have to do something about it'. So there's always a very strong tension between autonomy and top-down regulation from the Ministry.

Effectively, the disjunctures identified between educational and political or bureaucratic perspectives were the key drivers of these two key reform agendas in change and continuity for teacher preparation.

The conception of the reform agendas for teacher preparation rested on a two-fold principle. Firstly, that there is continuity in the need for change predicated on disjunctures about teacher preparation; and secondly, that this leads to changes to policy about the practices of teacher preparation. Across the study contexts, the disjunctures that underpinned change were far-reaching; covering the underlying principles, foci and models for teacher education and its relationship to both education and teacher preparation.
Change and continuity in teacher education was described by all interview participants as constructed out of an ambivalent combining of political, regulatory and educational agendas. Consequently, the reform that held the attention all of the teacher educators interviewed was connected to the political arena through regulatory processes rather than educational innovation. Across the study contexts, course accreditation and teacher registration or both were used to develop the focus of reform in teacher preparation. As one participant explained,

They don't have to say why, we're just implementing this and restructuring. It’s a merge I think between the ministry and the regulator. ... So, they're both in favour of this.

As such, the setting of regulations is effectively also working to set the course of change and continuity in teacher education.

Whilst many politically derived agendas appear on the surface to be innocuous, over-simplified regulatory solutions to challenges carry a level of risk in relation to attaining educational goals and purposes in teacher education. The problems of reform driven by regulatory requirements are twofold. At one level it separated reform from innovation, and on another it separated it from the knowledge and practice that might connect reform with evidence. As one participant described the agenda that underpinned the reform of teacher preparation away from teacher education,

There were two conclusions, one was we actually have a lot of empirical evidence that shows that actually teacher education matters more than anything else in students’ achievement. ... It was claimed there was this very, very strong empirical base, 200+ studies. On the other hand, there were others, primarily economists, who were claiming there were 400+ studies that showed that teacher education doesn't matter at all, or matters almost not at all.

That is, the empirical evidence that can be garnered to support the changes required by regulation was either very limited or strongly contested. Driving change by external regulatory means is, therefore, maintaining a reform agenda that keeps teacher education busy despite a high degree of uncertainty about the usefulness of the changes being made. While the discourse of reform was hopeful and optimistic, its outworking was dependent upon the capacity to connect reform with disciplinary knowledge of education. For teacher education, this necessitated the integration of the work of teacher educators across the purposes, practices and principles of reform.

**CATEGORY 1: PURPOSES; GOALS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

The first activity in facilitating educational reform in teacher education requires the identification of educationally justifiable purposes for that reform. For this to be achieved, the goals for the reform of teacher education need to be situated within its social context in the cultural field of education. That is, teacher education cannot be viewed as an end in itself, but as a means to the end of providing for the needs of schools and students. As one participant described,

I think we can connect more closely to the needs of the profession because it is quite clear what’s needed in schools. If your professional profile is very vague it is much more difficult to have a clear focus in your program.

This cultural situating of teacher education did not, however, downplay the significance of its contribution neither did it offer a narrow view of its impact. Rather, it acknowledged that the educational reform of teacher education was one means of promoting broader educational reform and that by this association its contribution has far-reaching impact.
As such, the purposes of reform in teacher education take in multiple contexts and multiple reasons for engaging with teacher education. They reflect the social and educational needs of all participants in educational contexts where teachers are employed. As one participant stated,

*This is the whole idea of teacher education for social justice.*

That is, educational goals for teacher education reflected the overarching purposes of education in meeting the needs of all students whilst also responding to the direct role of impacting the learning and development of individual teachers. As such, there were two core constructs that articulated educational goals for teacher education in the development of this thesis. These were the identification of an educational mandate for teacher education and the setting of goals for the reform of teacher education.

**Sub-category 1.1: An educational mandate for teacher education.**

The identification of an educational mandate was the means whereby teacher education was directly and integrally linked to the broader social context of the cultural field of education. It necessitated a reform agenda that was thoughtful and informed about the nature of teachers and teaching. All interview participants acknowledged that teachers could not single-handedly fix all educational problems. As one participant claimed,

*So we continue to have achievement gaps and we continue to have more or less people completing school and going onto college; and it is all along gender, ethnicity, race, language, minority, majority lines. We are teaching people all of that and then trying to help them understand what does it mean to teach against those things. But the way it got interpreted was we are teaching them that they can't make a difference because it is all socially structured. ... We are saying all this can't be fixed just by school factors, like teachers. Now there is some irony, I mean there is some tension here.*

Despite the tensions, the quality of the teacher was described as critically important to the provision of quality education. It was readily accepted that the teacher has agency in educational contexts and that quality teachers facilitate quality education. As another participant noted,

*So I suppose big idea is this notion of teacher agency, that teachers can make a difference, do make a difference. But, only make a difference if they are doing it in a thoughtful, intellectual, informed, curious sort of way.*

Essentially, the thoughtful and informed approach to teaching described by the interview participants was encapsulated in the definition of a profession.

As such, the educational mandate for teacher education was identified as the professionalisation of teachers and teaching. A contemporary understanding of the term *profession* or *professional* differentiates a profession from other occupations without devolving into the exclusivity of the more traditional discourses (Freidson, 1994; Sachs, 2000; Southwick, 1997). As one participant described,

*So I would say a profession does draw on a significant body of tradition of intellectual knowledge. And that knowledge is applied in ethical and thoughtful ways. That's what I would see a profession as. Then I stop myself and think, well why wouldn’t I say that a plumber is a profession? Because a plumber is drawing on a tradition, you know intellectual understanding of whatever it is and they're doing ethical work in a thoughtful way. Its hard to think what isn’t a profession under that definition. But to me there’s something about that intellectual body of knowledge that you draw on and you access and you continue to view critically that makes you a profession.*
Such a definition focussed on three key aspects of a profession. These are the presence of a body of knowledge, the need to work intellectually with that body of knowledge and the presence of a systematic professional pathway of growth (Sachs, 2000). As another participant explained,

*It’s a different mindset to look at the profession and if we don’t do that we keep on struggling with the profession, with the professional stages and with the professional quality of teachers.*

The application of a body of knowledge on the attitudes and dispositions of the teaching profession impact what is taught, how it is taught and how outcomes of that teaching are measured. While these can be intellectually considered in isolation, the actual practice of teaching requires that these three aspects are considered in combination with each other and simultaneously applied to the sociocultural and personal context of specific learners.

All of this points to teaching as a complex, intellectual professional practice (Southwick, 1997). The professional practice of teaching was predicated upon complex decision-making that is dependent upon both a depth and breadth of applicable knowledge and understanding. As one participant described,

*So the first big idea is being thoughtful about what you teach. The second big idea is being thoughtful about how you teach it. And the third big idea is being creative and thoughtful about how you decide whether it is making the sort of difference that you are aiming to.*

Teaching needs to be considered an intellectual pursuit that involves research-informed and theory-informed decision-making built on the foundations of the discipline of education. As such, conceptions of teaching that focus on either the skills of practice or intuitive acting fail to reflect the complexity of teaching. While teaching is a skilled profession that undertaken intuitively, these conceptions failed to encapsulate the totality of thinking that is required for quality teaching and learning. As another participant articulated professional practice in context,

*The real question, it’s about how you then do that and build in research-informed knowledge so that the sorts of critical practice that you could develop inside the school is also informed by research, by sharing, by reflection, by interrogating data, by all those sorts of principles.*

The conception of the profession of teaching, as described by the participants, was that it is a complex, intellectual practice and that the processes and practices of higher education were integrally linked with its amelioration.

Teacher education when defined as the participation of teachers in higher education across all stages of their professional pathway is uniquely situated to proactively contribute to the professionalisation of teachers. This was predicated on the close relationship that was evident between the practices of higher education and conceptions of a profession described by the participants. The professionalisation of teachers and teaching was not, however, assumed to be the sole responsibility of teacher education. Rather, a range of factors across the cultural context of education also had an impact upon the perception and practice of teaching as a profession. As one participant noted,

*You can educate teachers in a certain way, get them to do things. When they come to schools, the school climate is not supporting this specific way, then you can’t expect them to behave or to have a professional identity in a way that’s not supported. So, it’s the traditional transfer problem. You’ve learnt something which you have to apply in another context.*

Nevertheless, the educational mandate for teacher education as described by the interview participants acknowledged that teacher education’s contribution to education was mediated through its contribution to the professionalisation of teachers. This promotion and development of the
professionalisation of teachers and teaching was equally significant to education and unique to higher education. As one participant expressed it,

*My challenge is actually how you get some of the real exciting, the really high quality practical professional education and link that to some of these challenging, important, intellectual, critical ideas.*

**Sub-category 1.2: Educational goals for the reform of teacher education.**

In order to ensure consistency of purpose with the established educational mandate, the goals for reform identified by the interview participants also sought to link the educational reform agenda in teacher education to the professionalisation of teachers. These goals, while specific to the role of teacher education, were framed to be cognisant of the unique contribution of higher education to the entire cultural field of education. As one participant described these links,

*So how do you develop those strong debating communities inside schools? That's what you need, a critical debate inside schools being supported by universities. Where the universities are part of those teams and are bringing to bear research and other examples of excellent practice from elsewhere.*

Within this social context, the work of teacher educators was described as focussed on developing teachers as professionals by building their capacity to know, understand and work effectively across complex multi-faceted educational contexts.

Across all of the contexts selected for this study, the work of teacher educators in contributing to the professionalisation of teachers was underpinned by three core goals for the reform of teacher education. These goals were that teacher education in contemporary contexts should: engage teachers across their entire professional lifespan; interact holistically across the personal and professional domains of the person of the teacher; and act as a change agent in the lives of teachers, schools and communities. These goals stand in opposition to claims that a skills-oriented teacher preparation is the only necessary education for teachers. Even in teacher education a dominating focus on the primary role of classroom practice is not supportive of the professional learning of teachers. As one participant argued,

*The tendency is very much, very strong within initial teacher education to focus on that primary role. And you can understand, that's very good. But those teachers, coming into schools who don't have a professional culture, stay within that primary isolated role. You can't expect teachers who have been educated in that narrow primary role to extend that role out of themselves in a context that doesn't stimulate that.*

The narrowing of teaching to its primary classroom role was shown to significantly undersell the potential impact of the professionalisation of teaching on the continuing development of teachers, teaching, schools and education.

**Goal #1: That teacher education should engage across the professional lifespan of the teacher.**

The goal for teacher education in relation to the professional lifespan of teachers comprised two functions. These were to articulate a systematic professional pathway and to facilitate engagement with teacher education at all stages on that pathway. The interview participants described the main approach to a professional pathway in their contexts as engaging with teachers across two stages, preparation followed by teaching. A number of issues with this approach was identified as problematic. As one participant noted,

*I think one of the problems we are facing, and I think it is in many countries, that we treat the teaching profession as a profession where you have to develop during initial teacher education and once you are a teacher you are ready. And...*
that's the culture, in teacher education we have to prepare them for graduation and then they should be perfect teachers.

In some contexts, a third stage of induction was included, though its length, role and function was inconsistent.

However, the goal for a systematic professional pathway for teachers that was described across the interviews encompassed five stages; recruitment, preparation, induction, teaching, and leading. These stages describe engagement in teaching from the point of initial recruitment to the profession through to leading teaching and learning for the profession. Closely aligned with this pathway was the second part of this goal, which considers the professional learning that underpins development through the experience of these stages. As one participant described the need to embed learning in teacher education with practice,

So how can you build further thinking about education until you’ve been through that experience? Until you can talk about real issues and problems you are struggling with in your school, whether they are social, or cultural, or pedagogical, or whatever they are? You’ve just got to experience them I think and bring them back.

I think that’s good for us too. I don’t think it’s just good for teachers, I think it is good for education faculties to be challenged. To say, these are some of the things that are happening in the schooling environment, these are some of the real problems I’m struggling with. How does your research and theoretical, critical, psychological, sociological edge help me understand these things?

This created a challenge for education faculties to develop credible practice-embedded qualifications through authentic connections with schools that engage faculty members with real teachers facing real problems.

Given the unique contribution of higher education to teachers’ professional learning, the goal was to proactively extend teacher education beyond the standard practices of teacher preparation thereby providing further opportunities to participate in professional learning through all of the later stages. As one participant explained,

Well one thing I will mention, I really think it is necessary to make that change. But it’s a change in culture, it’s a change in the field of the profession, and that’s the view that it’s a lifelong learning process, the profession. And that teacher education is a continuum.

In so doing, the goal of a systematic professional pathway for teachers promoted the idea that teacher preparation was not the totality of teacher education. As another participant described,

So it’s not people coming into the university to read, what you might say traditional Masters courses. But in trying to get our Masters course sitting alongside practice and getting the reading of theory and the research integrated with practice. And I think that’s pretty challenging for us actually.

This goal, as described by the interview participants, acknowledged that higher education should contribute to the development across the lifespan of teachers for the benefit of those teachers and their students, schools and communities.

Goal #2: That teacher education should interact holistically with teachers.

Teacher education that interacts holistically with teachers provides professional learning that is life-giving. It considers becoming and being a teacher and not just with the mechanics of doing teaching. This brings into focus the role that attitudes, dispositions and values play in the development of a profession. As one participant defined the significance of attitudes,
Sometimes people say, the approach is it’s just a profession. You can bring in people from here, from there, there are all kinds of different elements. But if you don’t have the basic attitude towards children, towards learning and the dedication to that, I don’t think you can be a good teacher.

The focus of teacher education needs to be on the values that are important to teachers and teaching. Therefore, this second goal for the reform of teacher education was to develop the professional identity of teachers.

The conception of the professional identity of teachers provided focus for the intended learning of both initial and continuing teacher education. In order to achieve this, it was show that it was important for teacher education to maintain a broad perspective on the nature of the professional identity of teachers. This encompasses the social, ethical and moral values and dispositions that support the work of teachers alongside the required professional standards for knowledge and competencies in teaching. As such, teacher education needs to consider how students develop as both social citizens and teachers. As one participant reflected,

“It's very much, well what kind of citizen do we hope to produce? What is the end of education no matter what they do? ... So, it's very much having them think not as students, but as professionals and think about what they are going to be doing five years down the road as well, that's part of the culture.”

Furthermore, these values and dispositions that support the work of teachers in interacting holistically with students need to be established from the beginning of the professional pathway and then consolidated throughout. As another participant identified,

“A second thing is, certainly this is not anything brilliant, everybody says they believe this, and that is that we need to see learning to teach as a process that happens over the professional lifespan. So we have to be supporting people’s learning.”

In this way, the participants argued that the discipline of education will maintain its focus on learning that facilitates becoming and being the teacher across all stages of the professional lifespan.

**Goal #3: That teacher education should act as a change agent.**

Acting as a change agent focuses the role of teacher education on making a contribution to the educational and social needs of schools and communities. Again, there were two aspects to this goal. The first related to participation in inquiry through practitioner research as a professional practice and the second to the improvement of visibility and diversity in the teaching profession. The third goal of reform was to use teacher education as a change agent in defining and diversifying the teaching profession while also using the unique contribution of praxis-based research to encourage teachers’ agency within schools and communities.

For this to happen, a social justice agenda needed to be fostered across all aspects of teacher education. The capacity to harness the time, talents and interests of teachers was important to seeing them employ an inquiring stance. Given the personal dispositions of those attracted to teaching, the social justice agenda was described as an effective tool for achieving that end. As one participant observed,

“One of the things that seems to invigorate teachers is being part of communities that are working on questioning, challenging, researching, reflecting on their work as educators and coming together around some common goals. We found in doing the background research for our book, that there are inquiry communities of teachers all around the world and almost all of them, not all of them but very, very often the central theme is about inequity and diversity. That’s what people are coming together around.”
This goal sought for teachers and schools to participate in practitioner research that investigates their own praxis for the professional learning of teachers and their school community. As another participant argued,

It seems to me that what we need to understand, and I think Australia is a million miles away from this from what I know about it, but really to understand what research-informed clinical practice would look like, I use that phrase. So it is absolutely clear, we've known that very strongly over the last 20 years in this country, 25 years. The professional operation has to be grounded in strong school-based experience but you have to have schools themselves taking serious responsibility. Not just at an individual level but at a school level, at a district level, taking responsibility is incredibly important.

The participants agreed that teacher education must support, promote and develop the skills and practices of practitioner research and facilitate the planning, implementation and publication of that research for the benefit of teachers, schools and the broader community.

In addition, teacher education needed to maintain an open stance in relation to suitability for teaching in order to improve diversity and representation in the teaching profession for a wide range of communities and groups. This was significant in relation to entry to the profession, but more significantly it also took into account maintaining people in the profession. As one participant observed,

And particularly in this country how we get more Indigenous people into teaching in an affordable, sustainable way, because it sure as heck isn’t at the moment. We lose Indigenous students, so we get them into the programs, and there are a whole range of reasons why we lose them.

A culturally, linguistically, racially and economically diverse profession was identified as important across all study contexts. As such, the participants identified that teacher education needed to act as a change agent to find ways to achieve diversity and to harness its potential for social justice across the cultural field of education. As one participant explained,

They make the argument that these teachers of colour come into teacher education with a desire to be change agents, they want to teach because they want to change things. When they get into the schools, the culture of the schools changes them. And it moves them, essentially away from the agenda, the social justice agenda they came in with.

**CATEGORY 2: PRACTICES; PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL REFORM OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

The purposes of teacher education in targeting the professionalisation of teachers can be summarised as participating as a change agent in the development and provision of teacher education that considers the whole person of the teacher across their entire professional lifespan. In order to support these purposes, the second core set of activities of teacher educators identified in the development of this thesis were the practices of reform. The practices of reform were those activities that promoted an educational approach to the development and outworking of the reform agenda in teacher education. They necessitate getting involved in the disjunctive debates that surround decision-making in the political field.

Essentially, the practices of reform are those activities that contribute to decision-making amongst the political and educational reform agendas for teacher education. While it might be assumed that political power held control over the policy that drove reform, this was not consistently reflected across the study contexts. As one participant described, control can be influenced by negotiating,
And so the [regulator name withheld] have agreed that in negotiated examples we can reduce the requirement. But, we got it by trying to explain what we were trying to do rather than just saying no we’re not going to.

The outworking of reform in teacher education demonstrated that change and continuity was subject to interactions amongst discourses that underpin disjunctures between the various reform agendas. The practices teacher educators used around the discourses of reform facilitated the implementation of educational approaches to change and continuity in teacher preparation. As such, understanding and appropriating these practices was critical for the outworking of educational reform. They provided the means to proactively support and promote initiatives towards thinking about the big ideas that make the greatest difference to teacher education.

Across the study contexts four key practices that promoted and supported an educational reform agenda were identified. Figure 6.3 Practices Promoting Educational Reform in Teacher Education, below, outlines the nature of and relationships amongst these practices.
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Three of these practices were communicative; namely, constructing discourses, compiling evidence and crusading for educational outcomes. The role of these communicative practices was to negotiate the dissonances or disjunctures that frame the reform of teacher education. However, all of these communicative practices were predicated on the outworking of the fourth key practice. This practice involved determining a response to a particular issue or action in the reform of teacher education. The possible responses were to resist a reform, concede to reform or support a reform. The determination of a response includes both psychological and practical considerations. The aim was to target reform in teacher education that can be shown to have a high likelihood of positively contributing to the goals of teacher education. This was exemplified by one participant in identifying the need to avoid disjunctures between university-based and school-based teacher preparation,

I think through cooperation we very strongly try to avoid that clash between two cultures. And I think we really have succeeded in bridging that gap, more or less. I’m not sure whether every student or every teacher educator will agree with that, but I think we, we’ve come a long way in that.

The key to the practices of reform was to avoid political and regulatory busyness that thwarts the time and energy needed for other types of educational innovations.

**Practice #1: Determining a response to reforms for teacher education.**

In order to interact productively in the social context of reform, teacher educators need to practice developing informed and thoughtful responses to proposed reforms. Across the study contexts there
were three potential responses to proposed reforms or changes that were identified by the interview participants. These were to resist a change, concede to a change or to actively support a change. Each of these approaches were shown to be dependent on contextual factors that needed to be carefully considered in formulating responses. However, it was also shown that psychological factors were influential, though these were not always constructively considered in determining a response to change. As one participant conceded in relation to both contextual and psychological factors,

And I think all it's going to do is perpetuate and exacerbate the existing inequities. Absolutely. So, I'm actually not terribly optimistic at the moment.

Reforms that can be identified as strongly contributing to the purposes of reform need to be proactively supported by teacher educators. While the political reform agenda may contribute some positive recommendations, the educational reform agenda was considered the most important and likely source of educationally supportable change initiatives. As one participant explained,

So actually it's gone two-ways. Both from bottom-up through universities and schools and from policy of the Ministry that things come together. I think that leads to some quite interesting developments.

However, whether proposed reforms emerged from the political or educational agenda is moot. Rather, the participants argued that all educational responses to any reform agenda should focus on theoretically grounded and research-driven evidence of demonstrable outcomes. As the participant, above, continued to explain,

Yes, I think that it's part of our culture, we are very much a culture which is focussed on trying to create consensus and trying to be proactive. So every time that the Ministry comes with ideas and initiatives the people at, for example universities, think, 'Ok, how do you look at that initiative? Is it useful? How can we integrate it into our own views and policies?'

Unfortunately, determining a response to a proposed reform was complicated by the impossibility of foreknowledge. That is, it is impossible to have definitive evidence about the effectiveness of a change until after that change has been made. Therefore, in determining a response to a proposed reform teacher educators needed to use their expertise in the discipline of education for identifying the likelihood of success and the practices of research to provide the means to confirm outcomes.

Across each of the interviews the participants used the discipline of education and the practices of research to critique the reform agenda they faced in their particular contexts. In doing so, they identified three common dichotomous approaches to change that can be used to make judgements about specific reforms. These dichotomies involved structural as opposed to paradigmatic changes, the use of perception as opposed to evidence in justifying changes, and the use of secondary as opposed to primary viewpoints in formulating changes. Across study contexts, the criticisms made by teacher educators about the reform of teacher education analysed changes against these dichotomies and identified patterns in the political and educational reform agendas.

Reforms proposed and enforced by bureaucratic regulation were strongly criticised because they followed a pattern that was structural in nature, justified by a perception of issues with the quality of teachers, and constructed out of economic interpretations of evidence. These changes were shown to be made in response to a political regime that required that the processes and practices of teacher education conformed to specific regulated structural patterns for teacher preparation. As one participant criticised,

You've got a very bureaucratic system where you've got to tick boxes all the time and get people to jump through hoops. ... If they can do what the government wants perfectly effectively, why shouldn't that system be spread more broadly.
And that’s because we’ve had a reduction in what, there’s been a narrowing in what is expected. It has become a technical activity.

As such, these types of reforms were contrasted with educational conceptions that emphasised the need for paradigmatic change to the ideologies at the core of teacher preparation.

Equally, both political and educational reform agendas were critiqued for being constructed out of perception rather than valid empirical evidence. Across all study contexts it was either explicitly stated or implicitly implied that a longer course in initial teacher education would improve the quality of that preparation. As one participant stated,

*I don’t think that we should have programs that put people in charge with minimal or no preparation. And by preparation I mean theory and practice, so student teaching.*

While there is evidence that some preparation is better than none, there is little empirical evidence to support and at least some evidence that questions the perception that a longer preparation is necessarily better. As one participant responded on being asked, ‘So there hasn’t been any evidence collecting?’,

*We’ve had a wonderful experience for 20 years. And we have almost everyone whose got an opinion, but to my knowledge no one has tried to longitudinally track students who’ve gone into a BEd and out into teaching and students who’ve gone to a GradDip and out into teaching to see what short or long-term difference it makes.*

Similarly, political and bureaucratic assumptions about the validity of stakeholder research for developing the standards that direct the reform agenda in teacher education were also critiqued for proposing changes that were constructed out of perception. The circumstances of stakeholder research required participants from across the educational arena to make judgements and suggestions about teacher education without actual first-hand experience of the processes, practices and contextual issues involved. As one participant noted when considering the negative perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of teacher education,

*I equate that to them doing to us what they hate parents doing to them. Parents constantly critical of the school. It’s almost like they’re our parents, throwing stuff back at us without accepting the responsibility themselves for what they’ve contributed.*

The resultant standards and by connection changes to teacher education were shown to be linked to the unique perceptions or viewpoints of the various individuals and lobby groups involved rather than to any overarching conception of the nature of teacher education.

*So, we’ve got these standards for program delivery, and then graduating teacher standards, and then added at the end is this, ‘Oh and by the way, there are some special education standards as well’. It’s that same sort of accumulation of stuff that programs have to do, not really deep conceptual thinking about the big ideas that teacher education should, should try to develop.*

Despite these patterns, in developing a complex and intellectual response to reform, teacher educators needed to avoid resisting change for the sake of resistance. A tendency to resist change and in doing so to construct discourses about the likely negative consequences or problems of proposed reforms was reported by the interview participants. For teacher educators this was particularly prevalent when the changes proposed directly impacted their personal work, even when others educators were promoting a particular reform. In a number of contexts used in this study there has been a lot of negativity evident in the discourses used by teacher educators about the shortening of
teacher preparation courses. However, some distance from the point of change in at least some of these contexts has served to moderate these criticisms. As one participant reflected,

It [the primary graduate diploma] was reduced to one-year probably in around the mid-90s. I gather that caused huge difficulty. People couldn’t accept it. There was either three-year undergrad degree or a one-year grad dip primary. But that’s pretty much all gone, you don’t hear that discussion in the faculty anymore. … There is nothing like experience with students from both programs to say, well actually maybe my fears weren’t grounded.

The passing of time has demonstrated that the concerns raised were unfounded. For teacher educators working in the context of higher education it is important to avoid responding to proposed reforms out of a resistance to change or unfounded perceptions of the potential impact of that change.

Teacher educators also need to appreciate that opposing all political reform is counter-productive. It was important to be able to differentiate between changes of little consequence and those that were potentially destructive to the educational goals of teacher education. Conceding on reforms that were innocuous and would not negatively impacting upon the outcomes of teacher education opened the space to oppose more problematic requirements. As one participant responded when they were asked, ‘So, from your perspective is this change a good change, a bad change?’;

It’s just another change. … It is more structural than anything else. You know, it’s like changing the timetable. Just let them do it.

The capacity to identify and then support educationally responsive reforms and also concede on others of little consequence served to assist teacher educators to build positive relationships across both the political and cultural fields. This helped with avoiding oppositional relationships that can develop out of unfounded or overly resistant responses to the political reform agenda. This did not, however, negate the need to actively resist changes for which there was evidence of the potential for counter-productive or damaging outcomes for teacher education. In responding to the various reform agendas, determining when to resist, concede to and support proposed changes was identified by the participants as an important practice for teacher educators seeking to maintain their capacity to contribute proactively to the discourses used to construct the processes and practices of teacher education.

Practice #2: Constructing educational discourses.

Determining a response to a specific reform in teacher education necessitated activity across three communicative practices of reform. In effect, these communicative practices provided the content of the argument that supports the determination of a response. The first of these communicative practices, constructing educational discourses, was significant in that it pointed teacher educators towards responding directly to the core influences in the political field. Both teacher education and its reform were already described as framed by the language and discourses present in the political field of teacher preparation. It was also shown that multiple disjunctive discourses were identified by the interview participants in relation to both the ideological underpinnings and evidentiary basis of reform in teacher preparation. In effect, the influence of these discourses pointed to the way that language was used to describe, explain, motivate and justify teacher education and its reform through the construction of policies and processes.

Across the contexts used in this study multiple ideological and evidentiary discourses were discussed; including those of educators, economists, politicians and journalists. Yet, it was also acknowledged that the differences between the discourses from these various points of view were not equally represented neither did they equally influence the outcomes of policy making for the reform of teacher
education. This was exemplified by one participant who explained the silencing of the discourse of the discipline of education in policy requirements for teacher education. In responding to the question, ‘So there is none of this?’, they stated,


The differences present in the discourses observed in the political field served to illustrate two significant points about the way that discourses were used to construct teacher education and its reform. Firstly, they illustrated how discourses were constructive of processes and practices in reform. Secondly, they explained why power over policy direction did not equate to control over teacher education. These points were exemplified by another participant who described the capacity to negotiate requirements with the regulator. They questioned the requirements by asking,

So what do you need out of this process? We can give it to you, but not in the way you are describing, we can certainly give it to you in a different way.

Together these points created a space for the construction and promotion of an educational reform agenda through the construction of educational discourses that stand alongside and against other discourses in the political field. This was not, however, a neutral space.

Rather, issues surrounding dominant discourses and the presence of gaps in the debate served to promote some ideas or practices while silencing others. Many of the challenges and difficulties discussed by the interview participants were a consequence of negatively framed discourses about the quality of teachers, teaching and, by association, education. In other words, the ideological and evidentiary discourses of teacher preparation were occupied in considering problems and issues with teachers and teaching. As one participant explained,

The evidence they begin with is that teachers are differentially effective, and even teachers in the same kind of school district. So you can't say, 'Well, it's just because they are in an urban school or something'. So we have all these teachers and they don't all do the same. Then that becomes, so we ought to be able to figure out which teachers are more effective than others and we ought to reward them. If they are more effective we ought to pay them more. If they are more effective then we ought to seek those people and we ought to fire the ones who aren't.

Another participant stated,

Part of that is the result of very low trust in the quality of teacher education by both the public and politicians. You can question whether that lack of trust is based on facts, that's always a difficult discussion.

Commonality through the nationalisation and globalisation of political ideology was evident in the impact of this discourse of teacher quality as a core contextual factor relevant to teacher education in all study contexts.

The construction of the political reform agenda in teacher education from this perspective was motivated by the need to efficiently and inexpensively ensure the quality of teachers. This was justified by reference to data and standards that were used tautologically to prove the continuing existence of problems with teacher quality whilst also demonstrating the positive impact of political reform on the quantity of teachers in the short-term. As one participant described a politically mandated alternative pathway into teaching,

One model has been where a school or a group of schools can offer teacher training themselves. They may or may not choose to use a university to validate it, so you may not get a university qualification. ... That's been a minority route,
but a very important political animal because it’s part of maintaining competition with the universities sector and there are numbers that move into that route even though it’s consistently had really bad grades from [name of regulator withheld]. It’s always been controversial. And it’s been controversial because of its quality terms, but it’s been seen it’s constantly backed by government.

It was, therefore, identified as critical that teacher educators find ways to proactively give voice to educational responses to the discourse of teacher quality as a means of influencing the reform of teacher education.

In contrast to the dominant discourse, those inside the profession, both teachers and teacher educators, talked and wrote about enjoying teaching and loving what they do. Educational research and the discipline of education have constructed a perspective of the teaching profession that describes teaching as a complex, intellectual practice that is both research and theory informed. As one participant described,

_The key to us in that is whether we are producing teachers who are prepared to decide whether they are making enough difference. Not whether they are making a difference, but enough difference. ... The real key thing is are we, given what I am trying to achieve with these young people, given what they want, their community wants, their parents want, the school wants, are we making enough of a difference for those people? Or are there things we could be doing differently._

Furthermore, the focus on the development of professional dispositions, attitudes and practices required preparation that was integrally connected with teacher education. As another participant argued,

_So, that’s one principle I think, people have to be prepared, before they go in. Because what we have now is this model where we have more and more new teachers going into the schools and then not lasting long._

As such, the discourse of quality as embodied by critically engaged, inquiring and innovative professional teachers challenges the impoverished discourses of measurable data and standards.

While it was acknowledged that the low value placed on teachers and teaching had consequences, contributing to the discourse of quality by focussing on teaching as a profession and the professionalisation of teaching was a critical component in an educational reform agenda in teacher education. Through this discursive issue, the interview participants identified that the construction and promotion of educational discourses was important to influencing both policy and practice. However, the dominance of a specific issue, such as teacher quality, is not static. While the problems and issues facing teacher education will change, the importance of the practice of critically constructing educational responses to politically driven discourses will remain. Similarly, the capacity to identify evidence in support of educational discourses was also linked to responding to proposed reforms.

**Practice #3: Compiling educational evidence.**

The work of teacher educators in generating, applying and publishing empirical evidence of the processes and practices of teacher education was the second communicative practice that was identified as critical to an educational response to political reform. As one participant expressed their frustration at the lack of publications about innovations in teacher education that are impacting their context,
But I imagine these things, I’m not seeing this stuff written up at this level of detail to be real sure about what is.

They went on to state that,

*Those examples are very research driven, where really intellectually strong teacher educators are doing something in a close working partnership. There are glimpses of this stuff, but its idiosyncratic, it depends on the individual members of staff.*

The importance of empirical evidence to an educational reform agenda was two-fold. Firstly, an empirical approach to evidence was central to the processes and practices of higher education and as such was foundational to teacher education. Secondly, the emergence of evidentiary discourses in the political field of teacher preparation has placed the collection and analysis of evidence at the centre of reform. As such, the participants showed that issues of evidence and its misappropriation and misinterpretation need to be addressed by teacher educators in compiling evidence to support educational discourses and practices.

As discussed earlier in considering the discourse of influence in the political field, three different types of evidence were identified as relevant to the reform of teacher education. These were stakeholder, accountability and empirical evidence. However, the issue of the type of evidence being appropriated is secondary to the ways that these types of evidence were being selected and analysed. Neo-liberal political ideology is committed to accountability that demands the collection and analysis of evidence without a care for different types, uses and interpretations of data (Torres, 2009). As one participant observed,

*You can question whether that lack of trust is based on facts, that’s always a difficult discussion. But I think it is putting teacher education very much under pressure. I think that’s one thing which creates a tension.*

This leads to interpretations of evidence that were determined by an ideological frame of reference rather than generated from the data itself. As has already been referenced, another participant claimed,

*We came to the conclusion that you could almost tell what the research finding would be in these syntheses of the literature, supposedly, by looking at who did them before you read them. So if you looked at who the author was you would know what the conclusion was going to be.*

These different frames account for the production of conflicting interpretations of the same data that then promote the perception that there is no consistent evidence about the quality or impact of teacher education.

Despite the inevitability of the influence of ideology, the participants noted that teacher educators need to remain proactive in using research to provide a valid, reliable and useful evidence-driven focus for reform. The processes and practices of the discipline of research as developed in the higher education academy provide practices, standards and dispositions for the selection and interpretation of evidence (Boyer, 2015/1997). These are constructed to assure validity, reliability and usefulness as well as alleviate the role of bias in the use of evidence (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). As such, the identified issues with the use of evidence in the reform agenda in teacher education related to the unfettered reliance on ideology without reference to academically defendable research practices and findings. As one participant noted in relation to a proposed change to the length of teacher preparation,

*It's more a paradigm shift in the structuring of institutional life than it has anything to do with principles or practices.*
The significance of academically defendable practice was two-fold; it promotes evidence that has been grounded in sound research practices, thereby providing and interpreting evidence for the educational reform agenda in teacher education.

When the compiling of evidence was correlated with the contemporary discursive issue of teacher quality, the need to focus research on the impact of teacher education became apparent. Neo-liberal commitments to accountability by reference to measurable data was used to justify the use of students’ results for determining the effectiveness of teacher preparation despite the tenuous nature of the link between this data and teacher preparation courses. The fundamental issue identified with the use of this type of data in the assessment of the effectiveness of teacher preparation was the presence of a wide range of unaccounted for factors or variables that also impact student performance in testing processes (Berk, 1988). As one participant explained,

*I don’t know, what it would be great to do is to get people to realise the way to evaluate teacher education programs is not through value-added assessments, it’s too complex. And I think there’s a lot of evidence to suggest that these kinds of assessments are measuring a lot of things that aren’t about the teacher.*

In contrast, research-based empirical approaches required a focus on primary evidence that directly related to the effectiveness of programs or courses. An another participant posited,

*I think if you can present evidence that what you are doing is going to achieve what they want it to achieve they’ll listen to it.*

As such, the participants showed that the key to compiling evidence for the reform agenda was to directly correlate the data that is collected and analysed with the specific questions being asked about teacher education.

Across the contexts used in this study, interview participants recommended a range of suitable evidences of program effectiveness. These included employment statistics, employer satisfaction, propaedeutic teacher performance assessments, propaedeutic teacher feedback or a combination thereof. The preferred model for compiling evidence of propaedeutic teacher quality was described as using a standards-based approach connected to performance assessments that linked different types of evidence to specific questions about teacher education. As one participant explained,

*In the early 1990s, for example, teacher education wasn’t evaluated in terms of whether we could show a direct empirical impact on students’ achievement. It was mostly evaluated in terms of process and in terms of the curriculum and did it meet the standards.*

This was preferred because it looked at the question, *What did the teachers in this program learn?* However, it was also shown to be supported by contemporary initiatives such as performance assessments. As the participant went on to say,

*Now there is also a push for performance assessment, which is different [from using K-12 student data] because it is looking at teachers. And so right now many places are trying to do something about performance assessment usage in teacher education programs.*

This approach to compiling evidence maintained the expectations of rigorous research practices whilst providing direct evidence about the quality and impact of teacher education. Consequently, it was claimed by participants that this approach would also satisfy political imperatives for accountability without falling into the trap of using indirectly related secondary data that fails to control a wide range of complicating factors or variables (Berk, 1988).
Practice #4: Crusading for educational outcomes.

The third communicative practice, crusading for educational reform in teacher education, involved negotiating across both cultural and political fields to promote educational discourses and evidence. It involved teacher educators in proactive connections with others for the purpose of building positive relationships that support the work of teacher education towards making a contribution to the professionalisation of teachers. One participant described their own innovation in this area as,

I’ve created the Future Teachers’ Association which is a teacher development group where the teachers there mentor first-year [preservice] teachers and provide professional development to them, as well. So I mean, I just think that it needs to be a little more life-giving. Institutions tend to make you just think you are a student going to classes and I really would like students to be able to feel more like, ‘No, they’re professionals getting ready for hiring’, and getting ready for going into the world with something to offer. So, stop thinking like a student and start thinking like a professional.

In order to crusade for educational outcomes, teacher educators needed to publically promote positive educational discourses and foster trust amongst participants in teacher education. However, for these two core components of the practice of crusading to be actioned it is first important for teacher educators to be convinced of the need for and the likelihood of success in influencing reforms. That is, crusading for educational outcomes was dependent upon teacher educators formulating political responses to the political challenges of reform.

Much like the practice of determining a response to proposed reforms, there were choices that could be taken when faced with the politicisation of change and continuity in teacher education. The first was to ignore the issue entirely and thus avoid the conflict between educational and political agendas. However, this response did not change the political nature of teacher education. Whilst it avoided the conflict, it did not avoid the consequences of the politics and generally ended with teacher educators using and promoting political discourses, policies and practices by default. As one participant described the acceptance of political control of teacher education,

To be positive about this stuff, our position now is more secure in the university than it has been for years. In elite universities, which is very interesting, even those universities seem to be able to put up with a faculty that is actually in many respects government run.

Alternatively, teacher educators can choose to face or challenge political influences in the reform of teacher education. This involved crusading for educational discourses and evidence that promote the importance of teacher education to the professionalisation of teachers, both collectively and individually.

The practice of crusading for educational reform involved promoting educational discourses and their supporting evidence from inside the social context of teacher education. While the discourses in the reform in teacher education have been shown to be globalised and externalised, for the purpose of crusading the use of these discourses needed to be grounded in evidence that was localised. That is, teacher educators need to ask and respond to specific questions about the ways that global discourses were influencing local policies and practices in teacher education. As one participant described the local implications of perspectives about the literacy and numeracy standards of beginning teachers,

There are some new requirements and they do actually have the effect that a number of students drop out in the first year. There are some ideas to also strengthen the role of intake assessments or summer courses and things like
that. But, it's not real policy at this moment. There are some local initiatives but it's not a really strong part of the system at this moment.

Across all of the contexts used in the study the required local evidence needs to critically question the validity and reliability of the evidence used to support political interpretations of the discourses surrounding the quality of teachers and teacher education. This includes a critique of the economically-derived interpretations of evidence alongside the collection of additional evidence developed out of educational research.

The second key to crusading for educational reform involved the development of trust that makes room for contributing to the professionalisation of teaching. Across all of the contexts selected for this study, low levels of trust were directly related to high levels of regulation while higher levels of trust led to reduced regulatory control. As one participant reflected in relation to the level of regulation of teacher education in their context,

Creating agreements with the universities, what they need to put into place in their policies. Performance agreements which are made with universities, these are very strong; stronger than in other areas. And we have an accreditation system and teacher education has a separate position in the way that the visits of accreditation panels are longer, more intense, etc. Part of that is the result of the special responsibility of the ministry, part of that is the result of very low trust in the quality of teacher education, by both the public and politicians.

The relationship between trust and regulation provided insight into the factors that the participants identified as having contributed to the degradation of trust. These included failing to take ownership of the profession, leaving negative discourses unchallenged, and allowing oppositional relationships to develop between the various organisations involved in teacher education.

Building trust with political organisations in teacher education was predicated on working responsibly with policy requirements. This involved holding in tension two key factors; the need to fulfil bureaucratic requirements while remaining committed to enhancing the quality of teacher education. As one participant explained,

That you are keeping well lined up with [name of regulator withheld] matters. And, the interesting thing about that, if you do do that, for the most part the relationship actually works quite well. I don’t find the battle to be particularly productive.

Bureaucratic requirements needed to be respected and acknowledged as necessary in that they provided a right of access to providing teacher education. But, bureaucratic requirements should also be acknowledged as representing only a portion of the features of quality teacher education. As one participant described the limitations of heavily regulated programs,

I’m quite critical of what we've got at the moment because what you get, the opportunities for personal education are very, very limited.

Alternative conceptions of quality can be evidenced by educational research practices generated from within higher education. Yet, bureaucratising good practice won’t necessarily result in more good practice, just more bureaucracy. As one participant described the political commandeering of an educational initiative,

Lots of this stuff has actually been built by a government interpretation of a [name of institution withheld] model of teacher education. … And that model was then taken up by the government. When they were setting up the system, the local education authority seconded lots of teachers into schools to develop the collaborative program. That then became the dominant mandated model, but it's become kind of bureaucratised in most other places.
The participants described, therefore, that it was important for teacher educators to work both within and alongside the political agenda as a means of crusading for the professionalisation of teachers.

It was also important to build trust with educational organisations in teacher education. This incorporated fostering productive relationships with various sectors; including schools, education departments, professional regulatory bodies and teacher unions. Productive relationships were shown to develop when there was recognition of diverse forms of expertise and appreciation of the needs of each of the sectors. As one participant explained,

*The positive spin? That’s an interesting argument to be had actually. For us the existing system we’ve got, which actually asks much more of schools than Australia does, has raised the game in schools, in professional education really quite dramatically. I mean some of them are really bloody smart. And all of them will now take it very seriously which will be a core part of their policy. Any school’s policy now will see professional education both for initial teacher education and continuing professional education of staff as just really core to what they do. And that’s been one of the side consequences of all of these moves over the last 20 years.*

In initial teacher education this involved identifying and facilitating the differing expertise of schools, teachers and higher education in the development of propaedeutic teachers. In particular, trust was built when the expertise of lead teachers, as school-based teacher educators, was promoted and facilitated in the processes and practices of initial teacher education. For continuing teacher education trust was encouraged by ensuring that higher education was contributing to the needs and goals of the education sector. As such, the participants identified that trust was encouraged when teacher education was responsive to researchable questions generated in schools by teachers.

**Category 3: Principles; Applying Educational Reform to Teacher Education**

Alongside purposes and practices, the principles for the reform of teacher education outline a third area of core activity for teacher educators in the development of this thesis. While the first two core activities identified and promoted educational reform ideas, the activity of the principles of reform involved the direct application of these ideas. In effect, the activity of the principles of reform was to articulate the foundations for the actions to be undertaken by teacher educators to establish an educational approach to reform. In other words, this third action in enacting change and continuity involved the identification of principles that were pivotal to aligning the future provision of teacher education with its educational goals. For the contexts under investigation these principles needed to align to the educational mandate to proactively contribute to the professionalisation of teachers.

The principles for the reform of teacher education were a set of conceptions constructed to reflect an educational approach to reform. They were fundamental propositions that use values and dispositions to articulate how educational reform might be actioned for the future of teacher education. As one participant expressed the values foundational to professionalisation,

*I think what we believe in here is to equip students to grow in wonder, truth, justice and reconciliation to wherever they find themselves after they leave.*

These values must, however, be applied in the practices of teacher education. As another participant noted,

*Well, another one I think one other thing is the professional identity. (pause) What I’m struggling with in this institution, in teacher education in general, also in national debates now on the new standards which are developed for teachers is, how do you do that? A professional identity for teachers? What is being a*
teacher? Much too often, the professional teacher is reduced to teaching in classes.

As such, the principles provided a blueprint or design template for the outworking of professionalisation in the immediate future of teacher education. In other words, the principles for reform unpack what an educational approach to teacher education might look like and in so doing identified directions for change and continuity.

Across the interviews, four educational principles for the reform of teacher education were identified. Each of these principles contributed to actioning the educational mandate of professionalisation as an educationally mediated response to the debate surrounding the quality of teachers. These principles were that teacher education must; contribute to the conception of professionalism, facilitate continuing professional learning for teachers, engage teachers with best practice in higher education, and foster productive relationships with stakeholders. For each of these principles three related features were identified, analysed and described. Firstly, the principle was articulated as a rule of action or basis for the reform of teacher education. Secondly, it was framed by acknowledgement of the discordant processes or practices currently working in opposition to the principle. Thirdly, actions that outwork the stated principle were included. This structure for each principle showed how the participants believed that an educational reform agenda might challenge dominant political reforms and action educational alternatives.

Principle #1: Contribute to conceptions of professionalism in teaching.

The first principle for actioning an educational reform agenda in teacher education was to contribute proactively and productively to the conception of professionalism across the cultural field of education. It posited that the quality of the teacher was promoted when that teacher was recognised as a professional. This was because the practices of professionalism were shown to align with the practices of quality teaching. Therefore, any reform of teacher education must support the professionalism of teaching by contributing to developing professional identities for teachers, both individually and collectively. As one participant stated,

_We try to be very clear at the start because we think the development of professional identity should start as soon as possible._

Unfortunately, the contemporary climate described by interview participants is problematic to the promotion of teaching as a profession. The current political agenda in the reform of teacher education calls into question the professionalism of teachers. Politically generated reforms promoted alternative pathways for teacher preparation that focus on the skills or craft of teaching and its application through training in classroom contexts. As one participant expressed,

_I mean there are no concerns about the government. They are locked into this new right thinking, neo-conservative thinking which would argue that teaching is a very practical affair. Um, our Minister for Education said it, you know, ‘What you need is good subject knowledge, loving the kids and then just being in the classroom, being observed and that’s all it is.’_

The flattening of standards for teaching coupled with accountability measures served to reinforce perceptions of teaching that did not align with the conceptions of a profession. As one participant observed in their context,

_If you look at the reviews of school systems then, they say they can’t tell the difference between an experienced teacher of five and ten years and someone whose actually come out of College in the last two years._

Yet, another participant identified that,
People improve in effectiveness, in their practice for at least, well some people would say three years, others would say at least seven, some people would claim 12-20. So, at least for a while.

The ensuing critique of the quality of teachers was also linked causally, in both political and media discourses, to a critique of the quality of teacher education. Across contexts, it was assumed that the poor quality of teachers could be attributed to poor preparation for teaching. As one participant described,

So, lets look at teacher education because that’s where they have prepared the teacher, so the fault is teacher education.

Yet the participants argued that this was an anathema. As was further explained,

They are creating an illusion that teachers from graduation should be able to master every competence and to carry out every responsibility.

In contrast, the educational reform agenda described by interview participants sought to contribute to developing conceptions of professionalism for teachers and teaching. As one participant claimed,

It’s a different mindset to look at the profession and if we don’t do that we keep on struggling with the profession; with the professional stages and with the professional quality of teachers.

The conception of a profession, as described by theorists such as Freidson (1994) and Sachs (2000), was closely linked with the identified educational goals for teacher education. The core conceptions of a profession relevant to teacher education and its reform included developing a comprehensive professional pathway, providing for continuing professional learning and renewal, supporting new and continuing members of the profession, and facilitating professional self-determination. As such, the actions that emerged out of this first principle involved contributing to teacher effectiveness through professional learning that was no longer an individual pursuit but an outcome of participation across the cultural field of education. In doing so, both the research and teaching practices of higher education were shown to be involved.

The actions and activities identified by the interview participants that promote professionalism included: identifying professional dispositions and practices through continued research and development in the discipline of education; participating in the establishment, promotion and operation of professional associations; contributing to self-governed professional registration processes as both teachers and teacher educators; and engaging in and with school contexts as learning communities for all participants, students and teachers alike. While all of these activities were significant, the most effective means whereby teacher education as identified as contributing to professionalisation of teaching was through the education of its members.

The unique alignment between the processes and practices of higher education and the core features of a profession was identified as the most effective tool available to teacher educators in promoting professionalism in teaching. Teacher education, in contrast to other forms of teacher training, uses the processes and practices of higher education to make a contribution to that professionalisation. As one participant identified,

You want them to bring that practice to a sort of critical edge around engagement with further scholarship, research and theory. That to me makes a thoughtful profession really.

Consequently, reform in teacher education must ensure that the provision of teacher education takes into account both the regulatory requirements of teacher preparation and the purposes of higher education in its pursuit of developing professionalism for beginning teachers. This can then be
developed further through continuing teacher education that introduces teachers to increasingly sophisticated practices in higher education for continued professional learning and development.

**Principle #2: Facilitate continuing professional learning for teachers.**

The second principle the interview participants identified as underpinning educational reform in teacher education further expanded upon the promotion of the professionalism of teaching. One of the identified core values of professionalism was a disposition towards continuous professional learning (Sachs, 2000). As one participant observed,

> Much too often we say, 'Teacher education, oh, that's something which happens in university'. Maybe in cooperation with schools, but after four years and graduation it is finished. And I think that really, that REALLY hinders the profession.

That is, a key marker of a profession is complex, intellectual engagement with a body of knowledge that is maintained through further learning that both keeps up to date with and contributes to the discipline (Freidson, 1994; Southwick, 1997). Consequently, the interview participants argued that teacher education should not be relegated to the domain of teacher preparation. Rather, it should facilitate the continuing professional learning of teachers by extending throughout the professional life of teachers and in doing so contribute to the development of the discipline and the profession.

However, the contemporary political reform agenda has encouraged, developed and promoted a range of alternative pathways into teaching and approaches to teachers’ learning and development. Politically-driven discourses of quality, evidence and reform were shown to critique teacher education and its role in professional learning. These discourses promoted the view that university-based teacher education was maintaining a traditional view of preparation and taking a position that stands against reform, while politically driven alternative pathways were progressive and reforming in that they were responding to evidence. As one participant explained,

> But the way things have worked here, with this neo-liberal view, reform in education is getting constructed as, getting away from the unions, teacher unions, getting away from the universities who are seen as just sort of doing, what they always do and not preparing people ready to teach in classrooms. Heavy on theory - light on the real work of teaching.

The critique was founded in the argument that teacher education was out of touch with the requirements of the broader community because it was too liberal in its outlook, too theoretical in its content and failed to contribute to the practical core of teaching.

Despite the impact of politically driven alternatives, some form of both initial and continuing teacher education remained common to all study contexts. The capacity to reform teacher education to align with professional learning needs across the lifespan of teachers was described as dependent upon the capacity to successfully fulfil two core roles. The reform of teacher education needed to use the unique processes and practices of higher education to provide professional learning targeted towards the needs of teachers at each stage of the professional pathway. It also needed to conduct investigative research that provides empirical evidence of the effectiveness of this teacher education to the professional learning and development of teachers. As one participant observed,

> Some of the countries that do well in international comparisons, at least do well compared to [name of jurisdiction withheld], ... they focus on teachers as professionals, and professional learning and teachers over time.

Ironically, despite the growing body of research and evidence in education generally, many of the specific issues that impact professional learning across the lifespan of the teacher are yet to be interrogated.
Given that both the political and educational discourses recognised the teacher as the key human resource for quality educational outcomes, the role of teacher education in the learning and development of teachers can be shown to be related to effective human resource management. The political conceptions of human resource management described sought ways to maximise educational outcomes by maximising the performance of its key human resource through the recruitment, development and retention of quality teachers. As one participant described political accountability in their context,

*If you want to improve teaching and improve the schools, leading with accountability, and even you know this shame and blame and embarrassment and fire quickly. Get them in there and quickly find out if they can be effective, fire the ones who aren’t. That is not a good model.*

In contrast, the participants identified educational responses to human resource management as responding effectively to supply and demand, establishing sustainable and predictable professional pathways, and integrating teacher education with the practices of professional review.

Educational reform in teacher education should work towards modelling and matching the provision of teacher education with staffing requirements in schools. This requires sophisticated modelling across the various schooling sectors in order to diminish the issues associated with supply and demand. As one participant described,

*We haven’t had any crisis about supply since about 1991 now, since all of this [human resource] machinery really got going. And one thing the government can’t have, and one thing it is most vulnerable to is actually having no teacher standing in front of a classroom. Ministers are really, really petrified by that stuff. It’s an interesting policy debate because, I mean some countries would not, don’t even aspire, on principle, to match the two.*

Teacher education then needs to match the professional learning it offers to the five stages of the professional pathway for teachers; namely recruitment, preparation, induction, teaching and leading. Each of these stages needs to be described in relation to its core features, learning needs and promotional processes. Teacher education would then be capable of facilitating a process where teachers were able to apply for promotion based on evidence of professional learning and development in relation to professional practice. As one participant proposed,

*So it would be like saying to a teacher, ‘You want to go for a promotion to a senior teacher?’ Whatever term you want to use, lead teacher or whatever it is. ‘You plan your career to do that,’ – typically people do that after five years in teaching – ‘and there is a two-year qualification attached to it plus a whole lot of other things in the school and if you achieve those things then you’ll get your promotion.’ That seems to me to be a sensible, logical way of strengthening the profession and keeping good people in it.*

The key difference between this model and other forms of performance pay was its focus on rewarding committed effort in improving professional practice and demonstrating empirical evidence of professional achievement. In other words, the interview participants claimed that the educational reform of teacher education must focus on the needs of teachers and schools in terms of professional learning about professional practice and how this changes over the professional lifespan of the teacher.

**Principle #3: Engage teachers with best practice higher education.**

The third principle that underpinned educational reform furthers the association between teacher education and higher education by focussing on best practice. Essentially, the interview participants argued that teacher education needs to proactively align itself with contemporary best practice in
Higher education. Higher education is designed to engage staff and students in an academic community that provides educated citizens with broad and deep knowledge of selected disciplines; skills in problem-solving, research and higher order thinking; and dispositions that support a critical, inquiring stance to practice (Boyer, 2015/1997; Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold standards), 2011). The knowledge, practices and dispositions developed through higher education were shown to be directly relevant to the professional practices of teaching and learning as experienced in schools. As one participant expressed,

*Maybe, teacher education together with nursing education are the most narrow parts of higher education. On the other hand, I think it makes the focus of the program more easy. I think we can connect more closely to the needs of the profession because it is quite clear what's needed in schools and if you're professional profile is very vague it is much more difficult to have a clear focus in your program.*

As such, the participants described how teacher educators need to employ the best practices of higher education to maximise the benefits of that education for teachers and to provide empirical evidence that quality higher education matters.

Despite educational claims about the significance of teacher education in contemporary contexts, political reforms have been shown to consistently question its relevance. While political discourses concur with the need for preparation, questions about the length and level of that preparation were raised and political support has been given to alternative pathways that circumvent teacher education. As one participant explained,

*So, then we have lots more alternate routes emerging. And it sort of goes hand-in-hand, and now charter schools are really being pushed. A lot of the people who teach in charter schools enter teaching through alternate routes so it's sort of part of a package of reforms, these are always constructed as reforms. Traditional university programs are seen as anti-reform.*

Political questioning of teacher education intensified in relation to continuing teacher education. In most contexts, the interview participants identified that teacher learning beyond preparation was determined by the completion of a minimum number of teacher development hours or teacher development courses. As one participant observed,

*The regulator offers those courses for professional development and they have to take one at least every two years. Any practicing teacher has to take one every two years.*

The requirements of professional registration were shown to constrain the curriculum space available for constructing knowledge and practice across disciplinary areas such as philosophy, psychology, sociology and history. As one participant complained,

*You know we never cracked it, we never cracked doing it properly. But we have lost something by having no access to philosophy or history of education. It's completely expunged from all forms of teacher education, even undergraduate, it doesn't exist here anymore.*

Yet, these areas were identified as important for the critical reflective practices of teachers in implementing and thinking about practice-based research. As such, the significance of the knowledge and practices of higher education on the professional learning of teachers needs to become a core issue for interrogation by teacher educators.

The continuing commitment to and support for both initial and continuing teacher education must be grounded in actions that reflect best practice in teaching, learning and research. If the benefits of teacher education were to be fully realised, the higher education provided needs to be focussed...
around the provision of quality through contemporary best practice. This involves participation with and in a range of associations and organisations that are interrogating the processes and practices of higher education in order to source, apply and evaluate innovative practices. Across contexts, the identified quality practices of higher education included: the construction of curriculum grounded in relevant disciplines; involvement in experiential learning and research-based clinical practice; engagement with professional mentors and communities of inquiry; and the integration of technologies for learning.

Quality initial and continuing teacher education was shown to incorporate teaching and learning that links the discipline of education with professional practices and dispositions. The scope and sequence of curriculum should cover the professional learning needs of teachers while also fulfilling the expectations of higher education. The curriculum of teacher education needs to be generated out of and organised around the discipline of education and structured to progressively build the knowledge and skills of professional practice. As one participant described the consequences of non-specific courses in teacher education,

*So then that lead to very general programs for many types of professions outside the teaching profession and it reduced the focus of the teacher education curriculum on the actual teaching. So actually we didn't educate teachers anymore. So these programs have been abolished, for pretty much a stronger focus on teacher education, on the teaching profession. And of course we realise that people will move onto other professions, but focus the programs on becoming a teacher.*

Given the integration of technology across all aspects of life in the 21st century it is also important to consider the authentic integration of the curriculum of teacher education with technology. As one participant described,

*So, in fact, well all I have to do is come up with the scaffold, sometimes that takes longer than just a PowerPoint, and then constructing those cooperative learning strategies so we are actually using technology in pedagogical ways and not just in delivery ways.*

Current practice in highly innovative higher education also encourages greater interaction amongst the participants in teacher education through mentoring relationships. This links preservice teachers with teachers beyond the confines of school-based experience to deconstruct the student mentality. As one participant reflected,

*I think quite often the whole atmosphere of an institutional system world structure keeps you thinking like a student a lot longer than you should.*

For continuing teacher education, mentoring relationships with teacher educators were shown to facilitate professional learning and research.

The implementation of the curriculum of teacher education should focus on praxis that integrates the theoretical constructs of the discipline with contextualised practice. Experiential learning provides authentic opportunities for teachers to experience teaching and learning in higher education, school-based and other contexts. As one participant explained,

*I know you can’t really do much about that in the university setting. But I do think that some of that teaching and learning experience has to be done and not just talked about. So even having a little more room in your curriculum for doing project-based learning, or going out and doing community service.*

The most significant experiential learning for teachers happens within school contexts where close connections were maintained between professional learning and the everyday work of teachers at
both the initial and continuing stages of the professional pathway. As one participant described the impact of higher education in continuing teacher education,

In my experience, teachers who have been teaching for 10, 15 years and then go into a Masters program they are going through enormous development because all the things they have done they are re-thinking. Their experience, is put into a wider framework. So they have an a-ha moment. They think, 'Now I understand'. So the jump in their thinking is enormous.

For initial teacher education experiential learning inside school contexts can be supported by innovations in community and project-based learning that consolidate the knowledge, practices and dispositions of the profession across multiple contexts and opportunities. For teachers involved in continuing teacher education, the role of experiential learning reverses this contextualising by focussing on the outworking of the core practices of higher education in the contexts of schools.

Quality initial and continuing teacher education was also shown to involve teachers in research. This should incorporate empirical practices, such as research-based clinical practice, to develop teachers’ capacities to generate and use their own research evidence about classroom practice from within their own context. As one participant explained,

Practice-embedded learning would be one of the big ideas to think about. That’s a sort of process idea. Probably, the big idea, is us thinking about teachers as actively inquiring professionals.

Furthermore, the participants promoted communities of inquiry that build relationships around empirically grounded investigations that interrogate questions significant to participants within a context. It promotes professional learning that is a community endeavour such that teacher effectiveness is no longer an individual pursuit but an outcome of community engagement. Thus breaking down the contemporary focus on the individual teacher as the source of quality in education. As one participant explained,

So these communities and the larger networks of these communities that connect people beyond their own classroom encourage people to write about their teaching, research their teaching, present their work, connect with others and really make change. That seems to be something that is reinvigorating professionally.

Given the potential impact of research skills on the development of problem-solving, participation in research by teachers was identified as fundamental to professional learning across all contexts and as potentially the most powerful contribution of higher education to the professionalisation of teachers and teaching. Practices and actions taken in the classroom need a basis in sound evidence rather than common-sense or bureaucratic interpretations of quality teaching.

**Principle #4: Foster productive relationships with stakeholders.**

For the first three principles of educational reform to be successful, appropriate relationships amongst sectors, institutions and individuals must develop across the cultural field involved in teacher education. As such, the fourth principle underpinning action in the reform of teacher education acknowledged that the nature of the relationships amongst participants has a direct influence on the provision and outcomes of teacher education. That is, the interview participants identified that the relationships developed amongst participants in teacher education influenced the capacity for that education to impact the professionalisation of teaching across the professional lifespan of the teacher. As one participant identified,

We can say, well let’s educate all teachers at Masters level. But if you don’t do anything about school culture and school organisation you are just creating problems and frustration.
Therefore, it was argued that the outcomes of the reform of teacher education were maximised when the relationships amongst participants were unequivocally committed to the mutual benefits of teacher education to all involved in the cultural field of education.

The activities of and discourses in the contemporary reform of teacher education have been working against the development of positive, productive relationships in teacher education. Political and bureaucratic discourses have challenged the role played by teacher education in the field of education, leading to some serious questioning of its relevance to the needs of both teachers and schools. As one participant reflected, these criticisms are not limited to politicians,

And of course, the students are also critical of that stuff as well, because its not where they want to be.

However, the relational challenges faced by teacher education in contemporary contexts have equally been the responsibility of educational actions, perspectives and discourses. Politically, the impact of stakeholder processes and market competition has worked to build oppositional relational dynamics amongst participants across the field. These political issues led to a sense of distrust that was further fostered by the frustration that then tempers relations between the various educational sectors involved in teacher education.

Across contexts of this study, two key issues identified were the oppositional nature of the stakeholder research used to frame policy and standards and the competitive market-based relationships set up amongst institutions and sectors. Across all study contexts, the emphasis on the perspectives and biases of a multiplicity of stakeholders in the construction of standards drown out the voice of the teacher educators involved. As one participant criticised the role of stakeholders in the development of standards,

It’s that same sort of accumulation of stuff that programs have to do, not really deep conceptual thinking about the big ideas that teacher education should try to develop.

The resulting frustrations evident in the criticism of standards by teacher educators also takes in criticism of the stakeholders themselves. Teacher educators’ negative attitudes towards other educational participants have been further reinforced when competition for students has been promoted. This was particularly evident in contexts with alternative employment-based pathways where competitive market relationships have developed between schools and universities, universities and each other, and universities and other private providers of educational services for teacher preparation. As one participant explained,

That [school-based teacher training] has been a minority route, but a very important political animal because it’s part of maintaining competition with universities sector and there are numbers that move into that route.

Educational discourses have demonstrated the significance of mutually positive relational connections between the work of teacher education and the sector it purports to serve. Yet, teacher educators can over-emphasise independence or academic freedom, thereby running the risk of irrelevance, either in appearance or actuality. As one participant noted,

There’s still the complaint that they do theory, they do too much theory. They don’t do the real work of the classroom, don’t do the practical core of teaching.

The push for academic freedom is further supported by the appearance of a lack of appreciation for the potential impact of other educational participants on teacher education. In most contexts, the perception of professional experience placements as the core of this relationship has increasingly led to the linking of these placements with funding and the interpretation of them as an imposition in a one-way relationship that is of benefit only to teacher education. As one participant warned,
The money will follow into the schools, follow the students, and the schools will then decide for themselves what services they wish to purchase from a university. Alright. So that’s happening much more extensively and rapidly than was thought initially. What it does is put you in a market relationship in a very profound sort of way with your local school system.

As such, the negativity and frustration apparent amongst educational participants extends beyond political influences and if left unchallenged could ultimately be used to enforce the demise of university-based teacher education.

If the potential of teacher education to contribute to the educational mandate of influencing the professionalisation of teachers and teaching is to be attained, the suspicions, negativity and wariness that has come to define relationships amongst educational participants needs to be challenged. For this to be achieved, both the attitudes and actions of teacher educators towards others need to be reformed towards more productive relational approaches. As one participant expressed,

_Some people think that can only work with closer community connections, you know, local community relationships with parents, community centres, community organisations and there are some programs that have done a fairly good job with some of that. But I think we need to be supporting people all the way along, I think we need to do a lot more work on recruiting a more diverse teaching force._

The attitudes taken towards relationships in teacher education need to acknowledge the role of a wide range of educational participants in the processes and practices of teacher education and appreciate that teacher education should contribute to rather than impose upon the profession. These attitudes then need to be supported by strong leadership in the reform of teacher education, the alignment of purposes across sectors, and cross-sectoral relating grounded in negotiations that maximise the benefits of teacher education for all involved.

The interview participants linked the need to build productive relationships to the whole of the cultural and political fields that influence teacher education. This takes in five key relationships with politicians, regulatory bodies, teachers’ unions, schools and teachers. Firstly, teacher educators need to build relationships that create opportunities to influence political opinions by promoting frameworks for thinking about teacher education, and providing empirical evidence and feedback on reform practices and ideas. Secondly, teacher educators need to seek alignment with regulatory bodies by promoting proactive responsiveness to expectations and requirements. Thirdly, teacher educators need to garner support from teachers’ unions. The reimagining of the teaching profession and development of a systematic professional pathway incorporating promotion and remuneration are central to the interests and work of the unions. Fourthly, teacher educators need to develop authentic partnerships with schools that equalise the benefits to all involved. Finally, teacher educators need to respect teachers as professionals who make an important contribution to the work of teacher education in the supervising and mentoring of beginners.

Relationships that support teacher education must be framed by a mutual appreciation and respect for the expertise of the different participants in teacher education. As one participant stated,

_I think for me that I see very good development where schools and teacher educators are cooperating._

The primary expertise of the teacher educator was identified as grounded in the outworking of the discipline of education. By contrast, teachers and mentors in schools have primary expertise in the practices of and problems faced in schools and classroom. This primary experience of the practicalities of teaching was also unique to context and must be respected as an important contribution to
understanding and developing professional practice. University-based teacher educators need to acknowledge the limitations of their experience and learn to defer to the expertise of teachers and schools in relation to issues of professional practice. Similarly, teachers and schools need to appreciate the expert knowledge of teacher educators in developing the discipline of education, critical and creative thinking, problem solving, and research practices. As one participant explained,

*What I would want for the future is actually strong university involvement, but also very strong school involvement as well. But a strong university involvement.*

As another participant observed, this should not be limited to preparation,

*So you can argue and say, well all the new teachers need to have a Masters level. But instead all the teachers who are working in schools don't have a Masters degree and so there has been a strong tendency to focus on Masters degree courses in service for teachers who are in schools. It is seen as a career step for teachers.*

Thus, the alignment of expertise that appropriates early engagement with schools and teachers while progressively increasing involvement for higher education across the professional lifespan of teachers was identified as critical to the outworking of the potential of teacher education.

Across all of these relationships, there were three key activities that the interview participants identified as maximising the potential for success in connecting with others for the professionalisation of teachers and teaching. These were negotiating with others, making contractual agreements and avoiding conflicts. As with all relationships, the presence of alternative perspectives on issues necessitated negotiations. When negotiating it was important to differentiate the means from the end. Alternative models or methods for achieving the desired end need to be presented in such a way that they are viewed as a modification that requires a flexing whilst maintaining the intention of requirements. As one participant described,

*And so the teachers’ council have agreed that in negotiated examples we can reduce the requirement. But, we got it by trying to explain what we were trying to do rather than just saying, ‘No we’re not going to visit four times.’ So I’d agree, you kind of build the professional relationship with them really.*

Relationships also need to be formalised as the commitment of time and resources to the development of authentic practice-embedded higher education qualifications needs stability. Finally, conflicts over processes and practices need to be avoided. Whilst higher education holds a unique position within the education sector through its role in both generating and disseminating knowledge, it is important for teacher educators to remember that the knowledge they hold is privileged but it does not guarantee influence or control. As one participant explained,

*The sort of constant battle is not, is not helpful, really. No. There is no point having an argument, that’s my perspective, with an organisation that ultimately controls your destiny.*

Conflicts or confrontations about issues over which one has no control were described as unproductive at best and destructive at worst. For the interview participants, the nature and quality of relationships were pivotal to the contribution of teacher education to the professionalisation of teachers and teaching.

**Drawing Theoretical Conclusions**

This chapter has reported the analysis of contemporary interview data collected from across international contexts for the third phase of this study. Again, the theorising that has emerged from this data has focussed on the the nature of change and continuity in teacher preparation. Importantly,
the resulting theoretical model has highlighted the significance of the context of teacher education to that preparation. The key finding that this phase of the study has contributed to the development of this thesis is that change and continuity is directly related to its social context. That is, understanding the nature of the localised cultural and political contexts surrounding teacher education is critical to influencing change and continuity in desired directions.

However, across all of the study contexts covered by this third phase, change and continuity in teacher education was politicised, globalised and externalised. The almost universal presence of neoliberalism’s economic approaches (Torres, 2009) was evident in the emphasis placed on the collection and analysis of measurable data as well as the construction of over-simplified discourses about the quality of teachers and teacher education. This globalising influence was further supported by the development of documents that use global monitoring of the processes and practices of teacher education across a range of similar national and international jurisdictions to justify local reforms.

Consequently, change and continuity was increasingly removed from the actual processes and practices of teacher education and the sociocultural factors that impact the local context. These circumstances create contexts where it is challenging to continue to promote educational perspectives on teacher education. While teacher educators have been and continue to challenge political and economic perspectives on educational practices, there was a growing sense of despondency across the international participants interviewed for this study. Many were failing to be terribly optimistic about the possibility of change in the dynamics surrounding the globalisation and politicisation of teacher education in contemporary contexts. While the will to fight might be weak and it might seem easier to sway to political whims, yet, the cost of failing to crusade for educational outcomes in teacher education is too great.

At the centre of the theoretical model of change and continuity that emerged out of the international interview data was the core conception of reform. This reform was linked inextricably to a series of actions that promote the attainment of preferred futures. These actions incorporated identifying, persuading about and enacting an educational mandate for the future of teacher education. Across the interview participants involved, this mandate pointed to the professionalisation of teachers as the key to the reform of teacher education. Within the social context of teacher education, the activities of reform were identified as the core social process in influencing the future of teacher education. These key reform activities that underpin the actions required to facilitate change and continuity were strongly reflective of activity theory as explained by Engeström (1987).

Activity theory is a ‘cultural-historical theory’ (Engeström, 1987, p.19) designed to elaborate social transformations through the purposeful connecting of the discourses of socioeconomic structures with those of the individual and their actions in context. While it originated in the 1920s in Russian cultural-historical psychology and German philosophy, recent developments have globalised activity theory in dialogue with contemporary approaches across multiple disciplines (Engeström, 1987). Activity theory focuses on individual actions within the context of collective activity systems for the purpose of studying change as it happens in the moment and over time (Russell, 2002). In doing so, it has philosophically accepted postmodern conceptions of change, which reject oversimplifications based in cause and effect, to consider the complexity of the human psyche in interpreting multiple discourses in the construction of actions and activities (Cole & Engeström, 1993).

A comparative analysis of the core principle of activity theory with the theoretical model summarised in Figure 6.2 Change and Continuity for Preferred Futures in Teacher Education demonstrated a high
degree of comparability between them. The resultant evidence of the fit or workability (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) between the two constructs justifies the use of activity theory to explain, enlighten and draw conclusions about change and continuity in contemporary contexts in teacher education. Relevant core principles of activity theory were that human activity is social (Cole & Engeström, 1993), change is constant and a consequence of contradictions (Engeström, 1987, 1999; Russell, 2002), and human activity is constrained by context (Hardman, 2007).

Activity theory first and foremost focuses on human actions as a consequence of an externalised, collective activity system in a related social realm (Cole & Engeström, 1993; Hardman, 2007). Whilst a particular behaviour might be expressed by an individual, its nature and outworking are connected to how that behaviour or activity is understood collectively within its social context. This was expressed in the theorising of change and continuity in a social context as the contribution of individuals and institutions from across various cultural and political fields to collective understandings of the activity of reform. In doing so, it externalised the reform of teacher education as a complex, collective human activity grounded in a definable social context.

A second core principle of activity theory relates to the role of contradiction, particularly ambiguity or surprise, as a key driver of a continuous process of change (Engeström, 1987, 1999; Russell, 2002). An activity system unfolds or is transformed over time in response to the ‘raw materials or problem space at which the activity is directed’ (Engeström, 1987). As such, change is fundamental to activity theory, as if change is the most basic and consistent of continuities in any system. This same continuity of change was articulated in the discourses of disjuncture that comprised the issues at the heart of the reform of teacher education. This was further reinforced by consistent references to the discourse of reform in describing change across all jurisdictions selected in this study. Reform refers to change as something designed to improve rather than overthrow systems by seeking to correct ineffective or inappropriate practices. While it looks for action to be taken, that action is values-based as it is constructed out of motivations present in the relevant social context. What was key here was that the discourse of reform incorporated the materiality of what is, alongside the ideal of what could be, as the object of the activity of the reform of teacher education (Engeström, 1987). It articulated both the motive for and principles of the continuous unfolding of the collective activity of reforming teacher education in response to the disjunctive problem space that framed its processes and practices (Engeström, 1987).

Closely related to engagement with contradictions as a driving force, a third principle of activity theory is that these contradictions also constrain the actions of individuals. That is, actors in a particular activity may be required to act in ways that are contrary to their motives or preferences in a particular context (Hardman, 2007). This highlights human activity as both thoughtful and complex as individuals are required to respond to contradictions and issues in the problem space. Similarly, the actions discussed in relation to change and continuity for the future of teacher education were focussed on reconciling politically driven reforms and actions with the educational ideals that underpinned their motivations. The identified actions in the model unpack the collective activity of teacher educators as expressive of educational ideals through the reform of the material substance, the tools or artefacts, of teacher education (Engeström, 1987). These actions considered how to control reform by the mediation of the external tools and artefacts of teacher education (Vygotsky, 1978). It showed how teacher educators, as ‘cognising agents’ (Hardman, 2007), might act in order to bring alignment between their motives and productive action in teacher education. All of which is designed to assist
teacher educators to ‘gain control over their own artefacts and thus over their own future’ (Engeström, 1999, p.29).

Having identified these correlations between the theoretical model articulated in this chapter and the underlying principles of activity theory, it was also important to identify correlations between the activity system (Engeström, 1987), and the core activities of the theoretical model. Below, Figure 6.4 *The structure of Human Activity*, outlines the core components of an activity system and their relationships to each other, each of which can be related to concepts from the theoretical model developed over this third phase of the study.
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*Figure 6.4 The Structure of Human Activity (Engeström, 1987, p.78)*

Built on Marxist (1971) ideas about production, the model outlines four key relations that work holistically in human activities: production, consumption, distribution and exchange. Production, as the starting point, is directed towards consumption and then mediated by both distribution and exchange (Marx, 1971, p. 89). Yet, these relations work together. While distinctions can be articulated, ‘they all form the members of a totality, distinctions within a unity’ (Marx, 1971, p.99). While they work together, theoretically they can be distinguished as separate activities (Engeström, 1987, near p.78). These four relations are also present in the reform activities included in the model of change and continuity described in this chapter. That is, the relations of an activity system (Engeström, 1987) were evident in the interrelated principles and consequent actions that underpin the practices that promote the reform of teacher education towards educational goals.

Production considers how either material or psychological tools and artefacts are used in the creation of objects in response to the subject or need of an activity system (Engeström, 1987). For Marx (1971), ‘Production creates the objects which correspond to the given needs’ (p.89). In the theoretical model described in this chapter, this was expressed in seeking to achieve educational goals for the reform of teacher education that involves the production of teachers as professionals. Consumption then connects this directly to individuals, as ‘consumption is also production of the human beings themselves’ (Engeström, 1987). In the model, participation in the activities of higher education for the professionalisation of teachers was representative of this consumption. To support both production and consumption, distribution considers the spreading of the instruments of production and of the participants involved in different activities (Engeström, 1987). This was present in the model in the articulation of the actions required to achieve productive relationships across the cultural field. Similarly, exchange supports the production and consumption of the professionalisation of teachers through its consideration of the interactions and communication required to promote it (Engeström, 1987). The need for exchange is related to the permanent state of incompleteness of any activity
system evident in its continuing unfolding. Within the theoretical model, this was represented in the principles and actions of interaction and communication as described through the articulation of the practices that promote educational reform in teacher education.

Effectively, the presence of these four relations demonstrated that the underlying construct of Engeström’s (1987) activity system was closely aligned with the theoretical model developed through this phase of the study. Engeström (1999) then developed further complexity by considering multiple layers in or networks of activity directed towards an object. This complexity is also present in the activity of the reform of teacher education, particularly in the recognition of the alternative pathways to attaining quality teachers for quality teaching in the reform goals and agendas of different participants. However, Engeström’s (1987) original construction, as shown in Figure 6.4, holds the possibility of considering the core elements of an activity system as a means of conceptualising the core activity of constructing the reform of teacher education towards an educational reform agenda. That is, it facilitates a description of the activity of reform to be undertaken by the teacher educator towards educational goals. The outcomes of the correlation of the core elements of Engeström’s (1987) structure of human activity has been summarised on Table 6.1 *The core elements of human activity in the reform of teacher education*, below.

**Table 6.1 The Core Elements of Human Activity in the Reform of Teacher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Defined as...</th>
<th>Evidenced in the theoretical model by...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>that which provides the need for that activity (Vygotsky, 1930 as cited by Engeström, 1987).</td>
<td>The social subject is the need for quality teaching for the educational needs of the community. This is then individualised in the need to provide and educate quality teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>the means whereby the participants involved seek to meet the social and individual human need articulated by the subject. An entity or action becomes an, ‘object of activity when it meets a human need’ (Engeström, 1999).</td>
<td>The object is the provision of teacher education across the lifespan of the teacher to facilitate both the professional becoming and being of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>those things that are made and used in mediating human influence on the relationship between the subject and the object (Vygotsky, 1978). They are the external items, physical and psychological tools, used in the ‘preservation and transmission of the acquired skills or modes of action or praxis’ (Wartofsky, 1983 as cited by Engeström, 1987).</td>
<td>The tools of the teacher educators are the processes and practices of teacher education. This involves the combining of the practices of higher education with professional learning in situated praxis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>determined by the roles and responsibilities that evidence that a particular participant has a stake in the outcome of an activity (Engeström, 1987).</td>
<td>The community includes all arenas in the cultural and political fields that hold a stake in the development of quality teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Labour</td>
<td>the separation of responsibility based on the different commodities brought to the activity system by various member of the community (Marx, 1971).</td>
<td>The division of labour involves the matching of the expertise of participants to achieving the purposes of both higher education and professional learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>the ‘collective traditions, rituals and rules’ (Engeström, 1987) that regulate an activity.</td>
<td>Politically mediated rules include the development of standards constructed to control both considerations of the quality of the teacher and of programs designed to develop quality teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Defined as...</td>
<td>Evidenced in the theoretical model by...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educationally mediated rules relate to the correlation of the professional pathway of teachers to the practices of teacher education across the lifespan of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goal of activity theory, as a ‘cultural-historical theory’ (Engeström, 1987, p.19) of psychology is to understand the participation of the individual in a complex, collective activity. As has been shown, the core elements, relations and principles of activity theory are closely related to the theorising of change and continuity that emerged from the interview data used in the third phase of this study. As such, the comparative analysis of this study’s theorising with activity theory has further enlightened the potentiality of the work and role of teacher educators in the reform of teacher education towards an educational mandate focussed on the professionalisation of teachers and teaching.

The completion of the third phase of this study has used Charmaz’s (2006) constructive analytical processes. This has resulted in the theorising of change and continuity in relation to its social context. This has further supported the development of this thesis in relation to the theorising of change and continuity as a social process that emerged in the earlier historical phase of the study. Alongside the historical text analysis and theorising of selected historical contexts reported in Chapters 4 and 5, this third and final phase of the study has incorporated the interrogation of contemporary contexts. Again, the resultant theorising has foregrounded the social nature of change and continuity in the processes and practices of teacher education.

Having completed the analysis of the data gathered across the second and third phase of this study, the next step was to complete a comparative analysis of the theorising that has emerged from both the historical and contemporary contexts. The purpose is to draw conclusions about preferred futures for teacher education. These conclusions compare the theoretical outcomes of the substantively different contexts used across these two phases of the study. The purpose of this comparative analysis is the critical identification and analysis of the system relations at work in change and continuity in teacher preparation. The findings that emerge from this final stage of critical grounded theory make up the conclusions discussed in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final stage of critical grounded theory developed for this study draws conclusions about the system relations at work in the selected context that are drawn together into a substantive theory that forms the key findings of the study. In this study, the context of these conclusions was the theorising of change and continuity in the processes and practices of teacher education across both historical and contemporary contexts, as described in Chapters 5 and 6. This concluding stage of the research process is designed to critically reflect on current circumstances in the light of the exposure of the processes and practices that control or manipulate those circumstances. That is, it takes the theorising that has been analysed out of data from both the past and present to reflect on action for the future. This is the final stage in the application of critical grounded theory and uses Glaser & Strauss’s (1967) commitment to a general method of comparative analysis to promote action for social change. It does so by facilitating critical reflection on the theoretical analysis of the two main phases of the study. While comparative analysis has been central to the application of Clarke (2005) and Charmaz’s (2006) methods to the study, it is applied here to drawing conclusions for this study. These conclusions are reached through a comparative analysis of the two theoretical models followed by critical reflection on the outcomes of this comparison in relation to the four concepts incorporated in the research question; How might emerging paradigms for teacher education respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?

As identified in Chapter 3, critical approaches to research are constructed around two key concepts. Firstly, critical research acknowledges the role of knowledge, truth and power in the establishment and maintenance of social systems (Carspecken, 1996; Crotty, 1998). Secondly, it seeks the emancipation of groups and individuals by promoting action for social change (Kinchloe & McLaren 2008). As such, critical grounded theory seeks to combine, ‘reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it’ (Freire, 1972, p. 28). As such, this final stage of the study is pivotal to generating a critical grounded theory. It is in the expression of conclusions designed to influence future processes and practices in teacher education that grounded theory reflects both the ideological and practical outworking anticipated by critical theory’s commitment to emancipatory social action (Bohman, 2012).

The two theorising phases of the study, Phases 2 and 3, and the resultant theoretical models, Figures 5.1 and 6.2, have exposed and critiqued the ‘dominant ideological constructs and presuppositions’ (Harvey, 2011. p.5) of change and continuity in the stories of teacher education. These have been focussed on past perspectives in the national context and present issues across the international context. In doing so, they have given voice to the perspectives of teacher educators about the processes and practices that influence their work as teacher educators. That is, the theoretical models that emerged from the data, as articulated through Chapters 5 and 6, describe the systems and relationships that have led to and drive the current regulatory climate in teacher education both internationally and in the Australian context. This analysis of the ideological basis of the regulatory climate responds to the unspoken fear in the Australian context, as identified in Chapter 1, that questions the capacity of teacher education and teacher educators to survive and thrive in current circumstances. The stories told about teacher education across both the past and present serve to legitimise these fears about the future of university-based teacher education. These concerns lie at the heart of the theoretical models, yet the models also engender a hope for the future of teacher education.
Comparing Theoretical Outcomes

The first step in drawing the conclusions involved a ‘comparative analysis’ (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of the theoretical models that emerged from the analysis of both the past and present data. These models represent what Glaser (2007) identified as substantive theories. A substantive theory is grounded in data that is specific to an identifiable situation or scenario (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The first model, in Chapter 5, is linked to change and continuity in the history of teacher preparation in the Australian context during the period of crisis between 1930 and 1950. In contrast, the second model, as described in Chapter 6, considers change and continuity across purposefully selected international contexts in the present moment. For Glaser (2007), substantive grounded theories are descriptive in nature and have a short life in terms of relevance. They are contrasted with formal grounded theories, which are conceptual rather than descriptive (Glaser, 2007), and emerge from the constant comparison across a number of substantive areas or theories (Glaser, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In other words, a formal grounded theory takes the analysis of data to an abstract, conceptual level (Glaser, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). While Glaser (2007) makes a case for the abstraction of generalisable formal grounded theories from the comparative analysis of substantive theories, Corbin & Strauss (2008) argue for the continued contextualising of theory. Either way, the process of comparative analysis is designed to extract meaningful conclusions from the theorising that has emerged from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in alignment with the purposes of a doctoral study.

While both contextual and conceptual similarities were evident between the two theoretical models relating to change and continuity in teacher preparation, it is the differences that were significant to the outworking of their comparison. The contextual differences, in both time and place, support the capacity to use Glaser’s (2007) approach to abstract from these substantive cases towards generalisable theory. However, the conceptual differences present in the focus of the models make this problematic. The shift from process to context and from teacher preparation to teacher education creates conceptual distance between the two models that does not lend itself to formal theorising. Rather, the use of comparative analysis between these models supports conceptual abstraction designed to extract conclusions relating to the substantive area of change and continuity in teacher education (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This form of comparative analysis was used in the development of the conclusions to this thesis.

Comparing Core Conceptions

As has already been stated, the main difference between the two theoretical models discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 is their focal points. While the first model interrogated change and continuity as a social process using data from an historical context, the second considered change and continuity in a social context using contemporary international data. This resulted in three significant points of departure in the development of the two models; the core one being the perspective taken on change and continuity, which changes from process to context. This is then made more complex by contextual changes within the time periods, stemming from the 30s and 40s to a contemporary time frame, and the socio-political context, from Australia to a range of international jurisdictions. Given these differences, it is not surprising that the core conceptions, when placed side by side, appear to have few direct correlations in relationship to the language that is used to label them. Figure 7.1 Core Conceptions of Theoretical Models: Phase 2 and 3, below, lists the core categories from each model side by side for comparison.
However, the differences in the language used in describing the processes and practices of change and continuity in teacher education across the two models can largely be attributed to the approach used in theorising out of the data. The coding and analysis processes used across phases 2 and 3 included in vivo coding designed to draw out the emic perspectives and discourses present in the data (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). That is, the differences evident in the language used to label and describe the core concepts in the two models relate to the practicalities of considering stories in different historical and socio-political contexts. The differences present in the language that is used to describe the various components of the models, such as the personnel, processes and contexts of change and continuity, is reflective of changes in the discourses of the participants in the study. Given the different time periods covered and the required shift from written to oral data, these types of discursive differences would be expected. However, when the comparison is taken to a conceptual level there are significant areas of commonality evident between the two models. From the conceptual, comparative analysis three concepts that are common across the models were identified: participants, disjunctures and negotiation. While each of these concepts was present in both models, similarities and differences in their role and outworking was identified as significant to developing conclusions to the thesis.

The presence of conceptual commonality alongside linguistic differences points to the validity and reliability of the theoretical models. Since the inception of grounded theory, the trustworthiness or believability of an emergent theory has been determined by how it ‘fits or works’ (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.29), in relation to the identified context. The presence of linguistic variations linked to the time period and data sources used lends support to the relevance or fitness of the models to the different study contexts. More significantly though, the identification of three core concepts common across both the historical process and contemporary contexts is strongly supportive of the fitness or workability of the models over both time and place. That is, the presence and similarity of these common concepts, despite contextual differences, establishes the validity and reliability of the models within their specific contexts and their usefulness in building conclusions from the comparative analysis.

While it would be easy to assume that similarities point to continuities and differences point to changes, it is argued here that this is not the case. The theoretical models and the comparative analysis thereof elucidated the processes and practices of change and continuity rather than describe examples of them. Given the shift from local to international and historical to contemporary, the contexts used across the two models incorporated at least two potential sources of change and continuity. As such, it was possible to identify similarities and differences but, importantly, it cannot be assumed that these
are causally linked to each other. Further information about the contemporary Australian context and/or historical international context would be needed to make judgements about changes and continuities in this way and this is beyond the scope of this study. Further, and of significance, rather than seeking to describe specific changes and continuities, the comparative analysis generated the core conceptual propositions that underpin the theoretical model that has been proposed as the thesis of this study. This makes a significant contribution to new knowledge through the generation of four substantive theoretical propositions identified as integral to a social approach to change and continuity and implicit in the commonality identified between the models that emerged across Phases 2 and 3. The four propositions are built on four core concepts, namely: (i) the participants involved in; (ii) influence of disjunctures on, (iii) act of negotiating for, and (iv) the context of change and continuity in teacher education. Each of these propositions is presented forthwith.

**Substantive proposition #1: The participants involved in change and continuity.**

The first proposition identified as significant in presenting the thesis is that the historical roles for participants, as articulated in the social process of change and continuity described in Chapter 5, are productive in enlightening potential influence on the future reform of teacher education. The participants and the roles they take in teacher education have remained consistent across historical and socio-political contexts. The participants in the cultural and political fields of teacher education were identical to the diversity of individual and institutional participants identified in the historical context; this includes educational, bureaucratic and political participants. Over time, however, the names or labels given to participants have changed in line with perceived changes to teacher education. That is, master teachers have become lecturers, Principals are now Deans, teachers’ colleges have transformed into schools and faculties within university contexts, and education departments have been separated into various bodies, giving rise to professional registration boards. Despite these linguistic and structural developments, the roles and responsibilities taken by the various participants as well as the dissemination of knowledge and power amongst them is common across both models. In other words, the nature of the field and the arenas of influence over it were consistent across the two models and understanding these is significant to a social approach to change and continuity.

**Substantive proposition #2: The influence of disjuncture in change and continuity.**

The presence and influence of disjunctures in change and continuity is also consistent across both theoretical models. In theorising about both process and context, the second significant proposition in theorising change and continuity is that discursive disjunctures are acknowledged as the fundamental source of alternative perspectives about what could or should be done in teacher education. The key points of commonality were two-fold. Firstly, disjunctures were created when dissonances in the perspectives of participants came into contact with each other through institutional relationships. That is, the collectively held perspectives within specific institutions, educational and political, encouraged individuals to form allegiances with those perspectives from their own work that contradicted perspectives of others working in other institutions. Secondly, the disjunctures between the alternative perspectives of the different participants representing different institutional frames of reference were the core drivers of change and continuity across both the historical and contemporary contexts.

The details of the disjunctures in the various contexts were, however, quite different. This was because the disjunctures centred around action in the face of real or perceived social, cultural, economic and educational crises present in the substantive context of the specific model. For the
historical stories the disjunctures focussed on teacher supply and the provision of sufficient quantity of teachers. In comparison, contemporary disjunctures relate to the nature of teaching and the provision of quality teachers. However, these differences in the details of the disjunctures do not negate the commonality of the influence of disjuncture in change and continuity. Rather, the application of activity systems theory (Engeström, 1987; Engeström, Miettinen & Punamäki, 1999; Hardman, 2007) in the contemporary context can also explain the influence of disjunctures as contradictions that drove change in the historical context as well.

**Substantive proposition #3: Negotiating for change and continuity.**

The third substantive proposition in theorising a social approach to continuity is that negotiation is the core process whereby educational perspectives are given voice in the decision-making processes in relation to change and continuity in teacher education. Negotiation in relation to these disjunctures is the third point of commonality identified between the two models. In both models negotiation involves interacting socially in communicating about alternative ideological perspectives and their resultant actions or activities. It incorporates the identification and construction of discourses and participation in opportunities to give voice to support for preferred processes and practices in teacher education. In the historical context this communicative process was categorised as inter-personal negotiation described as mediating disjunctures. This was further elaborated as the practices of reform in the contemporary context. Interestingly, both systematic purposeful negotiations and random incomplete negotiations were identified in both contexts.

Similarly, perspectives on the psychological processes involved in negotiation varied between the models presented in Chapters 5 and 6. In the historical model the psychological process was identified as intra-personal negotiation described as hoping without despair. However, these psychological practices are merely implied in the contemporary contexts through sub-categories such as the reform practice of crusading for educational reform. That is, the psychological and emotive attitudes and dispositions reflectively discussed in the historical context were assumed to be present in the contemporary contexts. These variations and assumptions about the social process of negotiation point to a core area of potential development for teacher education and educators to proactively target educational outcomes in the reform of teacher education.

**Substantive proposition #4: The social context of change and continuity.**

The fourth substantive proposition in theorising a social approach to change and continuity is that the reform of teacher education is a contextualised social process. Abstracting from the specific contexts in which the models are embodied, the landscape of teacher education can be defined as a collective human activity undertaken by a specified group of participants in a chronological and sociocultural moment (Engeström, 1987). Within that context or collective human activity, the social process of change and continuity is effected by the actions negotiated and enacted by participants in response to the disjunctures held about the activity. As such, the engagement of participants in negotiations around disjunctures leading to change or reform has remained common across the two models. This supports the core conclusions that; the social process of change and continuity as identified through the historical phase of this study remains relevant in the contemporary context, and understanding that process in relation to activity theory is critical to the future of teacher education.

**Theorising a Social Approach to Change and Continuity**

The four substantive propositions that make up the key conclusions reached in the comparative analysis of the two models have brought into focus the system relations (Carspecken, 1996) at work in
change and continuity in teacher education. A key finding of this theorising is that negotiation, as the core social process identified across both the historical and contemporary contexts, is the key system relation in a social approach to change and continuity in teacher education. As the key system relation, negotiation links the social process, of the historical model described in Chapter 5, with the social context, of the contemporary model described in Chapter 6. This integration constructs an approach to change and continuity that facilitates emancipatory actions in and for the future of teacher education. Alongside negotiation as the core system relation in change and continuity, the three other substantive propositions serve to identify the three core entities that must relate to each other in the practice of negotiation. These entities are the participants, disjunctures and contexts involved is a social approach to change and continuity. Figure 7.2 A Social Approach to Change and Continuity, below, maps how these entities inter-relate to facilitate the core social process of negotiation.

Figure 7.2 A Social Approach to Change and Continuity

Furthermore, this theoretical model also demonstrates how the inter-relationships between the core entities must be responded to through action. The core social process of negotiation has been identified as the system relation that sits at the intersection of all three core entities. Negotiation involves participants in negotiating disjunctures in context. There are three supporting system relations that underpin the work of negotiation. These are the dispositions, discourses and relationships that emerge at the intersections between the three core entities. They include; maintaining a positive disposition towards the social activity of negotiation, understandings the role of discourse in negotiating, and fostering productive relationships for negotiating. These practices are critical to the development of the key findings of this thesis towards the emancipatory action needed for the future of teacher education. Each of these system relations that underpin negotiation and are central to the theoretical model being proposed here is outlined below
Systemic relation #1: Maintaining positive dispositions in negotiations.

Maintaining a positive disposition aligns with the psychological practice of hoping without despair identified in the historical model. While there is no equivalent conception articulated in the contemporary context, its importance is no less recognised. The outworking of the historical disjunctures pointed towards university-based teacher education as the solution to issues and problems. In contrast, contemporary disjunctures are focused on teacher education as the source of issues and problems. The outworking of this change in attitudes towards university-based teacher education is evident in the control of teacher preparation. In the historical stories, teacher preparation came under the jurisdiction of education departments meaning that the bureaucracy held direct organisational control, which was ultimately viewed as problematic. In contrast, the bureaucratic control of contemporary teacher preparation, which is undertaken by otherwise independent institutions of higher education, is maintained by compliance practices that have over time and contexts moved from optional to mandatory regulatory requirements. This increased interference from bureaucratic institutions points to a distrust of teacher educators by political and bureaucratic participants and potentially the death of the expert in decision-making about teacher education. Yet, in all contemporary contexts there remain processes whereby teacher educators can negotiate about and around these regulations. An important finding theorised from the system relations is that in the relationship between participants and disjunctures, developing dispositions that foster continuing negotiations despite the frustrations of externalised control, is critical to the likelihood of success for educational perspectives on the processes and practices of teacher education. This makes a significant contribution to this field of study.

Systemic Relation #2: Manipulating discourses for negotiations.

Closely aligned with maintaining positive dispositions is building understanding of and manipulating discourse in the processes of negotiation. As has already been noted, the contextual differences between the two models resulted in language variations in the articulation of the core concepts. These linguistic differences point to differences in the discourses that underpin thinking about and understanding of teacher education in the various contexts. For example, the dominant political discourse in the historical stories in the Australian context was identified as a form of colonialism underpinned by othering, progressivism, superiority without knowledge and moralistic rightness (Kohn, 2012; Said, 1979). Whilst many of these colonialist influences can still be identified in the Australian context, the overwhelming political orientation labelled across all contemporary contexts was globalised neo-liberalism. Neo-liberalism is underpinned by deregulation designed to maintain market-based approaches to political engagement in social contexts through privatisation and accountability (Torres, 2009). These differences in the discourses used in the different historical and political contexts can be identified in the analysis of the language used to frame the key ideas discussed in the various models.

The most fundamental of these transformations of language and discourse relates to the conception of change itself. Within the historical stories divergent conceptions of change were evident. While teacher educators were careful to separate change from progress in critiquing politically driven change, the idea that change is progressive was integral to the assumptions that underpinned the colonialist discourses of progress and development used by political and bureaucratic participants. In contrast, language choices across contemporary contexts by all participants consistently reflected the concept of change as reform; a term that ensures that progress or development is a goal, but with an understanding that it cannot be an assumed certainty. Interestingly, the language of reform originated in liberalist political discourses (Freeden, 2015), and has been carried through into neoliberalism in the
principles of accountability, measurability, evidence and their influence on social policy (Torres, 2009). Given this political derivation of the term, the consistent use of and linking of reform to educational outcomes by educational participants in teacher education is both significant and problematic. A second key finding from the system relations theorised in this study is that in the relationship between disjuncture and context, critically reflective understanding and the manipulation of political language and discourse is pivotal to the process of negotiating from and for educational perspectives and outcomes.

System relations #3: Building relationship for negotiations.

Lastly, the process of negotiation is dependent upon the relationships amongst the participants involved across the contexts relevant to teacher education. As already identified, the same diversity of participants with similar roles and positions were present across both models. While the broad distribution of knowledge and power was consistent, the means and effectiveness of that distribution varied amongst the various contemporary contexts included in the study. While differences in knowledge are expressed through discourse, differences in the outworking of power are evident in control. In the historical contexts the education department directly controlled teacher preparation through institutional ownership. In contrast, regulatory processes indirectly control contemporary university-based teacher education, though directly controlled alternative pathways are growing internationally. Despite the significant differences in the nature of control, the relationships amongst the participants were incredibly similar, particularly in relation to issues of trust and mutuality. A third key finding theorised from the system relations identified in this study is that positive relationships, when present, will result in support for an educational voice in decision-making. As such, the fostering of positive relationships is pivotal to maintaining communication pathways for the purpose of negotiating around the disjunctures in the field of teacher education.

RESPONDING TO THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The comparative analysis of the two contextualised substantive theories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) found in Chapters 5 and 6 has led to the articulation of the aforementioned key findings of this study. These findings have included the articulation of the substantive propositions used in the formation of a comparative theory, as shown in Figure 7.2, that outlines the system relations (Carspecken, 1996) at work in change and continuity in teacher education. The identification of system relations through this comparative process led to the foregrounding of negotiation as the core social process in change and continuity in teacher education. It also led to the description of three supportive practices; namely, maintaining positive dispositions, effectively using of discourses and building productive relationships. From these key findings it is theorised that the outworking of change and continuity in the political processes of reform towards preferred educational futures is dependent upon the capacity of teacher educators to both understand and effectively adopt a social approach to change and continuity through the purposeful employment of the system relations that underpin the social process of negotiation. To conclude the analysis of the implications of the theoretical model, Figure 7.2, the final step takes in a critical reflection of the implications of the social approach to change and continuity on each of the four conceptual components of the research question. These reflections are presented forthwith.

CONCEPTUAL COMPONENT #1: CHANGE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Fundamental to the theorising of change and continuity in teacher education was the identification of change is an inevitable continuity; the consequences of which must be reflexively considered in terms
of the social process of negotiation. In reflecting upon the role of change and continuity in the process and practices of teacher education, three significant concepts can be identified as critical to understanding the implications of a social approach to change, continuity and outcomes. These are the presence of different types of change, the philosophical implications of change, and the theoretical alignment of change to both invented traditions (Hobsbawm, 1993; Giddens, 1999) and activity system theory (Engeström, 1987).

Two types of change were present across all stories and contexts used in this study. These were pragmatic changes and paradigmatic changes. Pragmatic changes were changes made to the degree, either quantity or quality, of a particular practice in teacher education; for example, changes to the length of teacher preparation. As such, pragmatic changes are reminiscent of the incremental steps described by Kuhn (1970, p.10) as ‘normal science’ and are often of minimal consequence to the pursuit of educational outcomes in teacher education. In contrast, paradigmatic changes impacted the fundamental principles underpinning teacher education. Between the historical and contemporary contexts, shifts that were made between the training and the education metaphor (Karras & Wolhuter, 2010) were representative of paradigmatic change. These included changing from non-higher education models of teacher preparation to exclusively higher education models and then back to alternative pathways. These cannot, however, be equated to Kuhn’s (1970) paradigmatic changes described as scientific revolutions. Paradigm is used in education in a more colloquial form rather than in adherence to Kuhn’s (1970/1962) narrow definition of the term. As described in Chapter 2, the term paradigm in educational contexts is better aligned with social science’s term ‘theory versions’ (Chen, 2000, p.451), which describes the simultaneous presence of competing theories seeking to dominate a field (Dogan, 2001).

Alongside continuous change at either a paradigmatic or pragmatic level, philosophical conceptions of change have also undergone reconceptualisation. Across all contexts change was a philosophically loaded term whose interpretation shifted paradigmatically across time and context. Understandings of the discourse of change shifted from a scientific conception focussing on progress (Lange, 2011; Niiniluoto, 2011), to the political conception of reform (Freeden, 2015; Torres, 2009). While the earlier progressivist political discourse of change had undertones that implied both evolutionary and revolutionary possibilities, neither of these terms satisfactorily explains the social process of change and continuity as described by the contemporary discourse of reform. Despite the enthusiastic implications of language choices such as ‘crusading’, the practices of negotiation pivotal to a social approach to change lack the communicative violence needed to describe it as a revolutionary uprising or overthrowing of the status quo (Richards, 2004). Yet, the potentially incremental steps that make up reform cannot be described as evolutionary on account of the acknowledgement that improvement is not a given (Green & Troup, 1999). The current literature is not instructive at this point.

However, it is argued here that this acknowledgement of the potential for both positive and negative outcomes in the discourse of reform acts as a roadblock to change. The framing of change by the discourse of reform emphasises accountability and measurability (Torres, 2009), which promotes the use of evidence in negotiating for change. For a change to be effected it can no longer just be a good idea or grounded in the expertise or experience of teacher educators. Neither can politically driven changes be denied on the basis of their relationship to political ideology. Rather, evidence of the likelihood of success is also required. This is problematic given the complexity of teaching and teacher education that, based on the evidence presented in this thesis, seems to encourage political and bureaucratic participants to turn to oversimplified or inappropriately applied forms of evidence. It also
has the potential to create a tautological inertia where a lack of supportive evidence precludes the introduction of a change that then prevents the collection of the required evidence.

Across the historical and contemporary models, change and continuity was clearly aligned to invented tradition (Hobsbawm, 1993; Giddens, 1999), and activity theory (Engeström, 1987). Invented tradition explains continuities in relation to contextual conflicts (Flanagan, 2012). It posits that action is predicated on an established pattern that is maintained by guardians rather than experts (Giddens, 1999). In contrast, activity theory focuses on change as a driver of human actions towards desired outcomes, and innovation or the breaking of conventions as a precursor to change (Engeström, 1987; Hardman, 2007). Despite the contradictions, these two theoretical ideas can be integrated in understanding the social approach to change and continuity. This is a significant finding that will be instructive for the future of teacher education in Australia.

For change to the invented traditions of teacher education to occur, purposeful collective participation in negotiation, where teacher educators make a commitment towards and then crusade for a break to that tradition, is a necessity. A change always emerges first as an ‘exception from the rule’ or incumbent tradition, and having ‘emerged as an individual exception’ might become ‘in time a new universal norm’ or tradition (Ilyenkov, 1982, pp.83-84 as cited in Engeström, 1987, p.105). This thesis has demonstrated that understanding change as a social process with social consequences facilitates the application of the discursive practices of activity theory to simultaneously understanding, challenging, constructing and evaluating the invented traditions that drive a social activity. Here in lies the challenge of participation in change and continuity. Informed decisions predicate a need for teacher educators to engage with the interplay between ideology and control and crusade for the outworking of educational ideology in practice. But, before that is effective, there needs to be evidence that it will be worth the effort and will likely produce the required outcomes. This is the challenge that lies ahead for teacher educators in Australia.

**CONCEPTUAL COMPONENT #2: KNOWLEDGE AND POWER IN THE SOCIAL APPROACH TO CHANGE AND CONTINUITY**

A critical understanding of the roles and outworking of knowledge and power can be synthesised out of the system relations mapped in this study’s theory of a social approach to change and continuity, see Figure 7.2. These include the core social process of negotiation and the supportive system relations; dispositions, discourses and relationships. Critically reflecting upon the implications of critical theory to the articulation of a social approach to change and continuity has integrated the work of four theorists; namely, Foucault (1972; see also Gutting, 2014; Mills, 2003), Marx (1971; see also Wolff, 2011), Bourdieu (1977, 2010; see also Webb, Schirato & Danaher, 2002), and Gramsci (1991; see also Jones, 2006).

The engagement of participants in negotiations around disjunctures demonstrates that language or discourse sets the foundations for change and continuity in the context of teacher education (Foucault, 1972; Mills, 2003). As this thesis has shown, the dissonances present in the discourses established an oppositional relational structure between participants that differentiates control or ownership from the production or work of teacher education (Engeström, 1987; Marx, 1971). The ensuing struggle is not overt or physical but ideological (Bourdieu, 1977; Gramsci, 1992). It pits the symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1977, 2010), of educational knowledge and expertise about teacher education against economically mediated political ideologies that encourage regulatory control. The stories told about teacher education by teacher educators, both historically and contemporaneously, describe the use of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2010; Gramsci, 1992) against educational experience and expertise by
politically controlled regulatory processes and practices. Thereby, the stories identify the domination of hegemonic political voices in the processes and practices of teacher education and its reform (Gramsci, 1992; Jones 2006). This then highlights the significance of fostering counter-hegemonic voices that need to stand against the incentives of consensual coercion, making transparent the underlying pleonectic principles of political ideology (Burawoy, 2012).

Yet, the truth claims made on each side of the disjunctures in teacher education seek to both establish rightness and enforce control over its processes and practices. This is evident in the data presented and analysed here and reflects Foucault’s (1980) conceptualisation of power/knowledge that conceived of knowledge and power as a unified force (Foucault, 1980; see also Gutting, 2014; Mills, 2003). That is, ‘it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 52; also cited by Mills, 2003, p.69). Here in lies the challenge of change and continuity or reform in teacher education. The power/knowledge relationship is unstable because of the dispersal of control across contexts and participants, yet acts of resistance designed to challenge that control can also reinforce its maintenance (Mills, 2003). This struggle moves away from Marx’s revolutionary ideals in that it is ideological and not physical (Gramsci, 1992; Marx & Engels, 1993). That is, ownership of control is useful only so much as it is capable of coercing productivity because control and production represent two perspectives, described as the ‘twofold truth of labour’ (Bourdieu, 2000; as cited by Burawoy, 2012, p.187). These notions articulate the role played by the coerced in their own coercion (Burawoy, 2012; Jones, 2006).

Despite appearances, Gramsci’s (1991) socially constructed hegemony and Bourdieu’s (1977) individualised habitus are not contradictory but complementary. In stable contexts, both Gramsci (1991) and Bourdieu (1977) are useful for understanding consensual coercion. In effect, stability obscures the domination of either managerial or regulatory control and this obstruction of insight further reinforces the stability of the invented tradition (Hobsbawm, 1993; Giddens, 1999). For much of the history of teacher education in the Australian context this form of obstructive stability has served to blind teacher educators to the risks of politically driven participation in regulatory management and control. However, in unstable contexts both Gramsci’s (1991) hegemony and Bourdieu’s (1977, 2010) habitus fail to be completely useful.

As symbolic domination increases in response to instability the coercive nature of mismatches between control and production becomes more obvious or less subtle. As the reality or ‘second truth’ (Burawoy, 2012) of symbolic domination becomes increasingly transparent, individuals also lose the capacity to ignore its consequences, both personally and socially, and are driven to take action (Stahl, 2013). This reflects the role played by disjunctures as disruptive or destabilising devices within the context of teacher education. Disjunctures operate as mismatches between either habitus and hegemony or habitus and field (Bourdieu, 2010; Gramsci, 1992; Stahl, 2013), thereby fostering the instability required to increase transparency and prompt social action towards change. Ironically, the continued destabilising of teacher education by political discourses that has been evidenced in this thesis and designed to justify increasing regulation is also contributing to growing social action by teacher educators designed to promote and influence the demise of the political hegemony (Gramsci, 1992). Herein lies the opportunity of fragility.

Instability encourages hegemonic (Gramsci, 1992) demise by making the habitus (Bourdieu, 2010) conscious of the fragility of control. Instability generates the required context to break down the unconscious nature of the habitus (Bourdieu, 1977, 2010), that is transformatively ‘jolted into consciousness’ (Reay, 2004, p.436). The destabilisation that has been evident in the history of teacher
education in Australia brings into focus the interplay of alternative perspectives that leads to the tipping point in the balance between either ignoring or engaging symbolic violence. This leads to the application of Gramsci’s (1991) ‘good sense’ (Burawoy, 2012; Jones, 2006); a conscious action of recognising and responding to the misrepresentation of that violence as beneficial. In other words, fragility provides the opportunity to bring into focus the fulcrum point that tips the balance between consent and dissent, between continuity and change. This occurs firstly, towards consciousness in the habitus (Bourdieu, 2010) of the exploitative nature of the hegemonic (Gramsci, 1992), and secondly towards negotiation as the social action for change in teacher preparation.

As this thesis comes to a close, it is argued, based on the evidence that the fragility of instability in the field of teacher education is only maximised when teacher educators who are psychologically capable of maintaining hope without despair participate in the communicative activity of mediating disjunctures in order to negotiate for changes and continuities that align with their preferred educational futures for teacher education. Furthermore, there needs to be a volume in that negotiation, it is not sufficient to depend on the voices of a select few. The tipping point towards consciousness of the exploitative nature of regulatory control needs to take in a much broader range and greater number of participants across the field of teacher education. However, it has become clear that counter-hegemonic voices are only effective in a context that has tipped over into instability. For teacher education, this need for instability is the key issue behind the lack of impetus for educational perspective in its reform. In the current context there is too much stability that is reinforced by; the hegemonic (Gramsci,1992) regulatory work that keeps many educators occupied without critical reflective thinking, and it is argued here that this leads to the minimisation of the voice of teacher educators amongst the plethora of stakeholders. As a consequence, and based on the evidence presented in this thesis, the counter-hegemonic voice of teacher educators lacks a critical mass that is both conscious of and ready to speak against the symbolic violence being employed through the regulation of teacher preparation. While political stirring has the potential to construct instability, it is not there yet. Currently, in the context of teacher education in Australia, contemporary instability is working for political rather than educational discourses and ideologies. As such, there is a need to destabilise the political frame of reference before moving towards negotiation.

**CONCEPTUAL COMPONENT #3: EMERGING PARADIGMS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION**

The third conceptual component generated from the research question highlights the need to create instability in promoting an educational reform agenda, bringing into focus the paradigmatic issues at the core of change and continuity in teacher education. That is, working towards the destabilisation of political ideology needs an understanding and appreciation of the construction and influence of paradigms on the processes and practices of teacher education. Throughout this study, the term paradigm has been used to discuss and describe a socially constructed framework or model used, both consciously and subconsciously, as a set of conditions of and beliefs about a particular phenomenon that determines how that phenomenon is thought about, engaged with and acted upon. In Chapter 2, three paradigmatic models for teacher preparation were identified. These were: the apprenticeship model exemplified by the metaphors of the teacher as craftsman and teaching as a craft; the training model where the teacher is viewed as a technician and teaching as a science; and the education model that views the teacher as scholar and teaching as a profession. Across the contexts used in the construction of both of the substantive theoretical models, described in Chapters 5 and 6, all three of these paradigms for teacher preparation were evident.
The continuing presence of all three models for teacher preparation reinforces the conception of social paradigms as theory versions (Chen, 2000) or alternative points of view that compete to dominate the field (Dogan, 2001). This underlines the significance of the shifting support for and application thereof across time by the various participants in teacher education. While there is logically a strong affiliation with and commitment to the educational paradigm in the discourses of teacher educators across both historical and contemporary contexts, the same is not true of other participants across the field. Rather, the study has demonstrated that the perspectives of others involved in teacher education held to a range of perspectives that align with various components of all three paradigms that were then used to support the continuity of a range of invented traditions (Hobsbawm, 1993) and the reform of teacher education by the re-imagining of models and their practices from the past.

Regulatory requirements across contemporary contexts have served to maintain practices from across the three paradigms. However, the evidence collected indicated that one paradigm, the educational paradigm has never held control or successfully shaped the processes and practices of teacher preparation in the history of teacher education in Australia. In effect, the potentialities of the educational paradigm that advocate for a scholarly profession have not been fully realised or attained, due to the dominant influence of more reductionist paradigms which have constrained the processes and practices of teacher education. Across all contexts the negotiations surrounding regulatory requirements highlight the role played by all three models in teacher education, both in the support for alternative pathways to teaching and the setting of requirements reminiscent of the apprenticeship and training models within the context of teacher education.

There is evidence in the literature of a long-term commitment to the educational paradigm for teacher education. The discourses used across both the historical and contemporary data collected in this study point to a commitment to the educational model for teacher education. Firstly, the education model was described as a paradigmatic improvement on the other models. Politically, despite the presence of alternative pathways, the discourse of progress and development is used in relation to the education model of teacher preparation across both historical and contemporary contexts. This is then supported educationally by the discourse of crusading for reform that underpins the promotion of higher education as the focal point of educational ideals for teacher education. Secondly, the identification of the professionalisation of teachers and teaching as the collective mandate or object of the processes, practices and reform of teacher preparation links directly to the education paradigm. That is, the education model and its metaphorical conceptions of the teacher as scholar and teaching as a profession are directly associated with the identified collective mandate for teacher education. This is then further supported by the direct relational connection between the professional role of the teacher and the purposes and practices of higher education. Thirdly, both the political and educational discourses of reform focus on making modifications to rather than overthrowing current systems and structures. While participants from across the field of teacher education describe problems, issues and weaknesses with the educational paradigm, there is still a commitment to its fundamental value to attaining the collective mandate of the professionalisation of teachers as foundational to improving educational outcomes for all students.

Despite an ideological commitment of teacher educators in Australia to the educational paradigm, the evidence presented here demonstrates that it is still emerging. It remains under development or in transformation in relation to its ‘appearance, condition, nature or character’ (Delbridge et al., p.1993) and in the outworking of the reform agenda in teacher education. For Engeström (1999) transformation is a ‘process of expansive learning’ that involves the ‘construction and resolution of successively evolving tensions or contradictions in a complex system’ (p. 384). It is, ‘a collective
journey through the zone of proximal development of the activity’ (Daniels & Edwards, 2007, p.4), where the zone of proximal development is the difference between what can be attained ‘in isolation’ and what is possible with ‘expert guidance’ (Fernyhough, 2008, p.229).

In other words, the key critical reflection of this study is that the emerging paradigm for teacher education is not a new one. In the context of teacher education, expansive learning describes the difference between acting within the invented traditions of contemporary contexts and considering what is possible through the negotiation of reform by and for educational perspectives. It requires a, ‘reflective awareness of the interaction between individual sense-making and publically attested meanings’ (Edwards, 2010, p.75), in crusading for an educational reform agenda in teacher education. Contemporary teacher preparation is still grappling with the emergence of the educational paradigm that was first mooted in the Australian context in 1853 (Sweetman, 1939) and then thrust into the limelight in 1972 with the moving of all teacher preparation into independent tertiary institutions (Dyson, 2005; Roche, 2003). This evolution will continue to present challenges for the future, but also possibilities.

As the data across the study contexts exemplifies, there is an emerging frame for the educational paradigm of teacher preparation as education. This emerging frame is a potentially ‘expansive cycle of organizational transformation’ (Engeström, 1999, p.385), in the processes and practices of teacher education designed to introduce a ‘radically wider horizon of possibilities than in the previous mode of the activity’ (Daniels & Edwards, 2007, p.4). This emerging frame could be described as integrative teacher education. To integrate is to ‘bring together parts into a whole’ or to ‘amalgamate with the rest of the community’ (Delbridge et al., 2001, p.983). Integrative teacher education is concerned with bringing together or amalgamating the participants in and contexts of teacher education into a holistic learning community in order to maximise the potential of that teacher education. It is grounded in two key ideas; firstly that teacher education should be integrated across the lifespan of the teacher, and secondly that there should be an alignment of expertise with the needs of teachers across that lifespan.

The re-imagining of the scope of teacher education, as analysed from the data collected through the third phase of this study, represents an expansive transformation of the conception of the educational paradigm that also requires a reconceptualisation of the professional pathway for teachers. While the expansive discourse of teacher education for the professional lifespan is already present in the conception of the work of education faculties in Australian institutions (ATEA, 2012, 2014), it is argued here that it is not yet realised in either the regulation of or practices in teacher education.

**Conceptual Component #4: The Future of Teacher Education**

The final reflection identifies the significance of the emerging frame of integrative teacher education and the need to understand the relationship between contemporary system relations and future activity in teacher education. If this frame for thinking and acting is to be further developed it needs to be interrogated thoroughly with the purpose of constructing action in and for the future of teacher education. However, for this work to be effective it needs to be based in an understanding of the future and its relationship to both the present and the past. Futures studies, which acknowledge the presence of many alternative futures, are focussed on considering probable, plausible and preferred scenarios (Dator, 2010; Voros, 2001). As such, considerations of the future should not be focussed on predicting the future as that is a vain impossibility in light of the volatile nature of perceptions of and actions towards its construction (Dator, 2010, see rule I). Rather, it should work on forecasting, by identifying and examining the ‘major alternative futures’ (Dator, 2010, see Rule IA), and visioning, by
‘formulating, implementing and re-envisioning’ preferred futures (Dator, 2010, see Rule IB; Sardar, 2010). The evidence produced in this study enables such possibilities.

For this work of forecasting and visioning the future to be effective it must also be grounded in both the past and present, as the framework of this study reflects. As Sardar (2010) states, ‘the past and the present combine together to create a future’ (p.184). Since the future of teacher education does not exist and cannot be definitively known (Dator, 2010; Slaughter 2012/1996), the true value of forecasting the future for teacher preparation lies in the capacity of the data presented here to impact perceptions and actions in the present moment (Sardar, 2010). From this perspective, the significance of the two core phases of this study become apparent. The tracing of the system relations at work in teacher education from the past into the present creates a foundation to consider how this might be re-imagined into the future. As such, using the conclusions reached about the system relations at work in teacher education to shape attitudes, ideas and actions in the present will have consequences for the future that eventuates (Sardar, 2010; Voros, 2001).

Therefore, working towards preferred futures for teacher education necessitates the forward planning of a guiding vision designed to influence decision-making in the moment (Dator, 2010, see Rule IC). This thesis has attempted to initiate such a process. In doing so, it has become evident that the issues present in the field of teacher education must be tackled as ‘complex, interconnected, contradictory’ or ‘wicked problems’ (Sardar, 2010, p.183). The challenge being to deal with the open-ended complexity of disjunctures in the field of teacher education as a ‘continuously ongoing’ process (Dator, 2010, see Rule IC), and sceptically embrace the multiplicity of truths present amongst the diversity of participants across the field (Sardar, 2010). When considered in the light of activity system theory, the foregrounding of contradiction as a continuous experience within teacher education to date, is shown to align with Engeström’s (1999) explanation of expansive learning as the ‘construction and resolution of successively evolving tensions or contradictions in a complex system that include the object or objects, the mediating artefacts, and the perspective of the participants’ (p.384).

The complexity of alternative truth claims made about the processes and practices of quality teacher education that are threaded throughout the thesis, also brings into focus the need to make judgements about the usefulness of alternative futures in relation to the goals of teacher education. Futures studies claim that useful ideas about the future at first appear to be ‘novel and challenging’ or ‘ridiculous’ (Dator, 2010, see Rule IIA). This concept closely aligns with Ilyenkov’s (1982) argument that ‘a qualitatively better form of an activity always begins as an exception from the rule’ (cited by Wardekker, 2010, p.247), a conception that underpins activity system theory (Engeström, 1987, 1999). Taken together, any useful change to the activity system of teacher education may at first be touted as a ridiculous exception to the conventions of the invented traditions that act as contemporary continuities. Herein lies both the dilemma and importance of understanding the system relations at work and their impact on change and continuity of teacher education. There is a need to be able to look beyond and past the ridicule and the seeming impossibility to embrace the potential. In doing so, hope in the field of teacher education becomes a possibility.

These considerations of the nature of futures studies and their relationship to activity system theory can also be used to consider the usefulness, believability and applicability of the concluding theoretical model in this study, A Social Approach to Change and Continuity (Figure 7.2). The three entities, (participants, contexts and disjunctures), and the three processes, (dispositions, relationships and discourses), that make up the system relations in a social approach to change and continuity can be understood in relation to the processes of both futures studies and activity theory. All three
theoretical constructs consider how the alternative perspectives of a range of individuals in the context of an activity interact to construct and then mediate complex, contradictory problems. As such, conceptions of the processes of futures studies and activity theory can usefully expound the practical outworking of the social nature of change and continuity for teacher education.

**FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

As with all studies of this nature, the reaching of conclusions is by no means the end of the process. In reality, more questions have emerged across the development of this thesis than were conceived of in its beginning. As is clearly outlined in the underlying principles of futures studies, all change in social contexts is a continuous or ongoing activity that must respond to the emerging consequences of present actions. While this study has taken a snapshot of the processes of teacher education that makes a contribution to understandings about the practices of reform, its findings are neither static nor definitive. Rather, they represent an opportunity to critically reflect upon present perspectives about possible futures and requisite actions in the immediate future for the outworking of preferred futures. Of the questions that have emerged, the most pressing or significant of these can be grouped into three broad areas for further consideration. These areas include the implications of the findings for teacher education, application of the outcomes from the study beyond its scope, and questions that arose out of the data and its analysis. Alongside these questions and issues, a number of limitations have emerged from the decisions made across the progress of the study. Together, these issues and limitations represent opportunities for further research in the arenas of teacher education, education and educational research.

**ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION**

The implications of this study to the continuing processes and practices of teacher education have been well covered by the understandings of the system relations at work outlined in the preceding sections. The significant findings have included the appreciation of the application of a social approach to change and continuity to the field of teacher education, the identification of the emerging frame of integrative teacher education, and the consideration of radical proposals that might serve as useful exceptions to the conventions of contemporary regulatory control. There are, however, two major issues that have emerged alongside these conclusions as critically significant to the future of teacher education. These involve; i) the capacity for all participants to critically reflect upon the role of ideological assumptions on their perspectives about and actions in teacher education, and ii) the capacity for those participants to move beyond the combative and oppositional relationships that are promoted by the current regulatory practices.

The models of change and continuity constructed out of both the historical and contemporary contexts clearly demonstrated the significance of ideology to the processes and practices of teacher education. The presence of alternative political and educational perspectives on appropriate action in teacher education was one of the core continuities identified across the two models, which was then articulated as disjunctures in the social approach to change and continuity (see Figure 7.1). In identifying disjunctures as one of three core entities in teacher education, the role of ideology was problematised. Critical reflection on the nature of the problem shows that the issue is not in the presence of disjunctures or the negotiations they necessitate; the need to explain, elaborate and justify actions is not in itself a negative. Rather, the problem related to the predominance of ideological assumptions that underpinned the invented traditions supported by both political and educational participants. The problem lies in the reliance upon uncritical and unsubstantiated
perspectives in the processes and practices of teacher education. As such, the role of ideology inside the academy and the practices of teacher educators needs to be seriously challenged.

Across the data gathered and analysed for both the historical and contemporary phases of this study, the lack of reference to empirical evidence for the actions taken in the change and continuity of teacher education was astounding. The breadth of unsubstantiated ideas, issues and perspectives about both teacher preparation and teacher education covers almost the entire field. While there were numerous indications that there is research evidence about the processes and practices of both teacher education and higher education that could be usefully employed in the consideration of activity in teacher education, this evidence has not yet reached the discourses that drive reform. Even perspectives held in common by participants from across arenas are not immune to the influence of unsubstantiated invented tradition. For example, the discourse of the professionalisation of teachers and teaching as an educationally and politically supported mandate for teacher education lacks reference to empirical data that demonstrates its validity to the promotion of the educational outcomes. As such, almost the entire activity of teacher education could be critiqued as an invented tradition guarded by the bureaucrats that administer its regulatory control without due reference to valid and reliable evidence.

Contemporary teacher educators often point to the demise of the apprenticeship model as a progressive step in the history of teacher preparation, yet the evidence from the time is not supportive of this assumption. The historical data indicates that this was a politically driven decision ideologically connected to the discourse of the unions which described the practice as tantamount to ‘slave labour’. Interestingly, teacher educators at the time expressed concerns about the negative impact of the removal of an apprenticeship experience prior to training on the learning capacity of students in training. Ultimately, this led to educational arguments about the need to lengthen the training course to make up for the lack of apprenticeship experience that appears to be the source of the invented tradition of longer courses being better than shorter ones. Evidence that either confirms or denies the superiority of the education model in comparison to the apprenticeship model has not been used in the discourses that support the education model and it is likely that it does not exist.

All of which points to the criticality of the imperative of promoting research and evidence in the consideration and construction of the discourses of reform in teacher education. In doing so, it is important to acknowledge the implications of ideological commitments and to take a critical stance to both educationally and politically driven ideological assumptions. It is not sufficient to assume that educationally derived assumptions will lead to educational outcomes, neither is it appropriate to critique one ideological position with an alternative ideological position. For teacher educators this means that the assumptions that underpin their personal and institutional perspectives and actions need to be actively articulated, interrogated and critiqued.

When this critical stance is applied to the evidence that has been collected across the phases of this study, the imperative of productive partnerships across the field of teacher education is further highlighted. The evidence that was comparatively analysed in the construction of the social approach to change and continuity in teacher education identified three core practices that are pivotal to success in negotiations. Each of these practices is critical to the establishment of productive collaboration amongst participants in teacher education for the benefit of each other’s needs, illuminating the critical and immediate need to address and break down the combative and oppositional relationships that sit under the surface of the current regulatory climate. Amongst all of the potential actions that could be taken in the reform of teacher education, the social nature of that reform points to the critical
nature of cooperative collaboration amongst participants for the purpose of attaining mutually supportive goals and ideals. It could be argued that the survival of teacher education within higher education institutions is dependent upon its capacity to become an integral feature of the broader educational context. As such, the identification and development of a relational approach to the practices of dispositions, discourses and relationships should be the first priority of any interrogation of preferred futures for teacher education. In this way the value of teacher education to the broader educational context be assured.

**Contributions of the Study to the Field**

The outcomes of this study have significant on a number of levels, both theoretically and methodologically.

**Theoretical contribution to knowledge.**

Firstly, the theoretical model of the social approach to change and continuity may productively enlighten or explain social change processes and practices in other fields of social activity. As identified earlier, this model represents a substantive theory (Glaser, 2007; Glaser & Strass, 1967) of the social process of change and continuity within the context of teacher education. Interestingly, there is any number of other fields of social action that reflect very similar approaches to the dissemination of knowledge and power across various political and other social arenas where similar disjunctive perspectives appear to drive change and continuity. Even within the broader field of education similarities can be drawn between change and continuity in teacher education and change and continuity in schools, curriculum, pedagogies and assessment to name a few areas. Yet, the application of the social approach to change and continuity to other areas and fields cannot be assumed. Rather, this represents a significant opportunity for further research and investigation. Before any formalising or generalising of a theory of the social approach to change and continuity could be proposed, further substantive investigations of the social processes of change and continuity would need to be undertaken across a range of alternative contexts.

**Methodological contribution to knowledge.**

A second area that is open to further investigation relates to the possibilities of critical grounded theory. As explained in Chapter 3, the integration of critical theory with grounded theory as an approach to the construction of a research methodology has not been well explored in the literature. Consequently, the articulation of the philosophical and theoretical principles of a critical grounded theory and its practical application to the research methods used in the current study represented an important step in considering and articulating the possibility of a critical grounded theory. Having completed the study using and developing this methodological paradigm, its potential application to other research questions and projects needs to considered and the core principles articulated. As with its initial development, this needs to cover the methodological, theoretical and philosophical aspects of critical ground theory as a paradigm for inquiry.

The methodological processes used across the various phases of the study took on sequences and actions that integrated practices from Carspecken (1996), Charmaz (2006) and Clarke (2005) with the general principles of grounded theory methodology as described by Glaser and Strauss (1967). This integration of methodological principles and practices has been productive in the current study and could serve to provide methodological advice for the use and development of critical grounded theory in further studies. However, they should not be taken as a blueprint for critical grounded theory. As a first attempt at critical grounded theory, the methodological design of this study was tentative and
emergent and needs further interrogation. More significantly though, the identification of what makes the methodological design both critical and grounded denies the possibility of a standardised approach to critical grounded theory.

The methodological approach adopted for this study has identified two key factors necessary for ensuring that the design is both grounded and critical. These are the integration of foundational principles from Glaser and Strauss (1967) and the application of Carspecken’s (1996) five stages of critical ethnography. Carspecken (1996) described his research process as critical qualitative research that can usefully service a critical approach to any form of qualitative inquiry. This argument was used to justify its application to critical grounded theory and its outworking has served to support this connection.

The theoretical aspects of grounding critical theory was also facilitated by Carspecken’s (1996) methodological sequence, which provided direction for the role and placement of the integration of critical theory. As was argued in Chapter 3, the challenge of taking a critical approach to grounded theory was avoiding the potential for a pre-determined critical stance to lead to grand theorising rather than grounded theory. While it was acknowledged that avoiding epistemological grand theorising was impossible, the need to use processes that maintained an open and flexible approach to the usefulness of critical theory to understand and explain system relations was also identified. Using Carspecken’s (1996) methodological sequence has worked to facilitate an open approach to the integration of critical theory that holds the tension between employing critical theory and maintaining groundedness. This was achieved through a two-part approach to the application of critical theory to the process of critical grounded theory that acted as book-end to the methodological process.

Philosophically, the key to undertaking a critical grounded theory was identified as ensuring that the principles that underpin practices are both critical and grounded. In relation to research methodology, this frame of reference largely relates to epistemological perspectives, though it does take in ontological, axiological and aesthetic concerns. Across the progression of the study, the importance of the four conceptions of epistemological action as expressed in Chapter 3 became increasingly evident; these being normative, fallible, intersubjective and reflexive action. Together, these philosophical commitments worked to align research activity with both the critical and grounded concerns of critical grounded theory.

Over the course of this study, there have been four features of the research processes and practices that have been identified as pivotal to the application of critical grounded theory. These were: methodological flexibility based on the foundational principle of Glaser and Strauss (1967); a broad principled research sequence based on Carspecken’s (1996) critical approach to qualitative inquiry; a two-phase theoretical integration with critical theory; and the application of an internal, emic voice in the conduct of the research. As such, these have been identified as core principles for critical grounded theory as evident in this initial employment of it as a research methodology. However, this requires further analysis and evidence through the application of these principles, practices and process to other research projects across a range of social contexts and questions. As an initial foray into critical grounded theory this study has shown that it is a potentially useful research tool for primary participants seeking to interrogate issues from within the frame of the need for social action.

**ISSUES FOR INVESTIGATION BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THIS STUDY**

Finally, a number of ideas, questions and issues that arose out of the data that were of interest but remained outside of the scope of the current study. While there was a plethora of minor ideas, four
significant issues were consistently present. These were the; labelling of political orientations in contemporary contexts, scope of the discipline of education, articulation of an effective professional pathway for teachers, and absence of the student voice as a second primary participant in the context of the study.

The political arena and political orientations to teacher education were shown to be significant in both the historical and contemporary contexts. But, the labels used to describe these orientations differed significantly. While the political orientation in the historical Australian context was recognised as colonial, across all contemporary contexts teacher educators used the labels neo-liberalism and globalisation to describe the influential political orientations. Within the contemporary Australian context these same terms are used by teacher educators when discussing and describing the assumed political orientations at work in the Australian context (see for example ATEA, 2012, 2014). However, there is a lack of correlational continuity between the historical Australian context and its colonialisb orientation and the contemporary international contexts from which neo-liberalism has emerged (Torres, 2009). The labelling of political orientations in the contemporary Australian context has been called into question by the data that has been gathered across this study. Given the evidence of the role of invented tradition in maintaining continuities and the clear evidence for colonialism in the history of the field, the assumption that contemporary political activity in teacher education is reflective of a neo-liberal orientation needs to be questioned. However, drawing any conclusions about this is well beyond the scope of the research question and is identified as an issue for further investigation.

Similarly, the scope of and approach to the discipline of education in the contemporary Australian context has been called into question by the current study. Across the study contexts there were some differences evident in understandings about the scope of the discipline of education. In the United Kingdom in the 1960s the four pillars of the discipline of education were established as psychology, philosophy, sociology and history, and this conception of the discipline was prevalent across all English-speaking contexts (Furlong, 2012; Peters, 1977). During the course of the study the validity of these four pillars as the most appropriate branches in the discipline was called into question, particularly by the interview participants who identified three significant issues. Firstly, the inclusion of history as one of four pillars was a later political entry to the discipline that replaced economics, which had been the fourth pillar recommended by academics at the time. Secondly, alternative interpretations from within European contexts included didactics or pedagogy as a core pillar in the discipline of education. Thirdly, contemporary standards for teachers have eroded the influence of the established pillars of the discipline on the learning of teachers. Again, this questioning of the scope of the discipline of education is an interesting issue that is peripheral to the core research question, yet is an area of interest that has potential for further investigation.

Another practically oriented issue that emerged from the data gathered for this study that has proved to be beyond the scope of the research question relates to the outlining of a five-stage professional pathway for teachers. A five-stage professional pathway for teachers that involves teachers, schools, teacher education providers, unions and regulators and is linked to personal, professional and economic consequences for individuals and institutions was constructed out of the interview data collected across contemporary contexts. While the extension of the professional pathway for teachers beyond its current two-stage construction in the Australian context could be a further consideration for the future of teacher education, the broad based engagement of this idea across the field of education as proposed by this model goes far beyond the scope of this study. It is, however, a model
that is worthy of serious further consideration in light of agreement about the importance of the teacher to the outworking of educational outcomes for all students.

The final issue for further investigation relates to the methodological decision made to focus exclusively on the voice of teacher educators as one of the two primary participants in the field of teacher education. In doing so, the voice of propaedeutic teachers were excluded from this study. This decision was made in relation to practicality and scope. Practically speaking, the voices of propaedeutic teachers have been noticeably absent in historical discourses and as such finding or collecting data would have proved difficult given the passing of time. Given the need to limit the scope of the study to provide focus to the primary voice of teacher educators, the voice of propaedeutic teachers was excluded. While this decision has been productive in providing focus for the study, the possibility of the propaedeutic teacher voice to make a contribution to critical understandings of preferred futures for teacher education must be acknowledged as a potentially productive future investigation.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Closely aligned with these issues for further investigation, the research practices that have driven decision making have placed limitations on the scope of the study and these also need to be considered. While these decisions have been important to delimiting the scope of the study in order to provide focus, they have resulted in areas where the findings of the study must be qualified by reference to these limitations. Of the decisions that were made across the study there are three aspects that have had particularly significant implications on its findings. These are: i), the decisions made about the data collection processes; ii), data analysis processes; and iii), processes for concluding the study.

Firstly, data collection for this study followed the principles of purposive sampling focussing on teacher educators as one of the primary participants in the field and on text-based and dialogical data. The delimiting of the participants was designed to ground the data in the context of the field and the dialogical nature of the data collected was designed to facilitate critical analysis processes. While these decisions supported both the research question and the selected methodology, they were by their nature a limiting factor in the extent and applicability of the study. As a consequence the conclusions reached about a social approach to change and continuity only reflects the perspective of one type of participant from one of the arenas in the field of teacher education. It is likely that different understandings of the system relations at work in the context of teacher education might have emerged if different participants were selected for data collection. Understandings about the processes and practices of change and continuity in teacher education could be further enlightened by the extension of this study to consider additional voices, such as that of propaedeutic teachers, teachers and bureaucrats. As such, this is a limitation of the current study that could be potentially be taken up in further studies in this area.

On another level, collecting data from different teacher educators or other international contexts has also influenced the outcomes of the study. The international contexts included in the study were purposively selected on the basis of their potential to be profitably applied to understanding system relations in the Australian context. Generally, contexts were selected or eliminated on the basis of their comparability with the Australian context. Some contexts and participants were not included because of an inability to gain access to appropriate participants for an interview. Despite these limitations, the selected contexts served the research purpose and supported theoretical sufficiency. Yet, there were numbers of other contexts that might have proved enlightening. This included the
multiplicity of both North American and European contexts with similar contextual factors to those found in Australia as well as other geographical areas with quite different contextual factors. Again, both identifying and gaining access to participants across international contexts have served as limitations in the conduct of this study that might be used as an opening for further investigations.

Secondly, decision-making about data analysis processes has also had an impact on the outworking of this study. The focus of the research question, the enabling questions used in each phase and the data analysis targeted the processes and practices of change and continuity. The resultant theorising has worked towards an understanding of the system relations in the social context of teacher education for consideration of a social approach to change and continuity. Despite the maintenance of this focus throughout the study, the scope of the actual data collected was quite divergent. Both the textual data used in the second phase and the interview data from the third phase included materials that went beyond the processes and practices of change and continuity. In particular, the data included issues and ideas about the actual and possible content or actions of reform in the fields of teacher education and education more broadly. These ideas have been incorporated as appropriate in the findings in this study. However, significantly more detail about many of these reform ideas is available in the data. For example, there was significant discussion included in the contemporary interviews about the need for and nature of a five-stage professional pathway for teachers; including ideas about its integration with the professional, academic and economic needs of teachers, schools, higher education, regulators and unions. The decision to limit the use of the data to the processes and practices of change and continuity has meant that these ideas about the content of reform have been excluded from the data analysis processes. As such, there is a potential to further mine the data collected in different ways in order to identify and explore ideas for the future of teachers, teaching and teacher education.

Thirdly, the point at which this study has been drawn to a conclusion is another limiting factor. The theorising of *A Social Approach to Change and Continuity* (see Figure 7.2) as described in this chapter represents an initial explanation of the system relations as work in the processes and practices of change and continuity in the arena of teacher education. Despite the use of the principles of fit, workability and theoretical sufficiency in the comparative analysis of both the data and models incorporated into this theorising (Dey, 1999; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), the drawing of conclusions at this point is as much a beginning as it is an end. Furthermore, reaching conclusions that identify the possibility of the plausibly ridiculous in ideas such as the deinstitutionalising of teacher education and flipping the relationships of schools and universities is also merely a beginning. Further work needs to be conducted into the fit and workability of both this theoretical model to other fields or social contexts and the plausibly ridiculous in its outworking in praxis in the field of teacher education.
HOPE FOR THE FUTURE OF TEACHER EDUCATION

The aim of this study, as described in Chapter 1, was to use a critical approach to investigate the system relations at work in the development and outworking of the current regulatory climate in teacher education in the Queensland and Australian context. This study developed and employed critical grounded theory as its methodological approach. As an initial foray into critical grounded theory, this involved the construction of a philosophical, theoretical and methodological platform to guide research action in the conduct of the study as described in Chapter 3. Three core phases of research were completed, culminating in the drawing of the critical conclusions and the construction of a theoretical model of A Social Approach to Change and Continuity (see Figure 7.2).

The first phase involved the interrogation of context to construct an understanding and description of the contemporary field of teacher education in Australia and to refine the focus of the study to a specific question. This initial description of the context of teacher education in the Australian context and justification of the research question was reported in Chapter 2. This highlighted the influence of modernist and progressivist assumptions on popularist readings of the history of teacher education, posed questions about the influence of these common historical interpretations on contemporary practice and framed the study question to interrogate alternative readings of the history of teacher education and its influence in contemporary contexts.

Phase two launched from this initial exploration of the context of teacher education to conduct an alternative reading of the historical context of teacher preparation. It used both constructive and deconstructive approaches to two stories of teacher preparation and used a postmodern narrative approach to interrogating the historical discourses of teacher educators as primary participants in the field of teacher education. The construction and analysis of the Victorian and Western Australian narratives over the crisis period of the 1930s to the 1950s was included in Chapter 4. The key themes that emerged from this process showed that change and continuity was framed by the social, political and economic experiences of the colonial context where external, political power brokers held control over decision-making in teacher preparation but were potentially influenced by the perspectives of educational knowledge brokers in the field. As such, the hegemonies of a colonial habitus were present and powerful in both stories and served to frame the processes and practice of change and continuity. The analysis of the processes and practices of change and continuity was then conceptualised in the theorising of a model that described and explained change and continuity as a social process (see Figure 5.1). Chapter 5 provides an outline of this model alongside explanations of the core conceptions and their integration as a social process. This was then theoretically compared to Giddens’ (1999) conception of invented traditions and Vygotsky’s (1972 as cited by Chaiklin, 2003) cultural-historical understandings as related to the discourses of negotiation.

Alongside this historical engagement with the processes and practices of change and continuity, phase three of the study interrogated these same issues within contemporary international contexts with similar contextual features and issues as found in Australia. Interview data from high profile teacher educators in each context were collected and analysed using initial and axial coding, memoing and diagramming. While these analyses identified the presence of contextual nuances that created variations in the processes and practices of both change and continuity and teacher education, there was also striking similarities evident across all contexts in both the contemporary reform agenda and the political processes that surround it. Comparative analysis processes were then used to build up core conceptions from across the interviews in relation to these contextual similarities. These were theorised into a second model of change and continuity in its social context that pivots around the
disjunctures that give rise to alternative approaches to the processes and practices of teacher education that need to be justified and promoted in pursuing either change or continuity. This model was defined and explained in Chapter 6 and then compared theoretically to Engeström’s (1987, 1999) activity systems theory and the cultural-historical psychology of Vygotsky (1972 as cited by Chaiklin, 2003) and Ilyenkov (1982 as cited by Engeström, 1987; Wardekker, 2010) on which it is based.

The critical conclusions made about the system relations at work in the processes and practices of teacher education were analysed out of the abstract conceptualisation of these two models using comparative analysis process. The resulting third model provides an abstraction of the social process and social context of change and continuity evident in teacher education in Australia. This contrasts with the conventional conceptions of change and continuity, described in Chapter 2 as progressivist evolutionary or revolutionary practices, that have structured interpretations of and responses in the story of teacher education. As such, the confluence of models present in this theses provides a starting point for considering how to improve educational understandings of and responses to the present context for the purpose of influencing the future. The thesis concludes that teacher educators who hope without despair are able to mediate disjunctures towards successful negotiations that lead towards change or continuity that aligns with their preferred future for teacher education.
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EMERGING PARADIGMS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION

COLETTE ALEXANDER; PHD CANDIDATE

PROJECT SUMMARY

Contemporary teacher education and teacher educators are situated at a significant junction in the development of teacher preparation for the Australian context. Higher education, and particularly areas of professional education such as teacher education, is in a situation where institutions and faculties are increasingly being held accountable to achieve standards over which they have had very little influence and which, in some cases, can be shown to run against best practice. For teacher preparation* the dilemma is heightened by the tenuous hold that teacher educators have on their place and role within university contexts.

Teacher education has been part of the landscape of university contexts in Australia for almost 100 years. Throughout that time, however, education faculties have shared the role of teacher preparation with two other models; namely those of apprenticeship and training. While the history shows that teacher preparation has transitioned from a place where the apprenticeship model was dominant in the early part of the 20th century to one where teacher education is dominant in the early part of the 21st century, the change has not been complete or final. Both educational and political arguments abound in relation to the effectiveness of each of the models and the ensuing policies and practices of contemporary governments are hampered by the lack of sound empirical evidence about the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

Therefore, this project is critical in nature. It seeks to empower and give voice to teacher educators through a two-fold process. Firstly, by facilitating a critical analysis of the nature, scope, processes and practices of paradigmatic change in teacher preparation in the Australia context. This phase of the project investigates the history of teacher preparation in Australia using a critical, paradigmatic approach designed to explore the factors that have influenced changes and continuities in teacher preparation. Secondly, by engaging with experienced teacher educators from around the globe to discuss and explore contemporary contexts and preferred futures for teacher preparation. This phase will involve a series of interviews to gather the stories and perspectives of eminent teacher educators regarding the nature, scope, processes and practices of teacher preparation within their own context, and to discuss their preferred futures for teacher preparation. The intention of this project is to provide research-based evidence that might be used for the development of teacher preparation into the future.

* Teacher preparation – an overarching term that includes all of the possible models for the prior-to-service preparation undertaken by prospective teachers.
CORE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study seeks to critically investigate the nature of paradigmatic change and continuity in teacher preparation in historical, contemporary and future contexts.

The core questions of the study are:
- How have structures and systems influenced paradigmatic change and continuity in teacher preparation in the Australian context?
- What knowledge and power relationships have been established, promoted and maintained by these changes and continuities?
- How might emerging paradigms and practices for teacher preparation respond to hegemonic knowledge/power relations and influence change into the future?

CORE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

In order to engage with the issues relevant to this study during the interviews with teacher educators from around the globe, a series of interview questions have been developed and trialled as the basis for an open-ended interview process.

These interview questions are as follows:

Contextualising Questions:
1. What are the main principles of teacher preparation currently at work in ... (enter name of state or country here)?
2. What new principles or practices in teacher preparation are emerging in ...?

Core Question:
3. What would you consider to be the foundational or critical principles and practices of a preferred future for teacher preparation?

Enabling Questions (to be used to unpack the core question):
  a. If you were able to develop teacher preparation in ... unhindered, what would you like to do or to see happen?
  b. How might quality be assured in your preferred future for teacher preparation?
  c. How would relationships with other organisations and bodies be involved?
APPENDIX 2: EXEMPLARY MEMO – PHASE TWO CORE CATEGORY: 
NEGOTIATION

Negotiation is a social activity undertaken to sort through possibilities in order to make a decision about a course of action that represents either a change or a continuity in the processes and practices of teacher preparation. Negotiation is only required when alternative possibilities that reflect dissonant perspectives about the processes and practices of teacher preparation are present. When this occurs, negotiation is the means whereby different participants can engage with each other in considering the different knowledges or ideologies at work in teacher preparation. In doing so, participants will reflect on alternative points of view, but will do so from the perspective of their own role or position in teacher preparation. For each participant involved, the purpose of negotiating is to promote the ideological commitments they hold both as an individual and a representative of an institutional participant. While the content of negotiation engages with knowledge through ideological dissonance, the processes of negotiation engage with the power structures that control the allocation of responsibility for teacher preparation. When participants can both make and enact decisions independent of others the impetus for negotiation is low. However, when decision-making is being closely managed engagement in negotiations becomes a high stakes activity.

Negotiation can be identified as a social activity because it involves more than one participant negotiating from their particular point of view. It has, at a minimum, two potential outcomes that must remain open as possibilities until the negotiation reaches its conclusion. When this occurs, the various participants may assess the negotiations on a continuum between successful and unsuccessful. This assessment is, however, highly individualised and dependent upon the different roles and positions held by the various participants involved. A successful negotiation is one where the point of view of a participant is both heard and taken up in the determination of the course of action to be pursued. At the other end of the spectrum, an entirely unsuccessful negotiation would involve a perspective being neither heard nor heeded. In between, there are a range of positions involving circumstances where a perspective is heard but not enacted, partially heard or partially enacted. Across this spectrum, what one participant might view as a very successful negotiation could be interpreted as entirely unsuccessful by another. As such, engagement in negotiation does not always result in neither does it depend upon the outworking of a preferred course of action. From the perspective of the teacher educators engaged in negotiations about their work in teacher education, a lack of success in negotiating for a particular outcome does not negate the presence and significance of the social activity of negotiation. Rather, negotiation is identified as the core variable in the social process of change and continuity because it is the key to influencing rather than assuring the outcome of decision-making in the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

The actual action or social process involved in negotiation is communication between the individual participants engaged in teacher preparation. As such, negotiation is predicated on three key factors that influence the effectiveness of a communicative act; namely the avenues or channels of communication, relationships in communication and the actual content of that communication. These three factors correlate with the field, tenor and mode that make up Halliday’s sociocultural conception of the register of language. The register is defined by Halliday as the, 'differences in the type of language selected as appropriate to different types of situation' (Halliday teal. 1964, p.87). As such, the register considers the nature of the social context of communication and how this is manipulated to facilitate communication. In the case of change and continuity as a social process, this relates to the
manipulation of these three key factors in seeking to persuasively promote a particular perspective on teacher preparation.

The avenues of communication are the modes used in the communicative act. There are two components of the avenues of communication important to the process of negotiation; the presence of a communicative space and the right of voice. A communicative space is present when a channel for communication between participants has been established. In the process of negotiating change and continuity in teacher preparation both formal and informal channels of communication were present. Formal channels for negotiation included any opportunity for official communication between the various institutional participants. This included both the reporting and review processes. The annual reports to the parliament as prepared by the Principal of teachers’ college and political reviews into the teacher preparation are two examples of formal communicative spaces available for negotiation. The informal channels of communication are those opportunities for negotiation that arise from the participant’s relationships with each other. As such, they are dependent upon the voice afforded an individual participant. In order to engage in the communicative act of negotiation at both a formal and an informal level a particular participant must hold and maintain the right of voice in the context of teacher preparation. Without the right to voice their perspective, a participant does not have an open communicative space for engaging the process of negotiation. As described in the analysis of the nature of the participants in teacher preparation, voice is afforded a participant on the basis of their role in teacher preparation. It is not sufficient to have a right to voice a perspective, particularly in relation to informal channels of communication. Participants must also work towards maintaining the opportunities for and influence of their voice through the relationships they establish across both formal and informal communicative spaces.

The tenor is established by the roles and relationships taken on by the various participants in seeking to give voice to their particular points of view about teacher preparation. Relationships are established amongst the different individual participants negotiating change and continuity on the basis of their roles with the institutional participants. These relationships have a significant impact on the maintenance and impact of voice. There are two aspects to effectively using and maintaining voice and they both relate to the relationships between participants. Firstly, a participant must be invested in the outcome of the negotiations sufficient to warrant the development and use of the voice that is afforded their role in teacher preparation. That is, there needs to be a conviction that the stakes are significant enough and that getting involved in the relationships required to negotiate is worth the effort. There has to be some indication or evidence that the required relational engagement in negotiations will result in some benefit or good for teacher preparation. Secondly, the effectiveness of the influence of voice is dependent upon the trust and respect established amongst participants. The difference between a particular perspective being heard and being heeded is dependent upon the quality of relationship that is build on the trust and respect afforded the participant or participants representing that perspective. Without these two aspects, a conviction about teacher preparation and a sense of respect, participants rarely engaged successfully in negotiations.

The field makes up the content of the communication and is the final key factor in the communicative act of negotiation. Given that the focus of negotiation centres around dissonant perspectives, the content of negotiation is adversarial. That is, negotiation involves the presentation and then mediation of opposing perspectives. However, successful negotiations are not dependent so much on what is communicated as how it is communicated. In relation to the content of communication when
negotiating, the individual participant needs to traverse the boundary between emic and etic perspectives. That is, a persuasive presentation of a particular ideological perspective needs to engage participants that sit outside of a particular ideological perspective such that they are able to understand the issue at hand from inside that perspective.

The role of negotiation as the core variable in the social process of change and continuity is dependent upon two key conditions related to the personal-internal dimension of participants. Firstly, negotiation requires the dissemination of power across multiple participants. This is identified in the allocation of responsibility to various individuals. That is, negotiation comes into effect when the three levels of responsibility, to make, influence or enact decisions, have been disseminated to different participants. In other words, negotiation is necessary when the participants that are required to enact a decision are not the same participants that will make that decision. In this context both participants are dependent upon each other for some part of the social process of change and continuity. It is this dependence amongst the participants that creates the space that necessitates negotiation and sets it up as the core variable in change and continuity. Secondly, negotiation requires the presence of alternative forms or levels of knowledge that lead to dissonant goals for teacher preparation. It is only when the participants amongst whom responsibility has been disseminated have alternative perspectives about their preferred course of action that negotiation becomes necessary. When participants are in agreement, negotiation is redundant.

Negotiation is not, however, a prerequisite for making a decision about and then enforcing a particular course of action. That is, the participants who hold the balance of power for making decisions in a particular context are capable of making those decisions without reference to other participants. Technically, these participants do not have to engage in negotiation to either promote or enforce their preferred course of action, it is possible to directly control teacher preparation. However, across the two contexts analysed, these types of non-negotiated situations were rarely if ever discussed. While there were stories of political power-brokers making and enforcing decisions, for example the enforcing of the closing of the teachers’ college in Western Australia in the wake of the Great Depression, the story told by the teacher educators indicates that negotiations for an alternative course of action were attempted by a range of educational leaders and stakeholders. In other words, these stories as told from the perspective of the teacher educators were framed as unsuccessful negotiations rather than tales of non-negotiation.

This highlights the pivotal role that negotiation plays for participants who do not hold the balance of power. Negotiation is crucial to these participants because it is the process whereby they can influence decision-making processes that are beyond their direct responsibility towards their preferred course of action. In other words, negotiation is the means whereby the participants without the balance of power can sway decision-making processes towards their ideological preferences. As such, negotiating for their preferred course of action is critical to the success of their ideological goals for teacher preparation. In the stories of teacher preparation these participants are the educational leaders who have responsibility for enacting rather than making decisions about the processes and practices of teacher preparation. For these participants, the process of negotiation empowers them by providing a space for their voice to be heard in the decision-making process. This may well explain the reason why the discourses of teacher educators frame the stories around unsuccessful rather than non-negotiations. To take up a position that denies educational participants a voice in negotiations would work to disempower them in the processes and practices of teacher preparation.
This shows that the motivations and processes underlying negotiation are arranged or orchestrated by the relationships formed through the dissemination of power. However, the content of the resultant negotiations is related to the perspectives present in the context at the time. That is, the actual negotiations that take place are framed by the dissonances between the different forms and levels of knowledge held by the participants engaged in the negotiations. Participants will seek to negotiate from a point of view that reflects their ideological commitments as expressed by their goals for teacher preparation. In other words, negotiation involves mediating the disjunctions that exist between the points of view of the various participants around a course of action to be taken. Where there is no disjuncture, negotiation is moot.

Negotiation involves individual participants brokering a course of action using the spheres of both knowledge and power, expressed in the personal-internal dimension as responsibility and goals, to the advantage of their personally held ideology. Success, from the perspective of a particular participant, is dependent upon the individual’s capacity to use the advantage of there position in relation to either knowledge or power to influence decisions and actions towards their preferred processes and practices for teacher preparation. This is achieved through the manipulation of linguistic choices in order to manipulate the outcomes of negotiation towards a particular preference. While the communicative act of negotiation is carried out by an individual, it is not entirely dependent on the communicative genius of the individual. Negotiations engage the personal-internal dimension, but it is a social activity and as such it also engages the social context that surrounds it at any given moment. This involves both the social-external dimension the encompasses the institutional participants represented in the negotiations and the sociocultural context of the time. In other word, the negotiations made by a particular individual are tempered or framed by their relationship to the social and cultural context surrounding their engagement in teacher preparation.

In effect, the contextual factors surrounding the individual participant promote both pragmatic and ideological constraints of the perspective taken into negotiations. The spheres of knowledge and power in the social-external dimension, expressed as ideology and control, constrain the point of view taken by the individual in three ways. The first involves the patterns present in institutions and their hegemonic influence on participants, the second relates to the need to maintain representation when negotiating and the third recognises the influence of institutional roles on the control of voice. When engaging in negotiations, individuals both represent and are representative of institutional participants. As such, the relationship between individual and institutional participants serves to ideologically frame or constrain the point of view taken in negotiations. Beyond this, pragmatic constraints are also present in negotiations. These constraints relate to the influence of unavoidable practical problems or issues that place limits on the possibilities to be considered when negotiating.
APPENDIX 3: EXEMPLAR MEMO – INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

The analysis of this interview has identified thirteen focussed codes that can be grouped into four conceptual categories. The following discussion seeks to describe and explain these categories and codes.

They are as follows:

**Category 1: The Political Field**
Focussed Code 1: Government Forces
Focussed Code 2: Institutional Forces
Focussed Code 3: Inter-relationships between government and institutions

**Category 2: The Cultural Field**
Focussed Code 4: Teacher education as multi-contextual
Focussed Code 5: Schools as sites for teacher education

**Category 3: Political-Cultural Interface**
Focussed Code 6: Regulation of the profession
Focussed Code 7: Self-determination for the profession
Focussed Code 8: Building trust at the interface

**Category 4: Teacher Education for Building the Profession**
Focussed Code 9: Teacher education as an activity system
Focussed Code 10: Developing teacher identity
Focussed Code 11: Engaging the work of the profession
Focussed Code 12: Developing the contribution of higher education
Focussed Code 13: Developing relationships between university and school-based teacher education

The following diagram seeks to demonstrate the theoretical relationships of the categories and their focussed codes with each other.
**CATEGORY 1: THE POLITICAL FIELD**

This conceptual construct articulates the political context that shapes the nature of and issues in teacher education. All teacher preparation [name of country removed] is undertaken as teacher education within tertiary institutions. However, the term teacher education covers educational experiences of teachers in university contexts across all stages of their professional career. Therefore, the term teacher preparation will be used to refer specifically to that part of teacher education that happens prior to service and teacher education will be used in the broader more all-encompassing sense that was evident in this interview. Within this interview there were two sources of political forces identified and then the relationship between these two key players was discussed.

**Focussed Code 1: Government forces**

The first source of political influence upon teacher education, and particularly on teacher preparation is the government. Within the European context international comparisons and the recommendations of international bodies such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) become criteria for national governments to assess their performance and set policy agendas. The high expectations of practice in relation to teacher preparation in countries such as Finland serve to place higher expectations on teacher preparation in other European countries. This means that there is significant impetus towards Masters level education for teachers. In [name of country removed], this is being worked out in the continuing professional education of teachers though there is an expectation that Masters level teacher preparation will be pursued by political and departmental entities.

However, the current economic climate in [name of country removed], which continues to be affected by the global economic crisis and the problems of the European Union, is such that major investment in increasing the educational standards for preservice teachers has not been forthcoming despite international developments and commitments. To date, the funding provided has been directed towards teachers and schools and teacher education programs and faculties have benefitted through the development of relationships with those schools.

A core issue within the political processes that underpin policy and practice development is the lack of engagement with the complexity of educational issues. In the current political climate with high levels of international comparisons and the ensuing debates about problems in education and teaching, it is tempting for politicians and bureaucrats to seek out simple solutions. Two typical examples of this practice relate to the overemphasis of basic skills and the assumption that problems associated with teachers are a direct result of teacher preparation. These simple explanations of complex problems work because they provide the government with a scapegoat, usually teacher preparation programs, and a simple solution, usually the monitoring and regulation of such programs. They also provide for a narrow, easily defined and easily demonstrated set of educational outcomes in the short-term that will not necessarily provide for the broad educational needs of the community in the long-term.

**Focussed Code 2: Institutional forces**

The second major force in the political field is the higher education institutions themselves. In [name of country removed] there are different higher education institutions and courses engaged in teacher preparation for the different levels of schooling. For example, preparation for primary teaching happens at a Bachelors level through one tier of university while preparation for senior secondary is at the Masters level and happens at a higher tier of university. These differences result in differences in the; entry requirements for preservice teacher, types of preparation, levels of cooperation with
school contexts, and outcomes for preservice teachers. In addition, the different university tiers influence the availability of funding for the continuing teacher education to which recent government funds have been directed.

While the lower tiered universities prepare the vast majority of teachers through Bachelors programs for early and later primary and lower secondary, they have not been able to automatically participate in the development of continuing teacher education at Masters level. This, along with the perception that teacher preparation will ultimately become a Masters level qualification for all teachers, places institutional pressures on the teacher education workforce. There is strong motivation for institutions to encourage and support teacher educators to engage with higher degree studies themselves, though the nature of the encouragement and support is varied across the different institutions. This is one example of the influence of business models and economic realities on the nature and development of higher education in the [name of country removed] context.

This use of economic and business models in higher education is wide-spread in higher education in [name of country removed] and Europe. Institutions are supportive of economically viable programs and faculties and there is some pressure for leaders to ensure that available sources of income are accessed. This has also created some pressure to develop a broader perspective of education beyond preparation for the classroom in order to increase its potential clientele and thereby increase income. However, the [name of country removed] institutions appear to have maintained close relationships with schools contexts and to have used the availability of government funding through schools as a means of maintaining economic viability in order to protect the relationship between the education discipline and the professional context of schools.

**Focussed Code 3: Inter-relationships between government and institutions**

Teacher education faculties have to engage with the tensions and issues created by the competing or conflicting agendas of the governmental and institutional influences on teacher preparation. These tensions are being reinforced by perceptions relating to the nature of the quality of teacher preparation and the causes of problems in the education sector. Negative perceptions of the quality of teaching and therefore teacher preparation are prevalent and growing. Political responses to the community’s concerns, though often over-simplified, are designed to allay these fears. As a consequence, there is pressure on the professional autonomy and responsibility of schools, teachers and teacher education faculties and it is threatened by the political tendency towards regulation. The potential is that the development of educational practices could become the domain of the political agenda rather than the responsibility of educators.

These issues are further complicated by the overlay of institutional forces. The current system in [name of country removed] houses the vast majority of teacher preparation within the applied rather than the academic universities. Changes in the entry requirements or the exit outcomes of preservice teachers could have the effect of moving teacher education faculties from applied to academic university contexts. This has consequences in relation to maintaining connections with the professional contexts for which preservice teachers are preparing, and in the professional development of the teacher education faculties. Alternatively, significant changes would need to be made to the structure of higher education to allow for the development of higher level programs in the applied universities. Either way, the tensions developed between the political imperatives towards Masters level teacher preparation and the institutional practices and processes of higher education in [name of country removed] is problematic for teacher education faculties who need to be able to respond to both demands.
Alongside the political aspects of the interrelationship between government and institutional forces on teacher preparation there are the practical and ideological aspects of the relationship. Teacher education faculties need to be able to work effectively in the ideological intersection between government and educational institutions. This means that teacher educators need to avoid divisive or competing solutions to issues and work towards integrative initiatives that support political initiatives while working within the perspectives and policies of higher education. That is, teacher education faculties need to be able to develop educational ideas from the bottom-up, but they also need to integrate these effectively with top-down political initiatives. They also need to develop the capacity to develop ideas that pre-empt political initiatives in order to promote educationally responsible political agendas and initiatives. For example, teacher education faculties need to work towards their own performance agreements in order to satisfy political questions about quality rather than waiting for or allowing political interpretations of how quality might be achieved to be imposed. Currently this process is evident in the development of the registration of teacher educators by teacher educators and for teacher educators. This registration process can be used to demonstrate quality self-regulation by the profession that negates the need for the government to develop external regulation. This is, however, built upon a foundation of trust between political and institutional organisations.

**CATEGORY 2: THE CULTURAL FIELD**

This conceptual construct articulates the cultural context that shapes the nature of and issues in teacher education. Teacher education is provided in [name of country removed] for people engaged in school contexts. Therefore, preparation for the work undertaken in these contexts is foundational to all teacher preparation and flows into teacher education. However, this emphasis within the cultural field is working counter to the actual contributions that teacher educators can make to the development of teachers and teaching. Within this interview there were two key ideas discussed about the cultural field. The first was the multi-faceted reality of educational contexts and the second was the need to develop school cultures that are able to use teachers’ professional development to respond effectively to this complex reality.

**Focussed Code 4: Education as multi-contextual**

Despite the tendency of governments towards the over-simplification of the field of education to issues of basic skills and good teachers, the reality for teachers and students is that education happens at the intersection of multiple influencing contexts and factors. Education is contextualised within social, cultural, economic, environmental and academic communities that interrelate at the school site. If that wasn’t complex enough, this is further complicated by the inclusive nature of schools that integrate multiple communities across each of these factors within a single context. As such, the cultural field of each school context is a multi-faceted and complex phenomenon and has become increasingly so as the expectations of education have grown over time. Educators have the responsibility to mediate these contexts for their students in order to facilitate the students’ learning in line with policy requirements. Any attempt to see this as a simple task is a gross underestimation of the work of teachers within educational contexts. However, this oversimplification of the issues is evident in school cultures and structures as much as it is in political agendas, policies and practices.

For teacher preparation and education this is problematic. The work or teacher educators should be focussed on developing professionals with the capacity to engage effectively in these multi-faceted contexts. However, a focus on teacher preparation as the only necessary education for a teacher and the tendency in over-simplifying educational issues to focus on the primary role of teachers in front of the classroom significantly undersells the potential impact of teacher education on the continuing development of teachers, teaching, schools and education.

**Focussed Code 5: Schools as sites for teacher education**
Traditional approaches to the development of teachers within schools have used a two-step professional structure. The first step has been preparation for teaching and the second is teaching itself. The main assumption that underpins this is the idea that teachers should be completely competent at the beginning of their professional career and that only minimal induction needs to be provided in order to establish them in teaching. This is strongly embedded in the culture of schools. But, it is working against the complexity required to develop effective educational responses to problems experienced in these school contexts. While the development of Masters level teacher education for teachers has served to provide professional development for teachers, there is some frustration for graduates as the flattened professional pathway within school contexts is not facilitating the use of their learning or their continued professional development. As such, the traditional culture of schools is working against the professional development of teachers and teaching. This needs to be addressed as a significant part of the complex problem of improving education if the goals and purposes of teacher education are to be realised.

School culture needs to be developed to support the goals and purposes of teacher education. This involves recognising that responses to complex educational problems needs a teaching workforce that is capable of complex problem-solving that involves engagement with finding, developing and sharing empirical evidence about what works and what doesn’t work. For this to be achieved the secondary roles of teachers in the work of researching, communicating and participating in communities of learners/researchers are foundational. Teacher educators have an important role to play in the promotion and development of these secondary roles for individual teachers, but, also for the promotion of these as foundational to an effective schools culture. These things are the things that teacher educators bring to the cultural field of education and it is important that they are promoted through the work of teacher educators in the cultural field of education. Teacher educators needs to be involved in school cultures as part of their research-based communities of learners in order to facilitate the professional development of individual and to proactively contribute to the adaptation of the school culture towards more professional practices in relation to teachers and teaching.

**Category 3: Political - Cultural Interface**

The interface between the political field and the cultural field is important to the work of teacher education, both preparation and continuing. At this interface the integration of the competing purposes of the political agenda against the educational agenda work out into practice. This requires a balancing of freedom with control. In the contemporary context this is out worked through the balancing of political regulation with the freedoms of the profession. This is seen in the increasing regulation of the profession that is juxtaposed against self-determination for the profession. Successful balancing of these perspectives requires the development of trust between the two parties that is founded in evidence that both needs are being met.

**Focussed Code 6: Regulation of the profession**

In [name of country removed], as with many comparable jurisdictions, there is a strong push towards the development of a standards model for thinking about teaching. Within this model, political entities use stakeholders in education to develop a set of standards for the professional practice of teachers. These standards can then be used to impose requirements on teacher education at both the preparation and the continuing education levels. The consistent discourse in political contexts and the media that questions the quality of education is used by political leaders in the government and the department as the impetus for the continued and growing regulation of teacher standards and standards for teacher preparation. The political sense of responsibility leads to the regulation of
teaching as a means of demonstrating to the public that the government is in control of the situation and is able to regulate to ensure quality.

This model has developed some resistance from both teacher educators and teachers themselves. The voice of teacher educators is minimised in the structures used to develop these types of standards and as such the expertise they hold is negated in the establishment of requirements for teaching and teacher preparation. This places burdens on teacher educators in relation to fulfilling requirements as well as doing that which is effective in the preparation of teachers. For teachers the imposition of particular practices in continuing professional development has the effect of developing resistance from teachers to this and other forms of continuing teacher education. The lack of connection between requirements and the teachers’ own needs is problematic. The results of the political regulation of teachers and teaching are ultimately counter-productive.

**Focussed Code 7: Self-determination for the profession**

Juxtaposed against the development of regulation of the profession is the idea of the profession becoming self-determined through things such as self-regulation. The conception of a profession is closely linked to the idea of self-determination and the development of self-regulation contributes positively to a developing conception of the professionalism of teachers and teaching. With this in mind teachers and teacher educators in [name of country removed] are working towards broad participation in self-administered professional bodies that register both teachers and teacher educators. This is viewed as an initial step towards a broadening of the conception of professionalism in teaching towards the ideas of theorists such as Hoyle and Stenhouse.

This process works at two levels. Firstly, it provides evidence for political and bureaucratic bodies that there is sound regulation of the profession already in place, negating the need to impose a second political level of regulation. Secondly, it works to develop ownership of the profession by teachers for teachers, and encourages teachers and schools to pursue higher levels of professional recognition that then promote higher levels of professional practice. It serves to negate the resistance that develops around politically initiated and enforced regulations about registration and professional development.

This process also works to change the focus of the registration process. The registration process for teacher educators in [name of country removed] is self-administered by the profession and involves the development and assessment of a portfolio of professional practice. The teacher educator is responsible to prepare the portfolio and other teacher educators undertake the assessment. This results in a thorough assessment of the professional practices of the teacher educator that reflects a much broader perception of professional dispositions and practices than is possible by bureaucratic styles of assessment that focus narrowly on easily identifiable standards. In this way the process is able to focus on those things that teacher educators know will positively impact upon the quality of professional practice.

A second area where the profession could increase its professional responsibility is in the regulation of who qualifies for entry to the profession and what educational experiences are necessary for that entry. In [name of country removed] the profession does not currently contribute to the development of teacher preparation except where relationships exist between higher education and school institutions. This is viewed as an area of potential development for the profession as more formalised and thorough processes could be put in place to enable teachers and schools to contribute to the development of teacher preparation programs. This is, however, challenging for teacher educators who have traditionally undertaken this development themselves. The challenge lies in developing...
strategies that balances the expertise of teachers with that of teacher educators. This is often problematic in jurisdictions where this type of relationship is administered bureaucratically.

**Focussed Code 8: Building trust at the interface**

The establishment and development of trust between organisations across the political and cultural fields is paramount to the provision of quality teacher preparation and education. Low levels of trust inevitably lead to higher levels of regulation that minimise self-determination and the enacting of professional responsibility. There are two areas that stand out as potential risks to the development of trust.

Firstly, low levels of trust are developed where low levels of motivation are evident in the profession. Low levels of motivation to self-regulate and to engage with professional development or learning open the door to the imposition of external regulation. It is important for the profession to take ownership of its own development and to do so with a broad and high level of ‘buy-in’. The cycle of low motivation and resistance that leads to higher levels of imposed regulation based on a lack of trust in the professional responsibility taken on by individual teachers and the profession as a whole.

Secondly, low levels of trust develop when the data being used by politicians, bureaucrats and the media point to deep seated problems in the core foundations of education and teaching. Within [name of country removed], consistent coverage about problems in education has served to create a climate where political institutions feel the need to take responsibility and legislate against the perceived problems. However, international rankings call into question the negative impressions of teachers and teaching being promoted in the marketplace. It is important that teacher education faculties continue to question the validity of the data used to support impressions of poor quality and the conclusions that are drawn from it. In this way they need to be able to promote the profession both corporately and of individuals as a means of stalling the tendency to focus on low levels of trust that lead to high levels of regulation.

Teachers and teacher educators need to pay attention to the promotion of the profession and to actively participating in their own self-determination in order to build the trust that will make room for the continued professionalisation of teaching.

**CATEGORY 4: TEACHER EDUCATION FOR BUILDING THE PROFESSION**

The continued professionalisation of teaching is dependent on the organisation and provision of teacher education that engages with the unique contribution of higher education to the profession. That is, the needs of the profession in building professional profiles and practices are facilitated by the goals and purposes of higher education that is responsive to professional needs and contexts. It is therefore important for teacher educators to actively engage with the profession through both preparation and continuing education.

**Focussed Code 9: Teacher Education as an Activity System**

In developing teacher education that supports the profession the main area of concern within [name of country removed] is in the transfer of learning between higher education and school-based context. The capacity to develop professionally relevant teacher preparation and education is of paramount concern. With this in mind activity systems theory can be used to analyse the context and the problems of transfer. In this model the following issues correlate to the core ideas of the activity systems theory:
Subject: teacher identity

Object: multi-focussed teacher education, with emphasis on preparation

Rules: matching the career-long professional pathway with career-long teacher education

Community: building teacher educators across school and university contexts and relationships

Division of labour: cooperating around unique contributions of different contexts

However, the following categories do not align directly to these divisions as they seek to identify actions that arise out of the theorising rather than merely presenting the model.

**Focussed Code 10: Developing teacher identity**

Teacher education and particularly teacher preparation needs to maintain a strong link to the development of teacher identity. The professional identity of the teacher should provide a clear purpose for teacher education and be used to focus the intended learning of the program. While it is possible to use education as a pathway towards other professions, this has been connected to low employment opportunities and low retention rates. Maintaining a strong correlation to the developing professional identity serves to set a clear outcome for students in a course and as such helps to maintain students for whom this is a clear personal goal. In order to achieve this it is important for teacher education to maintain a broad perspective on the nature of the professional identity of teachers that encompasses ethical and moral perspectives and the dispositions that support the work of teachers alongside the professional standards for knowledge and competencies in relation to both the primary and secondary processes of teaching. In this way the discipline of education can maintain its focus on the learning that facilitates becoming and being the teacher at both the preparation and the continuing education phase.

In addition, teacher education needs to maintain an open stance in relation to suitability for teaching, particularly in relation to the foundational skills required to enter teacher preparation. While minimum educational standards may be required to ensure the suitability of a person for the profession, it is not necessary for these standards to be achieved prior to entry to teacher preparation. Rather, a culturally, linguistically and economically diverse profession can only be achieved if time and opportunities to develop required foundational skills is provided after entry to teacher preparation. In this way, teacher preparation can use the motivation of the developing professional teacher identity in the development of the required foundational skills.

Alongside the development of the identity of teachers, teacher education needs to work at developing identities for teacher educators in both higher education and school-based contexts. In [name of country removed] this has resulted in the development of teacher educator standards for teacher educators in both higher education and school-based contexts that are used in peer-assessed registration processes. This has been particularly helpful in empowering and developing the identity of teacher educators in school-based contexts which has in turn served to strengthen links between higher education and schools. Within higher education these registration processes need to be supported more strongly by the leadership so that they work alongside the increasing academic expectations of teacher educators in higher education to maintain the connections with the profession of teaching.

**Focussed Code 11: Engaging the work of the profession**
Engaging the work of the profession in teacher education requires a clear understanding of the role of the teacher and then engaging this role in the provision of teacher education. Broadly speaking, the role of the teacher can be divided into primary and secondary processes. The primary processes of teaching are the practices of planning, implementing and evaluating learning within a specific context. The secondary processes being those things that teachers do that support this primary process. This would include things such as working in teams, community engagement, developing leadership and research.

In seeking to engage with the work of teachers it is important that the level of teacher education matches the professional needs of its students. That is, teacher preparation must provide for the development of the primary processes of teaching while introducing the secondary processes and continuing teacher education needs to provide for the development of the secondary processes of teaching. In this way, teacher education will be making a contribution to the career-development needs of teachers at the various junctures. Failing to do so downgrades the profession and the contribution of higher education to its development.

In engaging the primary processes of teaching in teacher preparation it is important that propaedeutic teachers are provided with significant experiences of these practices in order to avoid cultural dissonance between the higher education and school contexts. This involves maintaining a high level of in-school experience throughout a teacher preparation course, seeking to merge the learning contexts and experiences of higher education with that of school contexts, and focussing on the development of professional identities from the very start of a course. It also involves the use of schools and teachers in attracting teachers and contributing to their education. This will serve to avoid potential clashes or dissonance between the cultures of higher education and schools through their seamless integration around the daily work of teachers in teacher preparation.

**Focussed Code 12: Developing the contribution of higher education**

The goals and purposes of higher education have the potential to make a unique contribution to teacher education. As with all other professions, professional learning and development are career-long endeavours for teachers. While the development of each individual is unique, it is possible to map a broad career pathway for teachers that recognises the changing needs of teachers across a number of broad phases. For example, propaedeutic teachers need a strong focus on the primary processes of teaching with some introduction to and awareness of the secondary processes. Beginning teachers need support in the development of personal practices for specific contexts. While experienced teachers need to be able to explore innovative strategies in teaching as well as personal and professional development in the secondary processes of teaching that will support their career goals within education. For each of these career phases higher education can make a positive contribution that aligns with its goals and purposes.

Higher education is designed to engage staff and students in an academic community that contributes to the broader community through teaching, learning and research. Its goals and intentions are to provide the community with educated citizens with broad and deep knowledge of selected disciplines, higher order thinking needed to critically evaluate and create solutions to complex problems in the relevant fields, and increasing skills in using and undertaking relevant research. This broad skill-set that is foundational to higher education is directly relevant to both the primary and the secondary processes of teaching in primary and secondary contexts. It can therefore be demonstrated that the knowledge, skills and dispositions that are developed through the completion of higher education makes a direct contribution to the personal and professional development of a teacher and their
identity. Furthermore, the fact that this skill-set is unique to higher education it that no other institution brings them together in similar ways means that this contribution to teachers’ professional development is unique.

Teacher education needs to embrace the unique contribution that they make to teachers’ professional development across the lifespan and bring its specialised skills and capacities to the educational community. This means that it is important that teacher education thinks about how a continuum of teacher education might match with a continuum of professional development. It also means that teacher educators needs to be able to anticipate needs and provide for ‘just in time’ initiatives that promote the continuing engagement of teachers in teacher education. One area in [name of country removed] where this notion is under threat is in the development of teacher preparation at Masters’ level. Evidence gathered in [name of country removed] supports the provision of Masters’ level study for experienced teachers ready to ‘re-think’ what they know about teaching and learning, and that engagement in Masters’ level studies too early in a teacher’s career will minimise the impact of the learning on their overall development. International trends to Masters’ level teacher preparation may serve to weaken the link between the contribution of higher education studies to the continuing development of teachers.
APPENDIX 4: EXEMPLAR MEMO – PHASE THREE CATEGORY: INFLUENCES ON THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION

This construct is evident across all five of the interviews. The relevant categories and focussed codes is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING CATEGORY</th>
<th>INTERVIEW CATEGORY</th>
<th>FOCUSED CODES (INTERVIEW)</th>
<th>INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>The Political Reform Agenda</td>
<td>Dominant Political Framework</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Political Field</td>
<td>Government Forces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpacking the Reform Agenda</td>
<td>Political Perspectives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>Political Agendas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants in Teacher Educ.</td>
<td>Role for Politics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Context of TE</td>
<td>Political Perspective – Ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUREAUCRATIC</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political-Cultural Interface</td>
<td>Regulation of the Profession</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants in Teacher Educ.</td>
<td>Role for Regulation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Context of TE</td>
<td>Regulatory Perspective – Ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Political Reform Agenda</td>
<td>Economic Drivers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructing TE for Profession</td>
<td>Professional Pathway – Financial</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL</td>
<td>Unpacking the Reform Agenda</td>
<td>Educational Perspectives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Context of TE</td>
<td>Educational Perspective – Ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION</td>
<td>The Political Field</td>
<td>Institutional Forces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants in Teacher Educ.</td>
<td>Role for Higher Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS</td>
<td>One enormous gap in the interviews.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLITICAL INFLUENCES ON TEACHER EDUCATION

The political context has a significant role to play in teacher preparation. The influence of political perspectives on the processes and practices of teacher preparation is a universally accepted experience. It is readily acknowledged that education and teaching is a political activity and as a consequence teacher preparation is also political. While teachers and teacher educators engage in the political activity of teaching, politics dominates its policies, practices and reforms. Teachers and teacher educators, therefore, need to be cognisant of the dominant political agendas that frame their work.

Across the contemporary contexts engaged in this study, the teacher educators identified the current political agenda as driven by neo-liberal ideology, which is economically framed and outcomes-oriented. This has seen the reconceptualising of reform in relation to economic rather than human terms. That is, reform has been reconstructed around economic rather than humanistic discourses. These discourses measure value in education on the basis of measurable educational outcomes and risk management and use demand-driven market-based drivers as the key means to differentiate between reforms that are supported or not. Interestingly, despite referring to the influence of the same neo-liberal political ideology the outworking of these political influences on teacher preparation have not been consistent across all contexts. While in some contexts neo-liberal political perspectives in teacher preparation have focussed on deregulation and privatisation, in others it has been used to support the bureaucratisation of teacher preparation.
While there was strong evidence in each context for the contemporary influence of politics on the processes and practices of teacher preparation, it would be erroneous to assume that this was the starting point of political intervention. Examples of earlier political interventions in teacher education were also evident across the various contexts and served to highlight the fact that political intervention has impacted the practices of teacher preparation long before the advent of neo-liberalism. Within the United Kingdom, the influence of the politically initiated and supported Robbins Report of 1963 and Hull Conference of 1964 on the acceptance of philosophy, psychology, sociology and history as the four pillars of the discipline of education is one such example. What is noticeably absent in this construction of the discipline of education is pedagogy or didactics, which is emphasised in European constructions of the discipline. This politically derived framework, which has been applied to the discipline of education in much of the English-speaking world, has demonstrated the power of political intervention in framing the processes and practices of teacher education over the long-term.

Despite the evidence of the longstanding influence of politics on education, it was also acknowledged that teacher educators have not necessarily been cognisant of or engaged effectively with the political forces influencing the work of teacher education. There is an acknowledgement that the contemporary political agenda and its reforms developed progressively over time and that the implications of the developing discourse had not been automatically evident. As the consequences of contemporary neo-liberal influences, framed by market-based drivers and accountability measures, have progressively taken a hold of teacher preparation, there has been an increasing alarm on the part of teacher educators at the consequences of these economically driven political perspectives and policies. In the light of this, contemporary teacher educators have identified the need to engage with and unpack the contemporary political agenda as part of their work in seeking the development of educational agendas in the reform of teacher preparation. This involves developing an understanding of the role of government, bureaucracy and economics in the outworking of political influences in teacher education.

The Role of Government

The first source of political influence upon teacher education, and particularly on teacher preparation is the government. The government is involved in teacher education at the level of setting policy to determine its processes and practices. For contemporary teacher preparation this largely takes in policy that supports the development of bureaucratic requirements, which have increasingly engaged with influencing various aspects of the structures of and infrastructure for teacher preparation. Across contexts there are two factors that have a significant influence on policy directions and initiatives; namely, political ideology and re-election. There is recognition that there is a lack of appreciation of educational perspectives, experience and evidence in the development of policy initiatives. This leads to some cynicism about the reframing of practices developed for educational purposes as political policy. There is a sense that educational practice can be commandeered and distorted if it can be shown to fulfil the right political purposes rather than engaged on the basis of the quality of its educational ideology.

The political ideology used to drive policy initiatives that was acknowledged by teacher educators as dominant across all contexts was described as neo-liberalism. For teacher preparation the most influential neo-liberalist ideals are productivity, measurability of performance and scepticism about the value of intellectual activity. The resultant development of regulatory control of teacher preparation in the contemporary political environment across political divides and parties highlights powerful bipartisan support for political control. The bipartisan engagement with political control of teacher education is one such example. What is noticeably absent in this construction of the discipline of education is pedagogy or didactics, which is emphasised in European constructions of the discipline. This politically derived framework, which has been applied to the discipline of education in much of the English-speaking world, has demonstrated the power of political intervention in framing the processes and practices of teacher education over the long-term.

The Role of Government

The first source of political influence upon teacher education, and particularly on teacher preparation is the government. The government is involved in teacher education at the level of setting policy to determine its processes and practices. For contemporary teacher preparation this largely takes in policy that supports the development of bureaucratic requirements, which have increasingly engaged with influencing various aspects of the structures of and infrastructure for teacher preparation. Across contexts there are two factors that have a significant influence on policy directions and initiatives; namely, political ideology and re-election. There is recognition that there is a lack of appreciation of educational perspectives, experience and evidence in the development of policy initiatives. This leads to some cynicism about the reframing of practices developed for educational purposes as political policy. There is a sense that educational practice can be commandeered and distorted if it can be shown to fulfil the right political purposes rather than engaged on the basis of the quality of its educational ideology.
teacher preparation is reflected in the outworking of the ideals of economic comparability within an increasingly globalised context in the processes and practices of teacher preparation.

Firstly, political support for initiatives in teacher education is economically rather than educationally driven. Despite the presence of educational perspectives in the debates that surround the development of policy, the key factor in either garnering or losing political support for a change of practice in teacher preparation is its economic viability. Politicians have been prepared to support a range of regulatory and educational ideas in as much as those ideas are economically sustainable. As such, political policy making lacks the ideological purpose or direction required to both identify and then support initiatives focussed on the education outcomes of teacher education.

Secondly, within the increasingly globalised context of education the trend in teacher preparation is towards international comparisons and recommendations in the setting of policy agendas. The high expectations of teacher preparation in some countries, such as Finland, serve to place higher expectations on teacher preparation in other contexts. Internationally, there has been an impetus towards increasing the length and level of teacher preparation towards postgraduate or Masters level education. This is not, however, reflected in the policy directions evident in all contexts. While international comparisons are en5ged across all contexts, the political conclusions reached about the viability and applicability of internationally derived processes and practices are linked with national factors in establishing policy direction. As a further consequence of the trend towards globalisation, in contexts where education is a state responsibility there has also been increased intrusion of politics at the federal level into education. While the criteria used by national governments is the assessment of productivity and performance, the justifications offered for policy initiatives generally refer to a lack of evidence about quality outcomes in teacher preparation and the impact of this on educational opportunity and equity for all students.

In the current political climate dominated by international comparisons and the ensuing debates about national standards in education and teaching, political perspectives tend to seek out simplified solutions that deny the complexity of educational issues and contexts. Two typical examples of this over-simplification across many contexts are the overemphasis of the development of basic skills as fundamental to teacher preparation and the assumption that problems associated with teachers are a direct result of teacher preparation. These simple explanations of complex problems work because they provide the government with a scapegoat, usually teacher preparation programs, and a simple solution, usually the monitoring and regulation of such programs. While politicians use carefully selected quotations from international sources as evidentiary support for their actions in relation to these simplified solutions, actual empirical evidence is regularly ignored. For example, the development of employment-based teacher preparation across many contexts is based on simplified productivity discourses, about the management, role and function of educators and education, without due respect to either the international or national evidence that the outcomes from employment-based routes are lower than those of higher education pathways. While simple solutions provide a narrow, easily defined and easily demonstrated set of educational outcomes in the short-term that do not necessarily represent a well aligned match between the perceived problem and solution and in that way fail to provide for the broad educational needs of the community in the long-term.

The lack of en5gement with long-term perspectives in the development of policy direction is likely a consequence of the issue of re-election. Within contemporary contexts, there is not much clarity
about the influences that are taken into account in setting policy direction for teacher preparation and the majority of politicians are reticent to adhere to or specifically discuss particular ideas or preferences about directions for teacher education. As such, there is evidence of a growing lack of political will and the weakening of political ideology that has resulted in contradictory and reactionary political agendas presumably focussed on a desire for re-election. Rather, politicians encourage the positive projection in the media of initiatives that provide an appearance of taking action, such as ‘Teach First’, ‘Teach for America’ and ‘Teach First NZ’, which internationally have attracted teaching but failed to keep individuals with high academic credentials. Consequently, these types of initiatives maintain their political support despite the fact that their retention rates if experienced by a university-based teacher preparation course would result in serious questioning of economic viability and in some contexts significant sanctions. Politicians are also sensitive to individual issues and questions such as the consequences of the over-supply of graduates and employment prospects and tend to develop reactionary policies that involve further regulation.

However, when pushed for a perspective, politicians across most contemporary contexts would appear to prefer a model for teacher education that moved the teaching profession towards becoming a graduate profession. Interestingly, this is not necessarily viewed as a requirement for teacher preparation. Rather, political directions in a number of contexts promote the goal of postgraduate qualifications for all teachers as a role for further teacher education. The occasional emergence of contradictory policy directions in support of these types of perspectives, such as the funding of part-time Masters degrees for teachers, demonstrates that the ideological basis of decisions is inconsistent. As in, these inconsistencies appear to be influenced by economic factors. Generally speaking, politicians differentiate between their preferred ideological model and their preferred level of funding. That is, while politicians may support the concept of higher levels of teacher education, they are not necessarily prepared to back that preference with financial support. Even when a policy announcement is made in teacher education, failure to garner media and community support can result in the withdrawal of the finances required to support it.

**The Role of Economics**

Across contexts the core driver of political influences on teacher education was identified as economics. In the light of contemporary neo-liberal political ideology the key economically influenced strategies and discourses in reforming education and teacher preparation relate to market-based policies that favour deregulation, performance assessment and measurable outcomes. However, the impact of economics on teacher education is more fundamental than even these contemporary political discourses. That is, the provision of teacher education, either as initial or continuing education, costs money. The financial outlay required of governments in providing for teacher education serves to create a context where politics and political participants assume an entitlement to influence teacher education as they see fit.

Despite the evidence of political entitlement in controlling teacher education, the political agenda is also justified by the use and interpretation of data. This use of data is significant in that it allows for the construction of an evidence-base for political discourses that effectively counteracts the evidence used by higher education faculties in the construction of educational discourses about teacher education. The economic approach to using data focuses on an outcome-oriented selection and interpretation of data that is framed by economists using economic measures of effectiveness. These interpretations predictably contradict the interpretations constructed by educators working with an
educational frame of reference. This contradiction is then used to construct discourses around the unreliability of educational data and educational interpretations thereof.

From within this neo-liberal economic frame of reference, educational data and evidence is used to link educational reform directly to school-based rather than broader sociocultural factors. Within the school-based factors, the teacher is then identified as the most significant capital capable of making a difference to educational outcomes for students. As such, the neo-liberal reform agenda is founded in reforming education by reforming the work of teachers around the discourse of quality teaching and quality teachers. This discourse focus on the language of human rather than social capital, targeting teacher impact and effectiveness as the most significant school-based factor in educational outcomes. Therefore, economic means are being used to control teacher preparation towards practices that reflect this focus on the primacy of the teacher as the most important capital in the provision of education. That is, funding, and in particular any extra or additional funding, is linked to the use of specific practices in teacher preparation that reflect this focus on the development of the human capital of the teacher. For example, the use of practices such as the performance assessment of preservice teachers has been used in at least one context as a requirement for the provision of funding for teacher preparation.

In most contexts the focus on the human capital of the teacher has seen a concentration of investment in initial teacher education as a once only opportunity to educate the teacher, thus creating high stakes teacher preparation that must ensure the classroom readiness of teachers. This has, in turn, driven political policies and initiatives towards the development of regulatory standards designed to identify the skills and practices that define classroom readiness and the provision of employment-based teacher preparation focussed on developing these standards. Even in those contexts where funding has been used to support continuing teacher education, the funds have been directed towards teachers and schools and teacher education programs and university faculties have only benefitted through the development of relationships with those schools.

However, investment in either initial or continuing teacher education is not solely influenced by political ideology. Rather, the availability of funds and the wide range of competing agendas and practices, both educational and otherwise, also impact upon government policies about and investment in teacher education. Additionally, the national and international economic climate also has an impact on the availability of funds, a situation that was brought into sharp focus by the most recent global economic crisis. In effect, the combination of economic interpretations and analyses of the effectiveness of teacher preparation combined with the scarcity of economic resources fosters the development of regulation and regulatory control of teacher preparation designed to ensure efficiency and effectiveness despite the ideological favouring of deregulation.

As such, funding is used politically as a means of enforcing selected processes and practices in teacher education and consequently controlling the its potentialities. Across contexts, the viability of the discipline of education and the attached education faculties within higher education institutions is linked economically to involvement in the provision of teacher preparation. Economic sanctions that cut either fee levels or student numbers have a significant impact on all of the activities of education faculties. Recent political commitments across many contexts to the transference of teacher preparation places to employment-based providers and the development of a competitive market between higher education institutions and other private providers have contributed to the destabilisation of education faculties.
The impact of the effects of economically influenced destabilisation is exemplified by en5gement with educational research. Across most contexts, funding from the provision of teacher education helps to support the research undertaken by education faculties. On one level, cuts in these funding streams impact the capacity for teacher educators to conduct educational research. That is, significant cuts to the fee income of the higher education sector threaten the employment of faculty available to conduct educational research. However, this situation is further exacerbated in relation to research into the processes and practices of teacher preparation. The requirements of regulatory control of teacher preparation effectively thwart innovation in university-based teacher preparation. That is, the threat to funding of deviating from the politically mandated agenda in teacher preparation serves to compromise any en5gement in research about the provision of teacher preparation, particularly if that research seeks to question that agenda. Across most contexts, the consequences of the use of funding arrangements to grow the regulatory climate is that the work of education faculties is increasingly being controlled by a bureaucratic government body that significantly limits the academic freedom of teacher educators in the performance of their responsibilities in the provision of teacher education.

The Role of Bureaucracy

The growth of the regulatory climate in teacher education has been built upon the economic analyses of educational evidence that have emerged in recent years to call into question positive interpretations of the outcomes of both education and teacher education. These discourses in both political contexts and the media have consistently and simultaneously endorsed the presence of evidence for the importance of the quality of the teacher as the most important capital in the provision of education while also calling into question the quality of teachers and of their education. Both political and departmental leaders have used this tautology as the impetus for the continued and growing external regulation of the teaching profession and of teacher education. That is, a political sense of responsibility serves to motivate the regulation of teaching and teacher education as a means of demonstrating to the public that the government is in control of ensuring the quality of teachers.

The development of both regulations and the requisite bureaucracy across the various contexts used in this study emerged in the 1980s. While often a product of conservative governments, the machinery of the bureaucracy has been used by both sides of politics to enact this politically driven agenda for teachers and teacher education. Across contexts, a government body that uses a number of layers of regulatory requirements is used to control both teachers and teacher education. These requirements can include professional standards for teachers that may be written at different levels for graduates and then experienced teachers, standards for teacher preparation courses and then other additional requirements.

Across the contexts used in this study the teaching profession is an externally regulated profession. In each context teacher registration is required to teach and it is granted on the basis of the completion of a recognised teacher preparation course. While in some contexts there is a single teaching certificate or registration for all teachers, in others teachers are registered or certified according to schools sector. In these cases specific preparation or further teacher education must be completed to teach in a particular sector. As well as the registration of teachers, teacher preparation courses are also regulated. The main bureaucratic functions available involve the regulation of the structure, content, teaching or assessment of a course; the assessment, evaluation or inspection of a course; and the control of the supply of places for preservice teachers. Given the evidence used to enforce regulatory control the focus of regulations dictate that teacher preparation maintain a practical orientation designed to facilitate the development of the skills and practices needed to en5g
effectively in classrooms. Generally, the regulation of teacher preparation relies upon the accrediting of courses based on the capacity to provide evidence that demonstrates that whatever regulations are applied have been or will be met by that course.

The contemporary approach to regulation across contexts has seen the development of a standards model for thinking about teachers and teaching. In this model, bureaucratic bodies, such as the education department and the regulator, work together to establish a set of regulations that establish standards for either teachers or teacher education courses or both. These standards are designed to ensure appropriate knowledge, skills and practices for teachers and that the processes and practices of teacher education would fulfil these expectations. They are usually designed to acknowledge the developmental nature of the process of becoming a teacher and to provide a clear starting point for working in the teaching profession. However, these standards can then be used to impose requirements on teacher education at both the preparation and the continuing education levels.

The standards model that has developed in most contexts also uses evidence-based processes to enforce compliance. Generally speaking, this involves the collection, organisation, analysis and reporting of evidence that standards have been met. This can involved both the course and the graduates from a course. For example, graduates may be required to provide evidence against graduate level professional standards when completing a course. This approach to standards is based on a compliance model designed to ensure that all courses and graduates conform with the regulations. In order to ensure compliance, the regulatory body is usually empowered with sanctioning powers that can be applied. For example, ratings that can affect the cultural and economic capital of a provider within the community might be published. Funding and student numbers can be cut or a course can be shut down completely. Sanctions are most effective when then pose a serious threat to the viability of a course or the institution and faculty involved.

The regulation of teacher education using a standards model, while preferable to some alternatives, also has some issues associated with it. While the standards approach to ensuring quality is not in itself problematic, the approach taken in the contemporary context is plagued by a number of issues relating to the nature of and means by which the standards are developed and enforced. Depending on the approach taken by the individuals involved with the regulator, this can and often does devolve into a checklist approach to attaining standards that loses sight of the bigger ideological picture for teacher preparation. This has the potential to stifle innovation in teacher preparation when standards specify certain processes or practices that then exclude alternatives. As such, the approach taken to the development and nature of the standards developed is important to maintaining a context that is open to creativity and innovation in the provision of teacher education.

Across contexts, the chief process used in the development of standards has involved stakeholder research. This involves the use of feedback from a range of participants involved in education through political, bureaucratic and educational contexts in making suggestions about, assessing and then approving of the standards. In this process teacher educators have only one voice amongst a multiplicity of perspectives and this has consequences for the way that the standards are worked out in practice.

Fundamentally, the use of stakeholder processes fails to provide a level of conceptualisation about the bigger ideological picture involved in the provision of teacher preparation. At one level, the use of a wide range of stakeholders creates a level of complexity through the inclusion of a multiplicity of standards that reflect the multiplicity of perspectives the stakeholders represent. This results in a
range of standards that are linked to the unique perspectives of various lobby groups some of which seem quite unusual in relation to the actual purposes of preparing for teaching. At another level, lobby groups or individuals that have been disaffected by educational processes and outcomes can have a negative impact of the development of standards. Complaints can and do drive the inclusion of some of the standards resulting in requirements based on a narrow point-of-view that is distanced from the real issues in both education generally and more specifically teacher preparation. The use of stakeholders also avoids engagement with empirical evidence that might be used to develop a reasoned and evidence platform for identifying productive practices in teacher preparation. This results in the accumulation of standards that can be used as a static checklist that holds teacher preparation in a pattern and avoids or discourages innovation. In effect, this approach to standards places limitations on teacher preparation as the specifications of some standards restrict practices to already established patterns whether there is evidence or their effectiveness or not. As such, standards are underpinned by departmental and regulatory bureaucratic perspectives, which may or may not reflect understandings of best practice as held by teacher educators.

As a consequence, this model has developed some resistance from both teacher educators and teachers themselves. The voice of teacher educators is minimised in the structures used to develop these types of standards and as such the expertise they hold is nested in the establishment of requirements for teaching and teacher preparation. This places burdens on teacher educators in relation to fulfilling regulatory requirements as well as doing that which is actually effective in the preparation of teachers. For teachers the imposition of particular practices in continuing professional development has the effect of developing resistance from teachers to this and other forms of continuing teacher education. The lack of connection between requirements and the teachers’ own needs is problematic. The results of the political regulation of teachers and teaching can quickly become counter-productive.

Despite the problems experienced by teacher educators in relation to bureaucratically driven standards, where information about the rating or ranking of teacher preparation courses has been released courses provided by higher education providers have been rated more highly than those offered through employment-based routes. It is, however, important to ensure that bureaucratic success is not equated with educational success in teacher preparation. Employment-based teacher preparation providers have been closing the gap. The checklist nature of the standards approach used to determine quality can be learnt and achieved without reference to the principles of higher education. At an ideological level, focussing on bureaucratic ratings denies the importance of the alternative perspectives on teacher preparation that underpin higher education provision. That is, the things that are measured as significant by the bureaucratic machinery are not necessarily important in determining high quality university-based teacher preparation. Using these bureaucratic measures as evidence for quality undermines the real quality of teacher preparation offered by higher education.

**Educational Influences on Teacher Education**

While the political agenda in education is undeniable, the need to moderate political influence by reference to educationally mediated perspectives is also strongly supported across contexts. It is readily acknowledged that both educational researchers and teacher educators alike have identified that contemporary political influences cannot merely be refuted; they must be countered by an educational approach to education and teacher education. That is, if educational practices are to be developed to meet the educational goals and needs of the community they will need to be grounded in an educational ideology that is fundamentally different from the ideological construct that
underpins the contemporary political agenda in education. This must go beyond the mere rejection of political approaches to meeting educational goals and needs to become a proactive agenda.

Educators working across a range of educational contexts and institutions bring educational perspectives and influences to the processes and practices of teacher education. In contrast to political and regulatory approaches brought to the table by political and bureaucratic participants, these perspectives are grounded in educational ideology that focuses its primary goal on making a difference to educational outcomes for students. Despite this commonly held goal, the educational ideas held by educational participants about its outworking are not consistent. There are significant variations in the perspectives held by different educators form different educational contexts that are reflected in the perspectives brought by educators in contributing as stakeholders in the development of standards. Educational perspectives are strongly influenced by position and experience within educational contexts. That is, educators that work in school-based contexts bring different perspectives to considerations of the processes and practices of teacher education from those proffered by educators working in higher education faculties.

Interestingly, the variations evident in educational perspectives do not just happen between educators operating in different contexts. Rather, even within the ranks of teacher educators working in higher education contexts the perspectives espoused can be inconsistent. These differences are not, however, necessarily linked to ideological commitments about education. This is exemplified in relation to the diversification of pathways into teaching. It has been found that it is possible to predict a teacher educator’s preferences about the most appropriate type of preparation course, either undergraduate or postgraduate, and the best length of that course on the basis of knowledge about the courses with which that educator is experienced. That is, most teacher educators will prefer one type of course over another on the basis of their personal experience in teaching a particular course without reference to the educational suitability of the model being used or empirical evidence to support it. In other words, a teacher educators experience in teacher preparation overrides longitudinal evidence, where it exists, about the effectiveness of various pathways into teaching.

The use of experience rather evidence facilitates a tendency for teacher educators and the courses they promote to retreat into a continuity of practice that is neither critical nor innovative. One area where this has been shown is in the preferences of teacher educators in relation to the lengthening of teacher preparation courses. In direct contradiction to comparative international reforms, the length of teacher preparation in New Zealand was shortened to a three-year course in the 1990s. When New Zealand’s three-year graduates are compared with Finland’s five-year graduates, the evidence demonstrates that the preparedness of graduates to deal with the rigors of full-time teaching on entry to the profession is remarkably similar despite the significant difference in the length and level of preparation provided. The evidence does not support the assumption that a lengthening of the course would make a significant difference to educational outcomes. Despite this, educational perspectives, promoted by teacher educators across all contexts, work on the assumption that a longer course would be better without consideration of the evidence. The use of experience-based assumptions that fail to engage critically with evidence serve to undermine the validity and believability of educational perspectives.

The influence of experience on the development of educational perspectives serves to illustrate the problem of bias and its influence on the impact of educational ideology. A core criticism that is levelled at educational perspectives relates to the divergence of seemingly contradictory perspectives. The
reliance on experience, rather than empirical data, in the formation of perspectives by educators across the range of sectors demonstrates the power of the need to maintain a hold, both individually and institutionally, on the role played in and by that context. As such, an over-reliance on the experience-base of the educator is present when considering how teacher education best serves the need to positively influence educational outcomes. The result is a range of educational perspectives that lack both empirical evidence and ideological consistency that are then used as validated stakeholder perspectives in the development of regulations for teachers and teacher education. As such, educational perspectives on the processes and practices of teacher preparation can be shown to be as problematic as political and regulatory perspectives. All perspectives, including educationally driven ones, are biased by the language, processes and practices used in their construction.

Despite the problems of divergence and bias, there are a number of very consistent ideas that form the foundations of contemporary educational perspectives about teacher education. Firstly, education, and by relationship teacher education, was identified as a complex activity that cannot be simplified. There are multiple contexts and factors that interact to influence the outcome of teaching, both in the moment and across the long-term of educational opportunity. The task of teaching involves continuous engagement in complex multi-faceted decision-making based on specialised knowledge of students, content and contexts. As such, the agenda in teacher education needs to acknowledge the complexity of teaching and of the processes and practices required to adequately prepare for teaching. Over-simplified solutions to the needs of preservice teachers in preparing to teach create unnecessary risks for those teachers and to the provision of quality education for all students.

Secondly, across all contexts there is evidence that shows that teacher preparation is a necessary precursor for both teacher effectiveness and longevity in the profession. Evidence that is garnered from educationally driven evaluations of teacher education processes endorses teacher preparation as an important foundational component of teachers’ ongoing professional learning that should be a prerequisite for all teachers prior to taking responsibility for a classroom. At a minimum, teacher preparation should combine learning across both theory and practice and provide opportunities to apply learning in school-based teaching experience. While this does not automatically exclude alternative pathways, regulatory processes should actively discourage those pathways that do not adequately and responsibly prepare teachers for the complexity of the rigors of teaching. As such, educational perspectives in all contexts support regulatory processes that lead to certification of preservice teachers after an appropriate period and form of preparation that includes professional experience.

Finally, the social nature of teaching is acknowledged across all contexts. It is universally acknowledged that education should engage teachers in a school community that works together to meet the socially motivated goal of equitable educational opportunities and outcomes for all students. As such, educational ideology encourages all participants in education to look beyond schools and teachers to take in a broader social agenda that targets a greater number of the circumstances and variables that impact upon educational equity. The outworking of this perspective in teacher education recognises that professional learning is a communal endeavour that is relevant across the professional lifespan of the teacher and embraces diversity and development for teachers. That is, the engagement of teachers in a community of inquiry is designed to break down the contemporary focus on the individual teacher as the key human capital in quality educational outcomes and make room for engagement with a broader social capital approach to attaining the goals of education.
Across all three of these key educational perspectives, the importance of empirical evidence as the basis for making an ideological claim is highlighted. The commitment to socially responsible teacher education that en5ges with the complexity of teaching in both initial and further teacher education is grounded in empirical evidence that they both make a difference in education. An analysis of research data from an educational perspective argues that teacher preparation and further education is significant to teacher quality and that teacher quality is significant, amongst a number of factors, to quality educational outcomes. Attempts to deny the positive impact of teacher education are a consequence of alternative approaches to the selection and interpretation of evidence that is supported by economically driven political ideology. Economically mediated analyses of the impact of teacher education reference data that is only indirectly related to the actions of teacher education. An example of this is the use of school student data in the assessment of the effectiveness of teacher preparation courses. The use of this type of secondary data in the assessment or evaluation of teacher education is problematic because of its failure to account for the myriad of other factors that impact student achievement data. It is therefore necessary to continue to identify means to articulate evidentiary empirical data that directly evaluates the impact of teacher education. This requires an evaluation of teacher education on the basis of the actual processes and practices of that teacher education.

Despite the evidence that teacher education does make a difference, it is also important that the limitations of university-based professional learning in making a difference to educational inequity are acknowledged. The use of educational perspectives to contextualise the impact of teachers within the broader context of the school and community contextualises the work of teacher education in the same way. While teacher educators across all contexts expressed a commitment to social justice and the improvement of the education system, they also recognised that they are not directly responsible for or en5ged in the processes and practices of schools. As such, the need to partner with the profession through en5gement in schools is fundamental to ensuring the effectiveness of teacher education and in particular in facilitating the professional learning of preservice teachers.

**The Role of Higher Education**

There are two means whereby higher education contributes to education and the professional learning or development of teachers. These are through the provision of teacher education and the undertaking of educational research. Across all contexts, teacher education was defined as en5gement in a higher education course that contributed to the professional learning of teachers and is differentiated from other forms of professional development that do not lead to a higher education qualification. The provision of teacher education is then further separated into initial teacher education, often called teacher preparation, and further or continuing teacher education. The academic distinction between these two aspects of teacher education is maintained in order to distinguish between the two different purposes they serve in the professional life of teachers. As in, en5gement in educational research was identified across all contexts as a key point of contribution made to the processes, practices and development of education by higher education. Educational research undertaken by educators with the support of higher education using recognised research processes and practices results in valid and reliable uses of empirical data that contribute to the development of educational perspectives on issues in education. That is, educational research mediated through the higher education contributes to the development of educational ideology designed to counter the dominant political agendas in both education and teacher education.
In relation to the processes and practices of teacher education, there are four key concepts that have emerged to influence the development of that education. These relate to the length, level, role and exclusivity of teacher education for both the initial and continuing professional learning of teachers. Two key educational ideals upheld across all contexts included in this study are that the teaching profession should become a graduate profession and that engagement in teacher education beyond the preparation phase is needed. While in some contexts this has seen the development of graduate-level initial qualifications, other jurisdictions have distinguished between undergraduate preparation for and postgraduate continuing development in teaching. That is, different processes and practices in different contexts have emerged in response to the same ideological commitment.

Variation in the processes and practices of teacher education is exemplified in the length, level and exclusivity of initial teacher education. Educational ideology about the role of teacher education in New Zealand motivated a reduction in the length of its teacher preparation courses in the 1990s and the continuation of undergraduate initial teacher education despite the international trend towards longer graduate-level preparation courses. At the time, this reduction was driven by teacher educators and not, as might be expected, the political need for economically efficient preparation. It was motivated by recognition that there is a limitation to the actual learning that can take place prior to sustained experience in teaching and that high obstacles at the preparation phase was not necessarily serving the needs of the profession or of potential teachers. This then creates space for teachers to engage in graduate-level studies as continuing teacher education beyond the preparation phase. Since teacher preparation in this context does not have to be pitched at a graduate level it is also possible to open up the possibilities of alternative pathways into the profession without reducing the significance or impact of teacher education and high-level academic study. Interestingly, these practices have built a conception of teacher education within New Zealand that is encouraging of a broader approach to both teacher preparation and teacher education than is currently present in many other contexts.

The capacity to construct alternative conceptions of teacher education from the same ideological foundations demonstrates the presence of internal political influences in higher education. On one level political influence in higher education is the product of the nature of different types of institutions that serve different purposes, while at the same time all institutions have to engage with the political issues of economic viability. Across most contexts there are different types of higher education institutions providing different types of initial and continuing teacher education courses for a range of purposes. This includes different tiers of higher education as well as private institutions. For example, in a number of contexts there are lower tiered institutions providing teacher preparation at an undergraduate level while preparation at a postgraduate level is offered at a higher tier of university. These differences, which are reinforced and motivated by institutional rather than educational factors, result in variations to the entry requirements, types of preparation, levels of cooperation with school contexts, and outcomes for preservice teachers. While this has implications for the educational opportunities and outcomes for students engaged in the various institutions it also impacts the professional practices of teacher educators.

The external pressure to develop teaching as a graduate profession translates into internal pressure on teacher educators to complete higher degree studies themselves. Though there is strong motivation for institutions to encourage and support teacher educators, economic realities influence the nature of the support available in various institutions. The use of economic and business models in the processes and practices of higher education is not limited to the professional development of the teacher education workforce. Rather, economic factors are critical across all aspects of the work.
of faculties and provision of courses. Institutions are supportive of economically viable programs and faculties and there is pressure for leaders to ensure that all available sources of income are accessed. This creates internal political pressure to develop a broader perspective of education beyond preparation for the classroom in order to increase potential clientele and thereby increase income. While these ideas have some credence in relation to educational perspectives, it is important to note that even within educational contexts educational ideas are not entirely bereft of political influence.

Ultimately, the viability of teacher education, and its faculties and courses, is contingent upon its capacity to make an effective contribution to teachers and the teaching profession. For initial teacher education this necessitates a greater level of engagement between higher education and school contexts in order to facilitate the sustained professional practice required to adequately prepare for teaching. Then, for further teacher education it requires a greater level of engagement in professional development and the development of credible practice-embedded qualifications. That is, teacher education needs to be capable of playing a significant role in the professional development and promotion of teachers with teaching and learning expertise and not just into administrative roles.