Leading Collaborative Professional Enquiry: Implications for Teachers, Chartered Teachers and their Managers

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education

The Stirling Institute of Education
University of Stirling

Alison Fox
October 2009

Index

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank the people who have ensured the completion of this thesis:

Professor Julie Allan, my supervisor, who knew exactly when to look disappointed and when to encourage; and whose patience, enthusiasm, wisdom and wicked sense of humour saw me to the end and enriched the process.

Ian Fox, my husband, who was and is endlessly encouraging and who provided space for me to indulge myself in these studies by moving to a new job in the Outer Hebrides half way through. In writing this I only now realise that there may be a connection! However in so doing, we have gained a wonderful 'other' life and a space where writing is a pleasure. I must also note his forbearance as he has endured my monologues on long beach walks as I shared new understandings, whether he liked it or not.

My 85 year old mother, Ena Sim, who has constantly reminded me that she wants to be at my graduation and that I would need to get a move on. As I write this it is looking hopeful that she will be there. And my father, Jim Sim, who has encouraged me to seek out knowledge since I was very little and who looks like he will be at the graduation too.

Robbie and Helen Fox, my grown-up children, to whom I have modelled continuous learning throughout their lives. That they have chosen a more hedonistic, active and seasonal lifestyle in the Alps and the Mediterranean, I only envy and admire.

My colleagues at The Stirling Institute of Education who have supported, challenged, and believed in me. In particular I would like to thank Peter Cope, Valerie Drew, Richard Edwards, Morag Redford and Jenny Reeves who all offered special levels of support at different times and in different ways.

Last but by no means least, I must thank the Chartered Teachers who are central to this story, and who have been inspirational. I would also like to thank their colleagues and managers for their participation in this research and for all the insights that they offered.

Alison Fox
August 2009

Abstract

This research explores the implications of the practice of collaborative professional enquiry on professional re-formation and development. A series of case studies focuses on four aspiring Chartered Teachers as they lead collaborative enquiries in two schools. The case studies take account of the experiences of the teachers in the collaborative groups, as well as the managers in both schools.

Using a Foucauldian theoretical framework, relations of power between all participants are explored. This reveals that active positioning is in operation. The Chartered Teachers are positioned in an 'in-between' space: neither teacher nor manager, and this appears to have allowed them to construct and negotiate new possibilities, contributing to their developing professional identities. While this challenged the established hierarchies in schools, the teachers reported that undertaking collaborative professional enquiry under the leadership of the Chartered Teachers, benefitted themselves and their pupils, appearing to offer opportunities to demonstrate an active professionalism which was in contrast to the expectations of their managers.

The findings raise several issues for consideration by the profession. These include a recommendation that collaborative professional enquiry is encouraged as a core pedagogical resource. The research also highlights the need for policy makers to take account of the way power is exercised in and on schools when developing new policies and evaluating the success of current ones. It is argued that genuine and open dialogue is necessary and it is recommended that the national CPD framework should reconsider the current practice of supporting distinctive pathways within the profession.

Chapter One: The Study: Context and Purpose

Introduction

This research involves a series of case studies which follow the stories of four aspiring

Chartered Teachers, who were undertaking a Masters programme leading to Chartered

Teacher (CT) status. The case studies focus on the CTs as they each attempted to initiate,

facilitate, evaluate and reflect upon collaborative professional enquiries undertaken with

their colleagues in two different settings, one primary school and one secondary school.

The initial intention was to explore the contribution that collaborative professional

enquiry (CPE) made to learning in schools, however as the stories unfolded it became an

exploration of collaborative practice itself, focusing on the exercise of power on and by

all the participants. The focus therefore changed to exploring what CPE offered in

relation to professional development, looking particularly at its impact on relationships

within the two schools. The specific research questions which it set out to answer were:

1. What is CPE as framed by the *Standard for Chartered Teacher*?

2. How is CPE experienced and put into practice?

3. What does the practice of CPE offer in relation to professional re-formation and
   development?

The study is set in Scotland, in the early days after the introduction of professional

Standards for teachers and headteachers (GTCS, 2002; GTCS, 2006; SEED, 2005), the

introduction of Chartered Teacher status and of major changes to teachers' pay and

conditions. These innovations and changes were a result of *A Teaching Profession for*

the 21st Century: Agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone

Report (SEED, 2001), to be called the *McCrone Agreement* hereafter. All of these

challenged current orthodoxies in relation to teacher professionalism, and had direct

impact on my work within the continuing professional development (CPD) programmes

at The Stirling Institute of Education (TSIoE) at the University of Stirling, where I teach.

The policy context, which informed practice in schools, involved discourses which

presented collaborative and collegial work practices as highly desirable. At the same

time, action research continued to be an accepted developmental activity amongst

professionals in a number of spheres (*e.g.* Elliot, 1991; Carr, 1995; Somekh, 2006) and

was also actively encouraged by the policy makers (GTCS, 2002). Collaborative

professional enquiry, a form of action research, was the CPD team's response to these

policy imperatives, and so it formed an integral element of the work undertaken by

teachers on professionally accredited CPD programmes at TSIoE. A main underlying

aim of this research was therefore to explore the impact of the practice of CPE on

teachers, Chartered Teachers and their managers, in order to contribute to the evaluation

and review of the pedagogical principles underpinning the programmes.

My place in the research

My involvement as both tutor and researcher makes complete objectivity an

impossibility. I was professionally committed to CPE and to the teachers as students, so

it could be said that it would be in my interest to show that CPE was a valuable activity

and had much to offer professional re-formation and development. However, I undertook

this research with sincere intentions. The research questions represented an honest quest:

a professional enquiry of my own to discover if the practices and activities associated with CPE, encouraged and legitimated by both the academy and current policy discourse, were worth doing in the interests of teachers and pupils in schools.

The focus of my investigation and how I went about it were inevitably influenced by my own personal and professional life history and the stances and viewpoints that I privilege. Mezirow (2000) believes points of view to be one of two dimensions of a frame of reference, the other being a habit of mind. He states that "a habit of mind is a set of assumptions – broad, generalising, orienting dispositions that act as a filter for interpreting the meaning of experience" (p.17) and that one's habit of mind "becomes expressed as a point of view" (p.18). He suggests that:

> a point of view comprises of meaning schemes – sets of specific expectations, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and judgments – that tacitly direct and shape a specific interpretation and determine how we judge, typify objects, and attribute causality. Meaning schemes commonly operate outside of awareness (p.18).

I have attempted to be aware of these meaning schemes in my analysis, though Richardson (2003) highlights further difficulties when trying to articulate these in the written form. From a postmodernist perspective she notes:

> that writing is always partial, local, and situational, and that our Self is always present, no matter how much we try to suppress it – but only partially present, for in our writing we repress parts of ourselves too (p.511).

So rather than attempting to suppress 'my Self' I have attempted to make clear the links between my own points of view and the ways in which I interpreted what I saw and heard. I have also made an effort to surface 'the parts' that are repressed in the interest of transparency, though acknowledge my limitations in this regard.

I therefore offer a brief synopsis of my professional and personal history in order to offer some insight into the underlying reasons that I have chosen to do what I have done. It may also offer an insight into the particular way that I have developed the theoretical framework which supports this research.

From school teacher to academic

As an undergraduate student I benefitted from the last few years of the career of a Professor of Psychology, Ralph Pickford, who was immersed in the psychotherapeutic work of Freud, and the humanist school of psychology pioneered by Carl Rogers. I was captivated by his stories and his insights, and was inspired towards a career working with children with barriers to learning and development. When he retired he was replaced by a cognitive, positivist psychologist and a very strong message was delivered that what had gone before was no longer valued or indeed valid. I also studied sociology at a time when lecturers were first able to proclaim that they were 'glad to be gay' and feminism became mainstream with the publication of Germaine Greer's Female Eunuch (1970). So I entered the world of work with some mixed messages, unformed viewpoints but with great enthusiasm.

I began teaching in a mainstream primary school where I learned nothing to question my belief in the humanist school of psychology. I worked with a Headteacher who was creative, innovative and encouraged autonomy in her staff and while I do not claim that these were halcyon days, the early years of my career were experienced as a time when I

was encouraged to use my professional judgement and take risks.   My early life as a teacher was unencumbered by national curricular guidelines and targets.

I then went on to work as a teacher in the Department of Child and Family Psychiatry in Glasgow which was led by Professor Frederick Stone, a psychiatrist influenced by the work of the psychoanalyst John Bowlby. Professor Stone was a man with great personal and professional authority, and although there were psychiatrists in the department who were cognitive-behaviourists, his psychoanalytical approach was dominant and my beliefs and understandings of the world were re-affirmed, and consequently I felt professionally and personally valued in that multi-professional setting.

Fast-forward twenty years of living and working in a variety of settings, during and in the aftermath of Thatcher's time in office as both Education Minister and Prime Minister, to my life as a Headteacher. By this time education had become a targets-driven pursuit, which was informed by a model of accountability that focused on narrow areas of measurable attainment. As Headteacher I had the authority and the responsibility to ensure that the culture and ethos of the school was one in which learning could flourish but I no longer felt that my way of doing things, informed by my deeply held values and belief system, was valued by those in authority. Talk was all of hard evidence, of raised attainment, reduced exclusions, increased attendance, and all these outcomes had to be delivered as soon as possible. I did not know of any easy, quick and honest ways of achieving these outcomes, especially if improvement was to be maintained but my managers were not interested in more long term, sustainable approaches to improvement.

The clash of values between my employer and myself led me to apply for a job in Higher Education (HE), an environment which I associated at that time with greater agency, and more autonomy of thought and action. And thus I began my life as a teacher educator, working in particular with teachers undertaking continuing professional development courses.

My values and beliefs clearly informed my understanding of CPD in its various forms and the way in which I performed the role of 'adult educator' in the early stages. My theories of learning had developed through my experiences to date, and were largely unarticulated until reading for and reflecting on this new role in HE led me to consider in some detail the kind of teacher I was and wanted to be. I came to understand myself as a teacher with a socio-cultural perspective; who believed in a social-constructivist theory of learning (Vygotsky, 1978); who continued to be influenced by Rogers' person-centred analysis of learning in that my interest lies not with instruction but in "the facilitation of change and learning" (Rogers and Freiberg, 1994, p.152) and who believed in participatory, democratic relationships in classrooms and schools leading to transformational learning (Mezirow, 2000). My work was therefore influenced deeply by these professional values and beliefs, which were supported by the growing number of writers and educators who critiqued the recent focus on accountability and attainment (*e.g.* Ball, 2003) and who believed that social justice and democracy needed to be re-established as vital elements of life in schools (*e.g.* Sergiovanni, 1994; Hargreaves, 2003). My interest in these areas was further strengthened by a report from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development on the quality and equity of

schooling in Scotland which reported that despite Scotland performing "at a consistently very high standard in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)" (OECD, 2007, p.14), socio-economic status is still the greatest factor in educational success for young people. The gap between the attainment and achievement of the rich and the poor was clearly evident and therefore it seemed that the focus on performativity over the last decade had not benefitted all pupils and therefore change was necessary in our schools.

The Professional Enquiry programme

The design of the Master of Education Professional Enquiry in Education programme (http://www.ioe.stir.ac.uk/) which leads to Chartered Teacher status is pertinent to this research. The development of the programme was based upon a particular ideology of professional education, and a commitment to practice-focused learning. It was informed by a number of theories and assumptions, with the work of Eraut (1994) being central.   It was also informed by what was learned from the experience of developing and engaging with the Scottish Qualification for Headship programme (Reeves and Forde, 2004; Menter *et al.,* 2005; Reeves *et al.,* 2005).   Over a decade ago, Eraut (1994) critiqued the state of CPD, claiming that little was known about what was learned when teachers undertook CPD. He noted then that Higher Education had an uncomfortable relationship with professional education, suggesting that it favoured a knowledge-base which was "segmented and framed in technical/scientific rather than practical terms, rendering the nature of professional knowledge highly problematic for aspiring professionals" (p.10). Elliot (1991) also comments that there are "hidden forms of control…exercised over

teachers' practical thinking" (p.27) by academic change agents. Kemmis (in Carr, 1995) goes further when considering the historical relationship between theory and practice. He notes:

> Knowledge was increasingly seen as a source of power - indeed, as Foucault points out, the division of labour between the scientists (whose task it is to know), the representatives of the state (whose task it is to make decisions) and the general public (the object of knowledge and decisions) is a relationship of power (or 'power/knowledge') (in Carr, 1995, p.9).

The construction of professional enquiry within all of the CPD programmes at TSIoE was a direct and deliberate attempt to counter these very concerns, with the focus on professional knowledge creation within practice (Reeves and Fox, 2008) by the teachers themselves.

Eraut (1994) looks at continuing professional development from a "knowledge-use" perspective, saying "the process of using knowledge transforms that knowledge so that it is no longer the same knowledge" (p.25). He argues that "higher education should aim to enhance the knowledge creation and utilization capacities of individual professionals and professional communities in general" (p.41). This encapsulates one of the principles of the Professional Enquiry programme: that professional enquiry in school leads to knowledge creation. He goes on to identify three different contexts for using and therefore creating knowledge about education in relation to CPD: the academic context, the school context and the classroom context, and comments that there can be limited transference of knowledge between these three sites. This is an issue that was consciously addressed within the design of the Professional Enquiry programme, and is intrinsic to the work done by students when undertaking professional enquiry. The programme was designed to be coherent and progressive with students firstly being

supported through a classroom enquiry, investigating an area of their own practice in the privacy of their own classroom context. Buchanan and Redford (2008, p.37) offer a clear description of the processes involved in classroom-based professional enquiry and suggest that "the three-stage process of professional enquiry – preparing, intervening and sense-making – offers teachers access to powerful techniques for bringing about changes in learning and teaching in their classrooms".

Back in the academic context students reflect on their classroom enquiry and study the issues around collaborative practice in schools before being asked to lead colleagues through the same process, thus undertaking a collaborative professional enquiry. This spiral and iterative programme design was intended to address the issue of transference highlighted by Eraut (1994) so that CPE involves teachers' use of knowledge gained in each of the contexts. Knowledge gained in the academic context is used and developed within the classroom context, and this new knowledge is then used and developed within the whole school context with others. Our early experience of supporting teachers as they put this into practice suggests the complex and political nature of CPE and this research attempts to shed light on some of these complexities.

Terminology

As professional enquiry and action research are not differentiated or defined within the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (SCT) (GTCS, 2002) it is not clear how they are understood by the policy makers, and whether they are perceived as being the same or different. Due to the lack of differentiation, I have made the presumption that the policy

makers use the terms interchangeably. Sachs (2003, p.77) outlines this same dilemma in

relation to research undertaken in classrooms by teachers, observing that it has "variously

come under the banner of 'teacher research', 'practitioner research', 'collaborative

enquiry' or 'action research'". She goes on to note that she generally uses the term

"'teacher research' for the sake of simplicity and clarity" (p.77).   I choose to use the term

'professional enquiry' both because the phrase is encompassed in the name of the degree

programme, and also because I believe it describes better the nature of the action

undertaken within the SCT and fits better with my own interpretation, outlined below.

Defining collaborative professional enquiry

The practice of collaborative professional enquiry, as operationalised within this research,

was developed by the CPD team at The Stirling Institute of Education in response to the

professional actions outlined in the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002). This

construction of CPE was developed collaboratively. It was informed by the individual

interpretations, educational values and theoretical frameworks of the tutors involved, in

association with local authority partners and students, in particular those who took part in

the pilot of the programme. At the outset of this study, the team was still discussing,

arguing, teaching, learning and continually revising its understanding of CPE and had not

yet articulated this in any formal sense. As I needed a 'working definition' of CPE at the

outset of this study, I came up with the following:

> Collaborative professional enquiry is an enquiry into an area of joint professional
> concern and/or interest, undertaken by more than one colleague within a work
> setting or settings, which focuses on assessment and intervention to effect
> progress in pupils' learning. Evidence is gathered and evaluated to demonstrate
> this process, and its product.

It is designed to contribute to the professional development of those who engage in it, and therefore is a collegial affair which takes place amongst colleagues for the benefit of the whole school community, enabling teachers to co-construct a bank of knowledge, which becomes an evidence base about their own practice and the business of effective learning and teaching.

A distinguishing feature of CPE, as we are constructing it, is that it is initiated and led by the teachers themselves and while it is likely to be consistent with the school development or improvement plan and supported by managers within the school, they do not drive it.

My first attempt was discussed with the Chartered Teachers who participated in the study and some small adjustments were made, and it was this 'definition' that was used throughout this research. In the meantime, the tutor team at TSIoE continued to refine, define and redefine its understanding and a tentative definition was articulated by I'Anson *et al.* (2008, p.73):

For us professional enquiry operates at a series of levels each of which is interdependent with both of the others. It can be conceived in three broad senses:

- Firstly, it can be understood in technical terms, as an identifiable series of events driven by a dialogic engagement between enquirers and contexts of enquiry. In this sense professional enquiries occur when practitioners identify problems in practice, trial solutions and incorporate what they judge to be beneficial strategies as part of their professional repertoire.

- Secondly, in part following on from the first sense, it can mean an orientation to practice, a professional disposition, a way of being a practitioner. In this sense it consists of enacting a professional duty to seek to increase the good of the practice you are engaged in. Within these terms, questioning, discussing and seeking ways to improve practice become an ethical and a political obligation.

- Thirdly, if we believe professional growth and development to be a socio-cultural phenomenon, professional enquiry has to be understood as a collective and interactive process. In the long run, whether it is instigated by individuals or by groups, enquiry can only lead to sustainable professional growth if questions are asked and responded to in the context of joint practice within and across various spaces of activity within the education service.

While I make no direct use of this definition with the participants in the research, its development and the sentiment behind it are central to my own understanding. I'Anson *et al.* comment that "professional enquiry is about exercising the power to change … It is about changing frameworks and disrupting custom. It is inherently dynamic and unstable in socio-cultural terms" (p.75). My research builds on this understanding and it is expected that the findings will contribute to its further development.

The structure of the thesis

In chapter two I discuss the relevance and importance of this research at this particular time in Scottish education. In considering the policy context in detail, I question some of the underlying assumptions and intentions which appear to construct teachers, Chartered Teachers and Headteachers in particular ways, and which impact on the experience of leading and participating in collaborative professional enquiry. I also consider the tensions that appear to exist between the competing discourses of accountability and teacher leadership, and the impact this has on the developing role of the Chartered Teacher.

Chapter three then considers the literature which has informed my thinking. In particular I consider the literature on professionalism, professional practice, identity and socialisation to explore what is known about the formation and re-formation of professional identities. This brings to light the deeply embedded social, historical and political influences which constrain and control the ways that professional practice is constructed and which work to ensure that asymmetric relations of power are protected

and maintained. My literature review led me into Foucauldian territory, described in chapter four, where I outline the theoretical and methodological framework which underpins this research. Chapters five, six and seven form the body of this work, in that it is there that I analyse the data looking at the ways that participants in CPE are positioned by policy and socialisation, the effect of that positioning and despite, or maybe because of, those effects, the contribution that CPE made in these two schools.

Finally in chapter eight I reflect on the research, revisiting some of the decisions made in the process. I consider the impact of my findings on my own practice, and the consequent implications for the teachers with whom I work. I also offer, with a little diffidence, a number of recommendations for the profession. I am aware that some of the messages which emanate from this research will not be comfortable to hear, nor easy to assimilate into practice. I hope however that my findings offer hope and succour to those teachers, aspiring Chartered Teachers and school leaders who want things to be different and who are looking to re-form their own practice and that of others.

Chapter Two: Policy Context

> Policy is as much a mindset as a set of texts. It is recognised as an expectation, and even an imperative, as much as it exists in written form. It is presented as rational, coherent, explicit, yet it is 'unscientific and irrational' (Ball, 1990, p3) and is certainly opaque. Furthermore, its inherently political nature is downplayed, as is the way in which teachers, children and others are constructed *through* policy… (Allan, 2006, p.53, *original emphasis*).

This study is particularly relevant at this time as it comes when there is heightened interest in teacher professionalism and teacher professional development, in the wake of the *McCrone Agreement* of 2001. It also emerges when there is a strong political imperative focussing on educational leadership, where headteachers are positioned as "the leading professional in a school and as an officer of the local authority" (SEED, 2005, p.2). Both policy and literature has a strong paternalistic twist (Harris and Muijs, 2005), as there is an assumption throughout that teachers need leaders who will 'harness' (Fullan, 1993) their capacity to collaborate. Harris and Muijs (2005) go on to note that these collaborative working practices will involve "redefinition, relocation and reconceptualization of leadership within and between schools" (2005, p.3). They will also involve 'the redefinition, relocation and reconceptualization' of teachers. This chapter will outline the 'inherently political' policy context which has seen the emergence of Chartered Teachers and within which they will enact the professional actions expected of them in the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002).

The policy context in Scotland

Kirk *et al.* (2003) outline the genesis of the Chartered Teacher grade in a policy trail leading from a report from the *National Committee for the Inservice Training of Teachers*

(1979) to the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001). *The McCrone Report, A Teaching Profession for the 21ˢᵗ Century* (SEED, 2000), which informed the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) first named the CT grade, though the development of a national framework for CPD was recommended in the *Sutherland Report on Teacher Education* (1997) and taken forward by the Scottish Office Education and Industry Department when they published a consultation paper (SOEID, 1998). In this paper, they linked such a framework with improvements in learning and teaching and thus pupil attainment. As a result of the consultation process of 1998:

> SEED published an invitation to tender (ITT) "for the development of a framework for the continuing professional development of teacher: expert teacher standard and associated work". The framework envisaged in the ITT consisted of three standards beyond initial teacher education: The Standard for Full Registration (SFR, to be developed by the General Teaching Council for Scotland), Expert Teacher Standard (ETS, to be developed by the contractor) and Standard for Headship (already in place) (Kirk *et al*. 2003, p.4-5).

This invitation to tender pre-dates the *McCrone Report*, but there seem to be clear links between the two. When McCrone reported in 2000, there had been a name change in that the Committee recommended the introduction of the Chartered rather than Expert Teacher grade, and in addition the establishment of an Advanced CT status.

The subsequent *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) was the work of an Implementation Group, made up of representatives from teacher organisations, employers and the Scottish Executive. They were tasked with examining the recommendations of the *McCrone Report* (SEED, 2000), considering the implications of their implementation, agreeing key principles to underpin next steps and "to make recommendations to the three stakeholders (employers, teacher organisations and the Scottish Executive) on these and any related

matters" (SEED, 2001, p.3). The *Agreement* was heralded as the culmination of a process that planned "to build a confident and highly regarded teaching profession" (p.2), and intended to increase the standing of the teaching profession within Scotland.

It is interesting that the *McCrone Agreement* clearly supported the introduction of the CT grade but saw the disappearance of Advanced CT status. Kirk *et al.* (2003) note that within the *McCrone Report* the implication was that CTs "would not be expected to take on any additional management responsibility beyond that of a main grade teacher" (p.6) while the Advanced CT "would be expected to have an impact on their colleagues" and would become a "resource for the nation as well as for their schools and local authorities" (p.6). When the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* was published in 2002 the proposed role of CTs appeared to embrace suggested elements of the Advanced CT role as envisaged in the *McCrone Report.*

Having looked at the background to the *McCrone Report* it is important to take heed of Humes (2003) who reminds us that there is a "need to dig beneath the surface of official statements about the origins and intentions of particular policies, and the justifications which are offered for their introduction" (p.75). The Implementation Group made some of this explicit as they highlighted their "shared agreement on a number of critical areas" (SEED, 2001, p.3), which were as follows:

- The central role teachers play in the quality and effectiveness of learning in school and the importance of the critical relationship between teacher and pupil
- Appreciation that teachers are committed and talented professionals who aim to develop and realise the potential of every child
- That this important work is critically carried out within the framework of social inclusion which seeks to engage every child in learning and personal development

to secure achievement and the promotion of confidence and ambition in all our young people
- An understanding that the current conditions of service for teachers were no longer fully able to support and develop the profession
- A recognition that this was a unique opportunity to address the question of teachers' esteem, professional autonomy and public accountability in a way which would enhance the capacity of school education to meet the challenges of the 21st Century (p.3).

It is useful to consider the critical areas on which the Implementation Group had 'shared agreement' with reference to one established model of professionalism as this may tell us something about the notion of professionalism that lies behind the *McCrone Agreement.* This in turn may give clues to the intentions and justifications for the policy. Eraut (1994), in his influential work *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*, notes that "most accounts of the ideology of professionalism follow the functionalist models … which accord primacy of place to the professional knowledge base" (p.1). Within the *Agreement* (SEED, 2001) the duties of teachers and CTs are outlined in Annex B, and are not differentiated. One of these duties is that they will undertake "appropriate and agreed continuing professional development" (p.25) thus continually developing their professional knowledge base. The underpinning principles of the Implementation Group do not necessarily suggest that a professional knowledge base is accorded "primacy of place" (Eraut, 1994, p.1), though the introduction of a CT grade that is gained by qualification at Masters level certainly suggests that a professional knowledge base is highly valued.   The focus within the *Agreement* is, instead, on the quality of the relationship between teacher and learner.

Eraut (1994) goes on to quote Rueschemeyer (1983) who describes the central assumption of the functional model of professionalism:

> Individually and, in association, collectively, the professionals 'strike a bargain with society' in which they exchange competence and integrity against the trust of client and community, relative freedom from lay supervision and interference, protection against unqualified competition as well as substantial remuneration and higher social status (in Eraut, 1994, p.2).

An assumption of competence and integrity is clearly implicit in the values that underpin the *McCrone Agreement* in that teachers are presumed to be "committed and talented professionals who aim to develop and realise the potential of every child" and who seek "to engage every child in learning and personal development to secure achievement and the promotion of confidence and ambition in all our young people" (SEED, 2001, p.3).

Other parts of Rueschemeyer's construction of professionalism seem to underpin the *McCrone Agreement*.   A stated aim of the *McCrone Report* (SEED, 2000) and the subsequent *Agreement* (SEED, 2001) was to enhance the status of teachers, and review their pay and conditions. Also professional teachers in Scotland are protected from unqualified competition as, since 1965, all teachers working in the compulsory sector have had to be registered with the General Teaching Council for Scotland.

The Implementation Group's assumptions regarding the notion of "relative freedom from lay supervision and interference" (Rueschemeyer, 1983 cited in Eraut, 1994, p.2) are less clear. They say that they want to take this:

> unique opportunity to address the question of teachers' esteem, professional autonomy and public accountability in a way which would enhance the capacity of school education to meet the challenges of the 21st Century (SEED, 2001, p.3).

It is interesting that they perceive teachers' esteem, professional autonomy and public accountability as one question, but whilst accepting that they are all linked the

Implementation Group do not at this stage make it clear *which* particular way they plan to address this question.

I was a headteacher when I read the *McCrone Agreement* for the first time in January 2001 and my own assumptions, built on my personal political ideology, the political climate at the time and my cumulative professional experience, led me to believe that teachers' esteem would only be enhanced if teachers were freed from the prevailing managerial culture and that their professional autonomy was assured by the valuing of professional judgement and the freeing of some of the more recently imposed curricular restraints. Public accountability as enacted in the form of school league tables, published school inspection reports etc. was at that time leading teachers as a profession away from Rueschemeyer's notion of "relative freedom from lay supervision and interference" (1983, p.31 cited in Eraut, 1994, p.2). Eraut (1994) elaborates when he explains that the "argument for relative freedom from interference is based on unique expertise, moral integrity, confidentially and protection from political abuse" (p.2). My experience as a Primary Headteacher was that my professional practice was relatively free from lay supervision and interference, and was protected from political abuse so long as it was in accordance with the prevailing values and political will of my paymaster, the Local Authority. The *McCrone Agreement*, while acknowledging the need to address these questions, does not explicitly refer to solutions. Scott (2000) notes that policy documents are:

> always underpinned by an ideological framework; that is, the text itself, explicitly or implicitly, offers a viewpoint about the nature of knowledge, forms of child development, teaching and learning, and organisational issues which relate to these (p.19).

So what was unsaid in the *McCrone Agreement* regarding the way in which "the question of teachers' esteem, professional autonomy and public accountability" (SEED, 2001, p.3*)* would be addressed, has perhaps more relevance to the discussion of teacher professionalism than all that was said.

It would seem therefore that the rhetoric of current policy places the teacher squarely within the realm of the professional: teaching is seen as a profession not an occupation. While the Implementation Group's notion of professionalism is not entirely clear, it seems to be partially based on the functionalist model as described by Eraut (1994), in its commitment to professional development, qualification leading to chartered status, higher social status for the profession, substantial remuneration and its stated belief in the importance of the critical relationship between teacher and pupil, which carries an assumption of competence and integrity.

The role of the Chartered Teacher

It is important to note that as the status of Chartered Teacher was introduced in 2001 this research has taken place at an early stage of its development. As already stated Annex B of the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) did not differentiate between the role of the teacher and the Chartered Teacher and there was, and continues to be confusion around what that role actually involves. While the teaching profession soundly endorsed the *McCrone Agreement*, there were elements of it which were under-developed when accepted and since then have engaged the whole profession in discussion and debate.

In relation to the Chartered Teacher grade, for example, the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002) was not published until the year after the *McCrone Agreement*. Only then were teachers offered a clear statement of the expected professional actions of a Chartered Teacher, and by implication how the policy makers wished to construct them. A further three years later the National CPD Team produced a paper entitled *The Contribution of Chartered Teachers: Advice and Guidance* (LTS, 2005). It restated the underlying principle that "Chartered teachers will not be asked to undertake a management role" (p.2). The *Standard* (GTCS, 2002) however states that Chartered Teachers will have "a leading impact on team and school development" (p.6); that they should work "as a leading member of a team, inside and outside the classroom, to share good practice, improve teaching and learning and develop resources for use in the school" (p.11) and that they should take "the initiative in enhancing the work of the school and leading its effective implementation" (p.11).

There has been much confusion around this principle focussed on the ongoing discussion within the profession of the difference, if any, between management and leadership. This area of tension and confusion was acknowledged in the *Report of the Chartered Teacher Review Group* (Scottish Government, 2008), which stated that:

> The contribution that a CT can or should make to the wider school improvement agenda has not been made explicitly clear. The McCrone Report did expect that CTs would act as role models for junior colleagues and offer a wide contribution to the school on learning and teaching while being a resource for the school and wider local authority. What is clear is that CTs will not have any additional management burden to that experienced by a teacher at the top of the main grade (p.6).

Clarity on this issue is requested as one of the report's recommendations, with the onus being put on headteachers to "discuss and agree with CTs … the duties that they should perform" (p.14). This should certainly offer much food for thought and fodder for discussion as it offers staff in schools a real platform to take forward the notion of teacher leadership (Harris and Muijs, 2005), which is currently being encouraged by policy makers and is reflected in the foreword of a recent HMIe document, *Leadership for Learning* (HMIe, 2007b). The Senior Chief Inspector of the time confirmed the Inspectorate's support for leadership at all levels:

> Developing leadership is not just about honing the skills of the most senior positions, important though that undoubtedly is. It is also about releasing the energies of every member of staff and every learner and about giving each of them a sense that their contributions are valued … A desire to take responsibility and to accept accountability is part of good leadership. Ultimate accountability rests with the person at the head of the formal structure but all members of staff must be committed to and feel accountable for their own development and performance (p.*v*).

The *Report of the Chartered Teacher Review Group* (SG, 2008) highlighted another area of the original CT scheme which has caused difficulty. The notion that teachers self select to enter the CT programme, without necessarily informing their managers let alone gaining affirmation, has been extremely contentious in educational circles. The recommendations of the review group do not suggest any great change in this beyond suggesting that "A teacher who embarks on the CT scheme should inform their Headteacher of this" (p.15). This issue strikes at the heart of the hierarchical structures that exist but the teachers' unions have fought long and hard to ensure that this principle

remains. The review group offers two further recommendations which are, perhaps,

designed to subvert the perceived loss of control and power of self-selection:

> Recommendation 7: The Scottish Government should take steps to routinely
> capture information on the impact of CTs in school. This should cover impact in
> its broadest possible terms and include the views of colleagues, pupils and parents
> (p.14)

> Recommendation 10: Local authorities should ensure that locally agreed
> procedures are in place to ensue (sic) that schools monitor, as with all teachers,
> that their CTs are continuing to meet the SCT (p.15).

So in future while teachers continue to have the freedom to enter the CT programme of

their own volition, once they attain chartered status their performance is likely to be

monitored at both national and local levels. A further possible threat to the integrity of

CT status comes in the form of the recommendation that the *Standard* is reviewed (SG,

2008). It is the case, therefore, that the early Chartered Teachers seem to be building

their identity on shifting sands, making their need to demonstrate "a critical

understanding" of "current policy debates" (GTCS, 2002, p.7) all the more essential.

The place of collaborative professional enquiry

At the heart of this study is the practice of collaborative professional enquiry. The

Standard for Chartered Teacher (GTCS, 2002) states that the professional actions of a

CT should be carried out "collaboratively with colleagues and others in a shared and

collegial undertaking" (p.3). It goes on to outline the expectation that CTs will improve

their professional performance by, amongst other things, "engaging in professional

enquiry and action research, and applying findings" (p.10), and one presumes from the

earlier statement that it is expected that such action should be undertaken collaboratively.

One of the purposes of this research is to come to a deeper understanding of what such collaborative professional action entails.

The terms 'collegial' and 'collaborative' are used liberally within the current policy context, and need further clarification. Humes (2009, p.68) notes that "the techniques of discourse analysis have alerted researchers in education and other fields to the significance of inter-connections between knowledge, language and power". He highlights the tendency for particular words and concepts to rise into, and fall from, prominence within policy texts; collegiality and collaboration are two such words. He suggests we interrogate such "approved discourse" (p.69) by asking a series of questions, two of which are particularly pertinent here:

> What is the knowledge base of the new discourse? Has it been informed by research evidence which provides a foundation for any policy directives that may invoke the discourse?

> Whose interests does the discourse really serve? Is it the politicians and managers who promote it, the professionals who are encouraged to use it, or the clients on whose behalf the discourse is invoked? (p.69).

In his book *Changing Teachers, Changing Times*, Hargreaves (1994) critiques the notion of collaborative practice in schools. He notes that "enough eulogies" have been written about collaboration "as an organizational solution to the problems of contemporary schooling" (p.17) and his work is an attempt to unravel its "conceptual wooliness" (p.17). While he cites a plethora of research which suggests that collaboration and collegiality are central to both school improvement and teacher development, he acknowledges that they have their critics and he himself voices concern that too much hope is placed on "their fragile shoulders" (p.187). He notes that most critiques of collaboration and

collegiality focus on issues around their implementation and enactment *e.g.* the structural issue of freeing of time for teachers to work together. Harris and Muijs (2005, p.29) draw attention to another such issue when they note that the success of collaborative activities also greatly "depends on the level and quality of involvement plus the degree of skilfulness within the group".   Such issues are rarely, if ever, addressed within policy texts.

Hargreaves (1994) then goes on to highlight a second set of critiques of collaboration and collegiality which focus on their multiple meanings and he wonders if this is the crux of the problem. He suggests that "because there are so many faces of collaboration and collegiality, their professed attractions as a whole should be treated with caution" (p.189). He notes:

> What matters is not that there are many different kinds of collaboration and collegiality but that the characteristics and virtues of some kinds of collaboration and collegiality are often falsely attributed to other kinds as well, or perhaps to collaboration and collegiality in general (p.188).

In essence he is highlighting the issue that individual research studies may be looking at a particular version of collaborative practice but then their findings are generalised to all kinds of collaborative practice. So to answer Humes' (2009) first question, it seems that there is research evidence to back up the policy imperative for collaborative practice but that there is little acknowledgment within policy texts of its multiple meanings, purposes and outcomes, nor the complex issues surrounding its successful implementation.

Hargreaves (1994) also helps to reflect on the second question framed by Humes (2009):

Whose interests does the discourse of collaboration and collegiality within policy texts

really serve? Hargreaves suggests that there are two perspectives from which to view

policy discourse: the cultural and the micro-political perspectives. He states:

> In the more dominant *cultural perspective*, collaborative cultures express and
> emerge from a process of consensus building that is facilitated by a largely
> benevolent and skilled educational management. In the *micropolitical perspective*,
> collaboration and collegiality result from the exercise of organizational power by
> control-conscious administrators (p.190, *original emphasis*).

Hargreaves (1994) suggests that from the latter perspective collaboration "becomes a

commitment not to developing and realising purposes of one's own but to implementing

purposes devised by others" (p.191). He names this "contrived collegiality" (p.191) as

opposed to the "collaborative culture" (p.191) engendered by the cultural perspective. If

one takes the micropolitical perspective, it is difficult to say whose interests the policy

discourse around collaboration serves as its political nature is not acknowledged within

the policy texts. It would appear that the texts construct teachers and school managers

from Hargreaves' 'cultural perspective', which carries with it an assumption of consensus

and shared interests, and benevolence from managers. It is possible that this is quite

deliberate and serves to mask a manipulative purpose to encourage collaborative

practices, thus serving the interests of the politicians and managers. It is also possible,

however, that the policy makers are not consciously aware of the issues of power and

control inherent within collaborative practices, and therefore take no account of them.

With this in mind, I will consider my own interpretation of the 'approved discourse'

surrounding collaboration and collegiality.

Elliot's (1991) differentiation between collegial, individualistic and bureaucratic accountability is helpful when trying to articulate my understanding of professional action undertaken collegially within a school context. I believe that the purpose of collegial action is not simply to benefit the individual teacher, or to serve a bureaucratic function. While it may do these things, its primary purpose is to benefit the wider school community, contributing at numerous levels and in many different ways. As with collaborative professional enquiry, it is expected that collegial professional action will address areas of shared professional concern, and will focus on working towards improvement. My interpretation implicitly acknowledges a micro-political perspective (Hargreaves, 1994) because underlying my understanding of collegial professional action is the assumption that the individual teachers will be active agents in their involvement, rather than doing the bidding of their managers. I assume also that collegial professional action will contribute to professional theorizing and professional knowledge creation at individual and group levels, and that each member of the group will be fully engaged in the process and will take responsibility for the outcome of the action. This involves, of course, "largely benevolent and skilled educational management" (Hargreaves, 1994, p.190) integral to the cultural perspective.

These discussions on collaboration and collegiality highlight the complexity of their enactment, which certainly seems to be downplayed within policy texts (Allan, 2006). Eraut (1994) built a conceptual framework for studying professional learning within which he identified three dimensions: different kinds of professional knowledge, modes of knowledge use and contexts of use. As noted in chapter one, he refers to the 'contexts

of use' for professional educators as the academic context, the school context and the

classroom context. He later notes that these contexts are applicable to other professions

and renames the latter two, now describing the academic context, the policy-discussion

context and the action context (p.52). Within the policy-discussion context he notes:

> Knowledge use means more than working out one's own ideas or even writing
> them down. One has to relate to other people's ideas, to make compromises and
> coalitions, to persuade people to think about certain policies and procedures, even
> to move people to a new view of what they are or should be doing. Then there is a
> further crucial difference between seeing people persuaded or reconciled to some
> new policy and seeing that policy implemented at more than a superficial level.
> Thus one can argue that knowledge use by a team or organisation involves not
> one but several people coming to understand, accept and internalize new ideas.
> Just as knowledge use in the academic context requires specialized writing skills,
> knowledge use in the policy discussion context requires specialized social and
> political skills (p.52).

So we are asking aspiring Chartered Teachers to take on a very complex, political task.

In working "collaboratively with colleagues and others in a shared and collegial

undertaking" (GTCS, 2002, p.3) they are being asked to use a variety of kinds of

professional knowledge, in a number of different ways within the policy-discussion or

school context as described above. This most certainly will require them to demonstrate

enhanced social and political skills.

Furthermore, despite its inclusion in policy texts, collaborative practice is not necessarily

established or even encouraged in schools. Boreham (2007, p.1) states that this is not only

the case for teachers when noting that many of the professions "have come under

increasing pressure to work more collaboratively than before". He outlined the tension

involved in such an imperative, noting that:

> in the UK we have a powerful cultural bias towards individualism, especially in
> our discourses about vocational competence, and this is reflected in the way

professions deal with the competency requirements of their members. In short, professionals are strong on regulating individual practice but not so strong on regulating or even acknowledging collective practice, especially when it is interprofessional (p.6).

This is particularly pertinent to Chartered Teachers who, as I have noted, are expected to enact their competence in the form of nine stated professional actions, to be undertaken collaboratively. In relation to CPE, this poses a fine irony for the aspiring Chartered Teacher who must engage "in professional enquiry and action research" (GTCS, 2002, p.10). While the policy requires that this should be a collective endeavour, it does not regulate such practice, nor describe what it looks like or what it should involve. Such construction has been left to the imagination and creativity of individual teachers within particular contexts, with the support of the providers of the CT programme.

Sergiovanni (1994) uses the notion of gesellschaft and gemeinschaft from Tönnies (1887) when arguing that schools need to take account of the needs of pupils and staff to belong to a community. In arguing for the development of "a community of mind" (1994, p.95) Sergiovanni focuses on the necessity of shared values and vision within successful school communities, a line of discussion clearly evident in the professional Standards that currently inform the practice of Fully Registered Teachers (GTCS, 2006), Chartered Teachers (GTCS, 2002) and Headteachers (SEED, 2005) in Scotland. He notes, however, that vision is not something that is encouraged in teachers saying that "after all, visions are supposed to be something that administrators have but not teachers" (Sergiovanni, 1994, p.95). The *Standard for Headship* (SEED, 2005) does indeed note, under the subheading 'Vision and Standards':

> Headteachers lead in the creation of a shared strategic vision and aims for the school which inspire and motivate children and young people, staff and all members of the school community and its partners and set high standards for every learner (p.6).

The phrase 'shared vision' can be interpreted as the headteacher as initiator, who shares his/her vision as in 'This is my vision which I communicate to you'. Another interpretation is that the headteacher should initiate discussion and dialogue to create a vision that is a genuine distillation of the values and beliefs of all members of the school community and its partners. In the latter interpretation, the school community collaboratively creates a vision which they share and to which they all commit. The literature suggests (*e.g.* Hargreaves, 1994; MacGilchrist *et al*., 2004) that such genuine partnership is more likely to lead to constructive relationships, though experience has shown that both interpretations are currently used.

On looking at the *Standard for Full Registration* (SFR) (GTCS, 2006) Sergiovanni's argument would appear to hold water. While teachers are expected to make "some contribution to the life of the school as a whole", "reflect on the values and personal commitment expected of a good practitioner", and work "as a member of a team of teachers" (p.4) the SFR fails to explicitly mention any commitment to contributing to the development and realisation of a vision or aims for the school. There are some mentions of collegial contribution such as "Registered teachers take responsibility for their professional learning and development" (p.15) and such action is illustrated by teachers who "productively contribute and respond to changes in education policies and practices", and "work collegially with fellow teachers and others involved in the delivery

of children's services on continuing professional development" (p.15). This hardly

constitutes unquestioned encouragement to become involved with and contribute to the

life and soul of the school, but rather is a reminder that their responsibility lies first and

foremost with their own classroom practice. Sergiovanni quotes Flores (1988) who

believed that the professional ideal includes the ability:

> to engage in a practice informed by the virtues …[in a fashion that] contribute[s] as well as strengthening and enhancing the growth and development of a practice. This is because the exercise of the virtues uniquely defines our relationship with all those other practitioners with whom we share the same purposes, goals and standards of excellence, such that the singular realization of these internal goods [purposes] naturally contributes to the overall flourishing of practice (Sergiovanni, 1994, p.147).

Sergiovanni goes on to develop the difference between developing one's own teaching

practice and being concerned with the practice of teaching in general. He describes the

latter concern as "directed to the broad issues of teaching knowledge, policy and practice

and to the practical problems and issues that teachers face every day in their classrooms

and schools" (p.147). He believes that this will ensure that "teaching is transformed from

an individual to a collective practice", where 'colleagueship' is integral, unlike the model

of professional engagement suggested within the *Standard for Full Registration* (GTCS,

2006) described above. It is from this background that Chartered Teachers attempted to

engage and activate others.

When looking at the practice of CPE and trying to make sense of the ways in which

different groups of teachers, and the individuals therein, experienced it and put it into

practice, one must consider the context and the many actors within the setting. The wider

political context in which the practice of CPE took place served as a backdrop for all that

31

went on in both schools. The "performative regime" (Ball, 2003, p.226) which currently pervades all levels of our educational system profoundly influenced the practice and identity of the teachers and school managers, as did the competence-based framework of Standard*s* discussed above.

So the policy makers form part of this story, as do the school managers and their manager, the local authority. All these groups had a crucial, if supporting role. As in many dramas, the context and some unseen players were highly influential in relation to the action. The political climate in which the whole drama played out was also crucial. The teachers who were central to this story therefore worked within institutions which were highly influenced by the policy context. The story unfolded at a time when schools were subject to "tougher, intelligent accountabilities" (SEED, 2004, p20) within a public sector which was striving for excellence in education, which "requires both professional freedom and public accountability" (p.20). The schools were led and managed by headteachers who were positioned as "the leading professional in a school and as an officer of the local authority" (SEED, 2005, p.2). The *Standard for Headship* (SEED, 2005) made the expectations of their political masters clear to headteachers, although their socialisation into the role through their own experiences, and through the experiences and expectations of others, also contributed to their professional identities. The collaborative professional enquiries central to this research were therefore being played out at a particular time when there were specific imperatives influencing and driving the development of schools as learning organisations.

Chapter Three: Literature Review

Focussing on research into collaborative professional enquiry alone is of little value as it is an activity with multiple interpretations, as highlighted in chapter one. This study looks at a particular interpretation of CPE, at a very particular time and place *i.e.* in Scottish schools in the early stages of the introduction of Chartered Teachers, setting out to investigate what this professional action offers in relation to professional re-formation and development. In this chapter I will therefore consider the literature on professionalism, professional practice, identity and socialisation. I will conclude with a section on the literature on enquiry as professional development, to develop and critique some of the ideas raised within the previous chapter.

Professionalism

I have already considered the notion of professionalism underpinning the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) which led to CT status. It is clear that the policy makers' interpretation is one of many. Indeed Humes (2009) notes that the term professionalism:

> can mean anything and nothing, can be invoked in whatever way serves the purposes of the moment. It assists in the bland elision of complexities and difficulties and potential conflicts (p.74).

If this is the case it is important to clarify what each writer means when using the term. Reeves (2007) clarifies what she means, when offering an account of her understanding of 'the new professionalism' in relation to Chartered Teacher. She argues that CT status has been introduced at a time when "'teacher professionalism' is subject to contesting and contrasting paradigms held and championed by different interests within the activity system" (p.60). She names these competing discourses as "the 'old' bureau

professionalism, managerialist views of teachers as operatives and progressive

managerialism's / educationalists' construction of a 'new' professionalism" (p.60),

arguing that the lack of a unified policy voice impacts on Chartered Teachers as they

attempt to establish their identity. She argues that if the model of teacher professionalism

is not clear then it becomes all the more difficult to operationalise what an accomplished,

expert teacher should be.

In his history of the educational researcher as public intellectual, Goodson (2003) argues

that public services and the workers within have been repositioned and relocated during

the last two decades of the twentieth century, and as such "the positional significance of

that work has been transformed" (p.110). He argues that teaching and schooling are

positioned as "practical matters beyond broad intellectual contestation" and any change in

schooling therefore requires only "technical fine tuning" (p.114). However he introduces

a subversive note when offering hope that "a collective memory of aspiration" (p.120)

still exists which recalls and continues to aspire towards intellectual work and social

justice. Perhaps this is what Reeves (2007) sees within the progressive managerialist

agenda of current policy in Scotland. She notes, however, that while progressive

managerialism is associated with Senge (1990) and his notion of the learning

organisation, this "somewhat utopian notion" (Reeves, 2007, p.59) is not without its

detractors. She quotes Rose (1999, p.122) who comments that it depends on "a

construction of social control that could and should be inscribed within the very processes

and relations of organisational life" (Reeves, 2007, p.59). Ballard (2003) would seem to

agree as he states that new professionalism is a construct "in which the teacher becomes an expert in compliance" (p.22).

Goodson (2003) discusses the disappointment and failure of "the wider political project for social justice, for an education of inclusion, a schooling that would seek to empower and enlighten all sections of society" though argues that such a project "produced its own blindness" (p110). He cautions that, as we begin again, we must be "less believing in governmental and global good intentions and more cognizant of the need for 'theories of evil' as we pursue our purposes" (p.114). This may sound highly cynical, and certainly partial in terms of the standpoint of the author, however I find it impossible to disagree with his cautionary words and those of Humes, Rose and Ballard when relating the literature to my own experience as a professional teacher. The 'new' professionalism positions teachers and school managers in very particular ways, and these seem no less restricting and constraining even though the discourse offers words of freedom and professional agency.

Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002) use the metaphor of the food chain when considering the hierarchical model that supports the audit culture endemic within education. They note that "those at the top" are "essentially reactive to government policies, with few spaces in which they can negotiate and modify" (p.342), a claim that is supported, as we have seen, in the first line of the *Standard for Headship* (SEED, 2005, p.2) which states that a headteacher acts "as an officer of the local authority". They offer a glimmer of hope in relation to professional freedom, as they argue that as you move

down the food chain "the boundaries of what might or might not be done become more permeable, with the possibility for greater resistance and reinvention" (Groundwater-Smith and Sachs, 2002, p.342), though they do acknowledge that agency may well be limited at "the very bottom of the chain" (p.342).

Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002) go on to construct the "activist professional" (p.342) as one response to the audit culture, but argue that such a professional is dependent upon the reinstatement of trust. Avis (2005), however, critiques the notion of the activist professional as developed by Sachs (2003) and also associated with Hargreaves (2003), arguing that "their analyses operate at the level of ideology" (Avis, 2005, p.218), in that they do not seriously address the "antagonistic relations that exist within capitalism" (p.219) and "they play down education as a site of struggle" (p.219). This does not seem to be the case as Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002) appear to be highly aware of the existence of antagonistic relations , stating that "first and foremost an activist professional is concerned to reduce or eliminate exploitation, inequality and oppression" (p.352). Indeed they acknowledge that:

> the formation of the activist professional is not straightforward, nor is it something that is easily acquired in a climate where managerialism is strong. Nevertheless, it is an aspiration that works strongly in the interests of those which the public sector serves (p.353).

They presume an assertive teaching force which demands the right to participate, invoking a "participatory democratic model of civic action" (p.354), and they acknowledge that this involves "creating new forms of power at all levels of a community" (p.355). In the context of this study, while the desire to participate appears to be present the appeal of forging new forms of power is less apparent.

So as Humes (2009) says, professionalism seems to be called upon to mean different things by different people, a finding supported by the AERS School Governance and Management Group (Reeves *et al.,* 2008) in their analysis of post-devolution policy. They found the key concepts of professionalism, collegiality and leadership to be "fuzzy and open to different interpretations" (p.4), which led them to consider a number of discontinuities across current policies. This would appear to have implications for the notion of professional practice.

Professional practice

Kemmis, in the prologue to Carr (1995), notes that "Educational practice is a form of power - a dynamic force both for social continuity and for social change which, though shared with and constrained by others, rests largely in the hands of teachers"(p.1). He explains that "the meaning and significance of practice is constructed in at least four different senses" (p.6-7), all of which need to be understood. These are:

- "the *intentions* of a practitioner"
- That practice is socially constructed. "It is *interpreted* not only by the agent but also by others" (p.6)
- That it is *historically* constructed. "It must be interpreted against the background of the history of the situation", both recent (my relationship with that student) and with "reference to deeper traditions of educational practice" (p.6) and
- That it is *politically* constructed. The practice of the classroom "may be shaped by domination and subjugation or perhaps by open and democratic discourse and decision making" (p.7).

This framework for understanding professional practice is interesting when set against the professional Standards which currently guide practice in Scottish schools. In these, practitioners are constructed hierarchically as separate Standards exist for teachers of differing status *i.e.* teacher, CT, headteacher. The different expectations of teachers at

particular levels of the hierarchy were explored briefly in chapter two, and Kemmis's framework highlights the power dynamic represented in such texts. When one reflects on one's own intentions in relation to the ways in which personal values and beliefs influence professional practice, it is easy to become overwhelmed when considering the cornucopia of intentions which drive the practice of even a small group of teachers undertaking a collaborative enquiry. When one adds to that the weight of the interpretations of others, and the influence of both the historical and political dimensions regarding expectations of how one will practise, the notion of genuine shared intent behind collaborative practice becomes questionable, or at best aspirational.

Sergiovanni (1994) believes that school teachers need to be competent but that "the hallmark ingredient in defining professionalism is virtue. Virtue comes from a commitment to values that constitute the professional ideal for any given practice" (p.141). Indeed Sergiovanni goes on to describe teaching as "a calling rather than a job" (p.147). Such an idea has resonance with the Aristotelian concept of the intellectual virtue of phronesis as examined by Flyvbjerg (2001), which he describes as " a deliberation about values with reference to praxis" (p.57). These ideas challenge the current notion that teaching and indeed school leadership can be defined by a series of professional actions as outlined in professional Standards. The power of these written texts to influence professional action is diluted by such dynamic forces, though they remain important and influential artefacts within the system.

Hagger and McIntyre (2006) seem to agree that Standards represent only one view of professional practice. They state that the way "good practice in teaching is best understood is a highly contested matter" (p.20). They suggest that power is integral to practice when noting that "differences in ways of understanding good practice tend to reflect the positions people occupy and their needs in these different positions" (p.20). They go on to specify:

> Teachers themselves have to find ways of understanding their lives in classrooms which are realistic and sustainable and on the other hand, politicians and managers often feel the need to understand good practice in ways that allow them to hold teachers accountable for the quality of their practice and that can lead to very different ways of thinking about good practice (p.20).

This is highly pertinent to this study, as it raises the issue of the way that teachers and their practice are positioned. Hagger and McIntyre make the point that they resist the temptation to "see different ways of understanding good practice as conflicting and mutually incompatible" (p.21), preferring to draw on a number of perspectives in building the understanding of their readers. This resonates with my own intentions within the case studies that follow.

Professional identities

Day *et al.* (2006) review the literature on teacher identity and note that there are two schools of thought, with some researchers arguing that there exists a single, identifiable and stable teacher identity while others believe that multiple, unstable, contingent identities exist. Day *et al*. clearly belong to the second group and present research evidence of teachers' multiple identities, noting that:

> The architecture of teachers' professional identities is not always stable, but at certain times or during certain life, career and organisational phases may be

discontinuous, fragmented, and subject to turbulence and change in the continuing struggle to construct and sustain a stable identity (p. 613).

The assumption underlying this statement, that a stable identity is desired by teachers, is interesting and begs further explanation which is not forthcoming in their paper. Drawing on the findings of a four-year study which looked at the factors which affect teachers' work lives over time (the VITAE project), they note that this research suggests "that some teachers themselves do seek and find, in different ways, their own sense of stability within what appears *from the outside* to be fragmented identities" (p.614 *original emphasis*). Interestingly a link was found between this stability and "a combination of positive factors to be found within personal life situations and school working contexts" (p.641). This appears to provide evidence of the complex and crucial relationship between personal and professional identity.

Stronach *et al.* (2002) also put their metaphorical hats into the multiple identities ring. They suggest that "there is no such thing as 'a teacher'" (p.109) and believe that the professional is "an indefensibly unitary construct" (p.109). Drawing on data from studies of the professional identities of both nurses and teachers, they suggest that these individuals present themselves through:

> mini-narratives of identification; unstable, shifting, sometimes contradictory or expressed as conflicts. These shards of self-accounting belie the professional as 'type':
> - teacher as recollected pupil ;
> - teacher as pressured individual;
> - the subject specialist;
> - the person/teacher I am;
> - the socialized apprentice;
> - the coerced innovator;
> - the convinced professional;
> - the professional critic;

- the sceptical pragmatist (p.116).

In their paper Stronach *et al.* (2002) explore the "in-between-ness of professional work" (p.126), as they suggest that the professional is caught between "an 'economy of performance' (manifestations broadly of the audit culture) and various 'ecologies of practice' (professional dispositions and commitments individually and collectively engendered)" (pl09). They argue that the discourse around performance indicators is counter-productive and that professionalism must "rely, in the end, on positive trust rather than be driven by performance ranking" (p.131). This would certainly represent a sea change to the way that professional practice is conceptualised both by policy makers and increasingly by professional teachers themselves.

Further, Stronach *et al.* (2002) suggest a change to the metaphor used by policy makers in relation to professionalism, a move from 'push' (or coerce) to 'pulse' (or motivate). They contend that "the teleology of the utopian professional self, and the ontology of the vocationally oriented human being operate in a pulse like way" (p.131), and that "each moment of practice articulates an accommodation between the actual and the ideal, the possible and the desirable – as the nurse or teacher sees it" (p.131). Stronach *et al*. therefore offer a complex picture of an uncertain identity, but offer optimism that the spaces between the oppositional discourses can be productively used by individuals to develop and form a contingent series of identities.

Stephen Ball (2003), on the other hand, is pessimistic about the opportunities for individual teachers to resist the influences of the policy context. He notes that:

a process of 'ethical retooling' in the public sector [which] is replacing client 'need' and professional judgement with commercial decision-making. The space for the operation of autonomous ethical codes based in a shared moral language is colonized or closed down (p.226).

He goes on to argue that this leaves "no space for an autonomous or collective ethical self" (p.226). Such a pessimistic outlook feeds a deterministic view of professionalism and professional practice, and does not take account of the link between personal and professional identity noted by Day *et al.* (2006). Nor does it acknowledge that Stronach *et al.'s* (2002, p.116) 'convinced professional', 'professional critic' or 'sceptical pragmatist' could all, in different ways, resist or subvert the influences of the policy context.

The literature on professional identities is of great relevance to the formation of identity for Chartered Teachers. Beyond the *Standard* (GTCS, 2002), neither they nor their colleagues have any grounded expectations regarding what a CT does, and what they are like. Indeed rumour and speculation gleaned from multiple interpretations of the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001), staffroom tales, and pronouncements and opinions in the educational press have done much to reduce the impact of the SCT as a framework for identity building. Little strategic thought has been given to the professional identity of the Chartered Teacher within the established institution of 'school' or where they sit in the hierarchies therein. They do, however, have to fit into a hierarchical system, which has time-honoured ideas of what people do and how they relate to each other. It is clear where the authority and power lies. Given that professionalism itself continues to be contested, and subjected to a battle of paradigms and discourses, and given that Reeves (2007) is in the vanguard of researchers who have turned their attention to the identity of

Chartered Teachers, I will now draw from the research and literature which looks at the

professional socialisation of both teachers and school managers.

Professional socialisation

Eisner (1996) highlights a major obstacle to change in schools when he notes:

> the images of teaching, of classrooms, and of what schools are like are learned
> early in life. Teaching is the only profession I can think of in which professional
> socialization begins at age five. As a result, those who teach have had years to
> internalize a set of expectations regarding what teachers do and what schools are
> like (p.6).

This issue is of equal importance to the expectations that communities have of

headteachers and members of school management teams. Crow and Glascock (1995) look

at the socialisation of aspiring school principals, reporting on a study of participants on a

school leadership programme, where they examined the socialisation process of the

development of the candidate's new professional identity. They note that it is commonly

believed that the way people enact the role of school principal or headteacher is

dependent on their conception of what that role entails. They go on to explore the

literature, looking at the sources and components of role conception and the mechanisms

which are present in the process of socialisation. They identified four main sources of

role conception, namely "societal, occupational, organizational and individual" (p.23).

These headings are useful to consider current literature in relation to the influences on a

professional at any level, particularly when developing their identity within a new role.

Influences of professional identity

Societal influences

As stated above Kemmis (in Carr, 1995) notes that two of at least four ways to understand the meaning and significance of practice are to consider that it is both historically and politically constructed. Kemmis states that education practice is therefore shaped from beyond its four walls "by social, material and historical factors beyond the control of anyone in the room" (in Carr, 1995, p.7). He talks of the historical influences on one's practice in relation to the recent history of one's relationship with the objects of practice, and also "by reference to deeper traditions of educational practice, etched out over years, decades, perhaps even centuries" (p.6-7). He suggests that the educational traditions which influence the form and structure of the way schools work are deeply influential to the professional practice of teachers.

Foucault's (1977) seminal study *Discipline and Punish* offers a meticulous account of the ways in which discipline in institutions, including schools, has emerged in relation to a general technology of coercive power, and casts some light on the historical and deep traditions that continue to influence the world of schools. This work will be explored in greater detail in chapter four. Foucault's analysis has particular resonance with the "terrors of performativity" as outlined by Ball (2003, p.215), who goes on to note:

> Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change – based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgement. The issue of who controls the field of judgement is crucial (p.216).

The issue of who controls the field of judgement is not straightforward. Hodkinson *et al.* (2008, p.29) list a large number of features which they found to influence learners in the Further Education (FE) sector, many of which are located within the individuals involved, and their working contexts. The final one, however, notes the influence of "wider social and cultural values and practices, for example around issues of social class, gender and ethnicity, the nature of employment opportunities, social and family life, and the perceived status of Further Education as a sector" (p.29). I would argue that these influences are universally applicable to both learners and workers in other sectors of education, where the perceived status of FE could usefully be changed to the perceived status of the school within society.

Occupational influences

The occupational influences which affect the professional identity of teachers can be said to come from the policy agenda and from the profession itself: the professional Standards outlined by the government and the General Teaching Council for Scotland and the teachers' collective voice which emanates from unions and professional associations. The current devotion to professional Standards has been outlined in chapter two, but their impact on professional identity has not been explored in the literature to any great extent.

Yandell and Turvey (2007) look specifically at the ways in which professional Standards in England were positioned alongside the stories of two particular teachers in their first year of teaching. While their research was funded by the Teachers' Training Agency it seems that they set out to question the value of the Standards as they comment from a

socio-cultural perspective, critiquing the model of teacher professionality that suggests professional identity can be reduced to "a set of isolable, individual attributes, measurable against a fixed scale of competences or standards" (Yandell and Turvey, 2007, p.534). Their findings identify "the significance of the subjectivity of the teacher, her values, interests and sense of herself" (p.548) and "the complex, dialectical interplay between such subjectivities and the larger power structures of school and society" (p.548). They conclude that the importance of the relationship between the individual teacher and the context and community in which he/she practises calls into question the value of Standards, arguing that for some new teachers they can even be counter-productive.

Yandell and Turvey's (2007) analysis is supported by others. Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002, p.351) cite Mahony and Hextall (2000) who comment "that in order to 'meet the Standards' you have to be the kind of person that the standards have in mind". This suggests a level of homogeneity that is at odds with the level of autonomy and agency which Eraut (1994) suggests is intrinsic to professionalism. Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002) go further and suggest that Standards lead to an individualistic model of professionalism, whereby teachers become entrepreneurial professionals who meet "the desires of the audit society for externally controlled practice, where there is little requirement for trust and moral professional judgement" (p.352). Fox and Reeves (2008) argue that the value-based Scottish Standards do, however, offer a more developmental, forward-looking representation than, for example, the American National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (2002), in particular, was "not only derived from examples of excellent teaching in current contexts

46

but as a prescription for what they [its authors] felt excellent teaching ought to become"
(Fox and Reeves, 2008, p.8-9).

Flyvbjerg's (2001) use of the Dreyfus model, which considers the place of rationality and
intuition in human learning, is helpful here. He notes that the model encompasses five
levels of the learning process moving from novice to expert, and comments that Dreyfus
and Dreyfus conclude "that intelligent action consists of something other than calculated,
analytical rationality, even although we often hear the opposite" (p.21). Flyvbjerg
contends that rationality has become synonymous with analytical thinking which he
defines as "conscious separation of wholes into parts" (p.22), and goes on to introduce
the concept of "arationality" invoked by Dreyfus and Dreyfus: "Arational behaviour …
connotes situational behavior without the conscious analytical division of situations into
parts and evaluation according to context independent rules" (p.22). Arationality
involves intuition and professional judgement. Flyvbjerg notes that there is no existing
research which suggests that it is possible that intuition and judgment can be
"externalized into rules and explanations, which, if followed, lead to the same result as
intuitive behaviour" (p.21). He further cites Dreyfus and Dreyfus who state that
"competent performance is rational; proficiency is transitional; experts act arationally"
(p.22). This argument has serious implications for the relevance and validity of a
Standard which sets out the professional actions of an accomplished teacher, as is the
goal of the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002), and has implications for the
professional identities of teachers aspiring to meet it.

Organisational influences

Schools are organised around a traditional hierarchical system which is familiar to those who work in schools through their own experiences as pupils. Hammersley-Fletcher and Brundrett (2008) suggest, however, that this traditional hierarchical system needs to be re-examined in the light of the call for greater distribution of leadership (e.g. HMIe 2007b). They note that there needs to be "a greater honesty about where authority lies" and "who has a right to exercise it" (2008, p.15).

Spillane *et al.* (2004) define leadership as "the activities engaged in by leaders, in interaction with others in particular contexts around specific tasks" (p.5). As already stated, leadership is currently high on the political agenda in the UK and beyond, and many acres of print are given to the examination of its meaning, both theoretically and in practice, and also to its difference from management practices. Spillane *et al.'s* definition is typical of many and illustrates Hammersley-Fletcher and Brundrett's point well in its failure to engage with the issue of power. In schools, where do leaders come from? How do they emerge? Do they choose with whom to interact? Who chooses the specific task and the ways in which people engage? And in whose interest? Spillane *et al.* (2004, p.27) go on to state that leadership practice "emerges in the execution of leadership tasks in and through the interaction of leaders, followers, and situation", and in doing so they acknowledge the importance of relationships without explicitly mentioning or exploring relations of power (Foucault, 1977). This is a fundamental gap in much of the literature on educational leadership. The ways in which schools are organised and why, would seem to be of vital importance to the developing professional identity of all teachers, and

Chartered Teachers in particular. The political call for greater distribution of leadership

in schools must be accompanied by an examination of what this means for relationships

and relations of power.

MacDonald (2004) reports on a case study undertaken in a primary school in the

aftermath of the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001). Her research sets out to explore the

relationships and attitudes of staff in the school, focusing on the policy imperatives linked

to increased collegiality. She reports that her data suggest that "the tendencies of teachers

to adopt a subordinate persona, and to comply with the wishes of the hierarchy despite

their own professional reservations point towards the existence of a hegemonic system in

which collegiality has little locus" (p.413). While this is a small scale study, she takes

some care to explore the ways in which the teachers construct relationships within the

existing hierarchical system, and how they perceive their level of autonomy within the

organization. MacDonald argues that her data suggest that, despite being given

permissions to move towards a collegiate community through policy frameworks and the

headteacher's espoused commitment, the teachers continue to construct the headteacher

as having authority over them, and consequently they "carefully maintained the existing

power relationship" (2004, p.431). Interestingly she uncovered evidence that teachers

"believed their own obedience to be simultaneously imposed on and chosen by them"

(p.431), making the point that such a tension:

> between coercion and consent is distinctive of hegemonic systems where the
> ascendancy of one group over another is perceived by the dominated group to be
> 'natural', inevitable and even advantageous (p.431).

For teachers to break through the hegemonic hierarchical system in schools would seem to involve more than a policy decree, and commitment on the part of those who inhabit the positions within the hierarchy. The organisational influences on role conception form a very strong base to the professional identity of both teachers and school leaders. Deeply held historical and political constructions about power relations are at play, and so the political call for collegiate and collaborative work practices in schools must also be accompanied by an examination of what this means for relationships and, in particular, relations of power.

Individual influences

Our own experiences, values and beliefs inevitably inform our understanding of the roles of teacher, middle and senior managers within schools, recalling that one of the multiple identities articulated in Stronach *et al.'s* work is that of "teacher as recollected pupil" (2002, p.116). Eraut (1994) draws on the work of Clark (1986) who discusses teachers' implicit theories which spring from "many sources, rules of thumb, generalizations drawn from personal experience, beliefs, values, biases and prejudices" (1986, p.5 cited in Eraut, 1994, p.62). Clark goes on to note that these implicit theories "are thought to play an important part in the judgements and interpretations that teachers make every day (1986, p.5 cited in Eraut, 1994, p.62). Ballard (2003) develops this further by using the work of Carol Witherell (1991) in his exploration of teachers' identity, noting that "her emphasis is on relationships and on an ongoing interrogation and reconstruction of ourselves in relationship to others" (2003, p.16). She sees "teaching as involving ethical issues centring around the 'nature of self, the relation to self, to other and to culture, and

conception of knowing, meaning, and purpose'" (Ballard, 2003, p.16). The emphasis on

relationships and ongoing interrogation leading to reconstruction is affirmed by Crow and

Glascock's (1996) research which identified peers in the cohort on the school leadership

course as being crucial in giving individuals "a sense of identity" (p.32), quoting one

respondent who said that the cohort helped him in relation to "where I saw myself, and

where I'd like to be" (p.32). Crow and Glascock claim that their data showed that

discussions on values and beliefs allowed novice school leaders to develop their

individual vision of what the role entailed. This makes sense in relation to my own

professional experience, learning from interactions with colleagues, and reflecting and

making judgements in relation to different professional practices observed. It also

highlights the centrality of individual values and beliefs to professional practice.

Crow and Glascock (1996) identified the aspiring principals' own experiences as teachers

who witnessed the work of school principals, to be an important source of their

understanding of the role. This could perhaps be articulated as 'headteacher as recollected

teacher', with apologies to Stronach *et al.* (2003). It was acknowledged that such

recollection was both "expanding and limiting" (Crow and Glascock, 1996, p.32). Eraut

(1994) would seem to agree that experiences can limit as he states:

> Early socialization into classrooms and schools initiates [school managers] into its
> many unquestioned norms and traditions; and they learn to speak education in the
> distinctive dialects of their training institutions and local schools. There is a
> danger that such knowledge will remain static and unchallenged, for even
> controversial issues tend to be debated along familiar dichotomized lines … A
> major problem in developing managers' conceptual knowledge is making them
> more aware of how they already think, so they can bring their knowledge under
> greater critical control (p.90).

Eraut (1994) goes on to make the case for the importance of reflection, claiming that the process of socialisation of teachers in relation to their professional action is intrinsically linked to the theorisation of their practice. He quotes Korthagen (1988, pp.38-9) who is describing the importance of reflection on prior experience linked to the learning of a teaching subject:

> A second major aspect of the programme is that reflection is stressed even before students embark on their practical teaching. The idea behind this is that student teachers can be armed against socialization into established patterns of school practice (Eraut, 1994, p.61).

The use of the military metaphor here makes a strong statement regarding the individual identity formation of teachers, and their ability to resist the pressures of established practice. Korthagen's quote does however suggest that they can be "armed" enabling them to do so. I am less convinced of the links between reflection and the theorisation of practice as Eraut purports. I do recall learning the 'distinctive dialect' of the institution where I trained as a teacher, and the struggle when trying to use it then re-learn the dialect of practice in school, which placed little value on the theoretical dialect of the academy. My recollection is of the development of pragmatic survival strategies rather than theorisation and yet I also recall resisting practice which clashed with my own values and beliefs, and those which had developed during training. It is less clear whether the ability and motivation to resist was developed during training or whether it was linked to my intrinsic disposition.

This review of literature pertinent to professional identity and socialisation has set out to map some of the many variables that influence the way that individual professionals

construct themselves and are constructed and how professional practice is influenced by

forces beyond the school boundaries, including the historical, organisational and political

power structures embedded within the wider education system. I will now consider the

literature on enquiry as professional development, and the possible ways in which such

professional action can contribute to professional (re)formation.

Professional enquiry as professional development

The *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002) appears to assume a causal link

between the engagement in professional enquiry / action research and improvement in

professional performance, an assumption prevalent within the literature. For example,

Jackson (2006), when reporting on the Networked Learning Communities project

undertaken by the National College of School Leadership, notes that "involving groups of

staff in collaborative enquiry is, *of course,* professionally developmental for those who

engage in it" (2006, p.286, *my italics*). The nature of the involvement would seem to be

important.

Zuber-Skerritt (1996) reproduces a summary of Carr and Kemmis's (1986) distinction

between three types of action research: technical, practical and emancipatory. Each one

demands particular types of involvement from the participants.   Where technical action

research is undertaken, an outside 'expert' is involved who co-opts the practitioners to

evaluate particular areas of educational practice. There is a claim that this contributes to

the professional development of those involved. Such action research is typical of work

undertaken in partnership between Universities and schools, where the university

researcher involves practitioners in one or more setting.

Practical action research involves a facilitator who takes on a "Socratic role"

"encouraging participation and self-reflection" (Zuber-Skerritt, 1996. p.4) by the

practitioners where the aim of the work is to evaluate effectiveness of particular areas of

educational practice. Zuber-Skerritt (1996) also claims that the nature of the facilitator's

engagement will contribute to enhancing understanding and transforming the

consciousness of the participants. Again practical action research could be said to be

characteristic of the type undertaken by teachers who are working towards an accredited

qualification and where the facilitator is a university tutor.

The nature of the involvement of staff engaged in emancipatory action research (EAR)

however is markedly different. Zuber-Skerritt (1996) describes action research as

emancipatory:

> when it aims not only at technical and practical improvement and the participants'
> better understanding, along with transformation and change within the existing
> boundaries and conditions, but also at changing the system itself or those
> conditions which impede desired improvement in the system/organisation. It also
> aims at the participants' empowerment and self-confidence about their ability to
> create 'grounded theory' (Glaser and Strauss 1967), i.e. theory grounded in
> experience and practice, by solving complex problems in totally new situations,
> collaboratively as a team or 'community of scholars'. Everyone being a 'personal
> scientist' (Kelly 1963), contributing in different ways, but on an equal footing
> with everyone else (p.5).

She states that the aim of emancipatory action research is "participants' emancipation from the dictates of tradition, self-deception, coercion; their critique of bureaucratic systemisation; transformation of the organisation of the educational system" (p.4). Here teachers are involved in a democratic activity which is designed to empower and contribute to transformational change at both individual and organisational levels.

Weiskopf and Laske (1996) introduce the issue of power within the process of EAR and ask if it is "possible that the emancipatory effort camouflages the establishment of new power relationships rather than frees the people concerned from arbitrary restrictions" (p.125). In describing their research they conclude that asymmetrical power relationships are inevitable. This is unsurprising when an assumption underpins their work that 'a researcher' is involved in the action research process, despite stating:

> The action research approach has been seen as a way to emancipate the people in organisations. In the field of personnel development, the idea is that the members of an organisation should be able to free themselves from domination and structural limitations by a process of (co-operative) self-reflection, which has to be according to the ideal of a discourse free of power and domination (p.123).

Weiskopf and Laske (1996) talk of "critical solidarity with the employees" (p.123) and describe themselves as "research consultants" (p.124). I would suggest that the involvement of an 'expert' positions their work within Carr and Kemmis's (1986) practical action research as I believe that emancipation cannot be achieved while being led by someone invested with authority. Indeed Zuber-Skerritt (1996) identifies participants' "dependency on experts or seniors instead of independence of thought and expression" (p.90) as one barrier to the success of EAR. It would seem that where

55

dependency exists it is often encouraged by systems and structures within the organisation, where such dependency is linked to issues of power and control. The nature of the relationship between the facilitator and the group would therefore appear to be vital to the success of the enterprise. Weiskopf and Laske (1996) argue that this relationship is fraught with difficulties, and indeed claim that "the idea of a discourse free of power and domination must appear fictional" (p.129). They believe that reality is "characterised by different power structures and diverging interests, by scarce resources and conflicts" (p.129).

Sergiovanni (1994, p.144) is also a proponent of school-based inquiry as a means of positioning schools as "inquiring communities". He quotes Oakes (1992, p.25) in defining such enquiry as:

> Characterized by open communication, reflection, experimentation, risk-taking and trust among the diverse members of that school's community … this inquiry process locates the locus of change at the school itself, and grounds the effectiveness of change in the participation of those at the school in critical discourse about and practical experimentation with new practices (Sergiovanni, 1994, p.145).

He acknowledges that the way leadership is exercised within a community which provides the conditions to allow such professional action to flourish, is of vital importance, and he goes on to note that "when "leaders" and "led" are separated by different goals, when they do not trust each other, and when they do not share the same theory; the leader has to begin at the beginning" (p194). This statement exposes an underlying paternalistic assumption, not uncommon in the literature on leadership, that it is the leader who desires change, has to influence and encourage (Harris and Muijs, 2005) and make right the faulty goals and theories of the teachers. Sergiovanni acknowledges

the lack of shared goals as a key feature in research on failing schools (*e.g.* MacGilchrist *et al.,* 2004), however the assumption that the school leader's goals are the right ones is not challenged. Sergiovanni's (1994) construction of school-based inquiry clearly differs from the emancipatory model outlined above. Without acknowledging them, it illustrates the asymmetrical power relationships that Weiskopf and Laske (1996) suggest are inevitable and builds in the barrier identified by Zuber-Skerrit (1996) where teachers are expected to depend on their senior colleagues. To challenge such dependency would seem to challenge the hegemonic hierarchical system which MacDonald (2004) found alive and well in post-McCrone Scotland.

Gronn (2003) does, however, challenge the binary of leader-follower as he believes it implies "that one person monopolises all the influence while all of the residualised non-leaders are supine" (p.278). He notes that "with remarkably few exceptions, leaders are conventionally constructed as causal agents of work outcomes" (p.278), while refuting that there is the evidence to support this construction. Jackson (2006) in his exploration of networked learning communities raises a further issue when noting that the leadership role of the headteacher is vital in that they act as "advocate and gatekeeper for the progressive cultural and structural changes required in the way things are done within the school" (p.287). Most of the literature focuses on the advocacy role, and the role of the school leader as gatekeeper receives little analysis. Gronn (2003) warns that current analytical terminology does not reflect actual practice in schools and it "imposes an outmoded discursive template on reality which, as with 'leaders'-'followers' … obscures the actual division of workplace labour" (p.279).

So it would seem that the success of professional enquiry as professional development is dependent on the construction of professionalism which underpins the practice and value systems of the different players. They in turn impose particular constraints and permissions for the development of relationships and networks. Where the leader-follower binary (Gronn, 2003) is embedded, and where traditional hierarchies are unquestioned and unchallenged the nature of enquiry is unlikely to lead to transformation and re-formation because the status quo is protected and sustained as seen in the work of MacDonald (2004). Where professionalism is underpinned by an understanding that professional knowledge is rational and analytical, and linked to a competence framework, this fails to take account of "arational" behaviour, linked to judgement and intuition (Flyvbjerg, 2001) or the multiple professional identities articulated in the literature (Stronach *et al.,* 2003; Day *et el.,* 2006). Where professionalism is presented as pro-active and critical *(e.g.* Groundwater-Smith and Sachs, 2002; Hargreaves, 2003) the literature begins to raise the issue of power relations and professional trust while positioning activism as problematic and aspirational.

Much of the literature, however, fails to acknowledge the implications of power relations integral to professional practice. The deeply embedded social, historical and political influences on the construction of professional practice (Kemmis, in Carr, 1995) offer a considerable barrier to change, in the ways in which they contribute to the socialisation and expectations leading to professional identities. Few writers, however, take a deterministic view. This offers hope even although the concerns raised by Weiskopf and Laske (1996), Sergiovanni (1994) and Gronn (2003) in relation to the nature and location

of power in schools are likely to profoundly affect identity formation and developing role conception of Chartered Teachers.

In my work with teachers aspiring to headship, middle management and chartered status, I hear and read accounts which support the notion that leaders at different levels perceive the organisation from different perspectives, yet rarely attempt to confront the implications of asymmetric power relations. The exploration of CPE, as a tangible manifestation of a change in established models of leadership, allows us to look in more detail at ways in which power is exercised.

Chapter Four: Methodology

In this chapter I will discuss the theoretical framework which I have used before outlining the methodological approach I chose to take. I will then go on to outline the research process.

In exploring collaborative professional enquiry in relation to professional re-formation and development, I make use of the theories of Foucault to understand how it was experienced and put into practice, focussing on the power relationships between all of the participants. This research looks at these relations of power, how this impacts on the professional action that takes place, and the implications for professional re-formation and development. The process of theorisation that has taken place has been central to my own professional and personal development and embodies the learning that has taken place throughout my doctoral studies. This process has been contemporaneous with the analytical process, zigzagging between published theoretical works, the data, the literature and my own fundamental beliefs and assumptions.

Biesta (2008, podcast) considers that theorisation serves several purposes. He notes that it can help to generate "descriptions and re-descriptions" allowing educators to "generate different vocabularies to talk about education". He suggests it can also assist in the generation of explanations and understandings. Deleuze, in conversation with Foucault, puts it more simply saying "A theory is exactly like a box of tools" (Foucault and Deleuze, 1977, p.208). Foucault's work offers a number of tools which facilitate the

study of the practice of collaborative professional enquiry, helping me to seek explanations and understandings of what took place. Further, it offers structures to help make sense of the multiple discourses that are evident in the narratives of the participants.

The notion of theory building is explored by Eraut (1994) who differentiates between public and private theories: public theories are published and studied while private theories exist in people's minds. He states that "educational theory comprises concepts, frameworks, ideas and principles which may be used to interpret, explain or judge intention, actions and experiences in educational or education-related settings" (p.60). Eraut goes on to note that it is often difficult to identify the source of a theory, and that the distinction between public and private theories can be unclear. I certainly recognise that the way that I have used, reviewed and developed theory to interpret, explain and evaluate the data has been affected by my own autobiography, both personal and professional. The theoretical framework which underpins this work has been constructed in light of my own implicit, private theories as well as the published theories of Foucault, and others. Eraut wonders if we select the theories we use according to 'utility or ethical principles' or "by more intuitive criteria like personal preference or fittingness" (p.64). He also notes that "both the selection and use of ideas are likely to be influenced by existing conceptual frameworks" (p.64).   I believe that I have been drawn to the theories of Foucault due to their resonance with my own experiences and in light of their 'fit' and utility in relation to the data.

Theoretical framework

At an early stage of data collection I became aware of a familiar dissonance between the stories of the teachers and the managers. There seemed to be a certain inevitability about the roles that each took in relation to innovation and change. Teachers seemed to be positioned and, on occasions, to position themselves as reluctant, lacking in confidence and ability, and in need of motivation. This in turn positioned managers to take on a maternalistic/paternalistic role which involved them having to encourage, increase capacity and capability, and to motivate. The literature on educational leadership largely supports the view reflected in the evidence from the managers, as do the practices and policies related to CPD and the introduction of "tougher, intelligent accountability" (SEED, 2004, p.20), and yet teachers told stories of constraint, lack of trust and lack of understanding on the part of their managers. There seemed to be a resigned acceptance of entrenched and opposing positions, despite espoused common goals.

The evidence suggested that the two groups were "talking past each other" (C W Mills cited in Goodson, 2003, p.13) in their pursuit of these goals. All participants were supportive, to a greater or lesser degree, of the practice of collaborative professional enquiry and there seemed to be an underlying belief that such professional action was likely to lead to better experiences and outcomes for pupils. Both managers and teachers talked of collaborative practice and distributive leadership but revealed different understandings through the ways in which their stories clashed, collided, contradicted and confused. Such dissonance has real implications for everything that goes on in schools,

and has particular significance for the Chartered Teachers who appear to inhabit an unexplored space between the two entrenched positions – a no-man's land.

Foucault's work drew my attention to the central issue of relations of power allowing me to generate some explanations and understandings which in turn might enable others, the Chartered Teachers in particular, to describe and re-describe their positions within the organisation. An even loftier outcome may be to contribute to the vocabularies with which teachers and managers talk about their work.

Relations of power

One major theme which runs through the work of Foucault, and which helps to make sense of the ways in which practitioners at all levels of organisations are positioned by history, policy and expectation, is that of relations of power. He notes that ".. if we want to understand how we have been trapped in our own history" (1983, p.210), we have to go beyond rational explanation, and look at "a way which is more empirical, more directly related to our present situation, and which implies more relations between theory and practice" (p.210-1). Popkewitz and Brennan (1998) concur stating that "the study of the effects of power enables us to focus on the ways that individuals construct boundaries and possibilities" (p.19).   They explore Foucault's notion of power by reflecting on the metaphors of "power as sovereignty" and "power as deployment" (1998, p.16). They believe that:

> power as sovereignty often creates a dichotomous world in which there is the
> oppressor and oppressed, thus producing a dualism whose effect is to define
> particular social groups as monolithic entities. The researcher's story is of one
> group who dominates while the other carries social righteousness but does not

possess power. The dualism of oppressor/oppressed loses sight of the subtleties in which power operates in multiple arenas and social practices (p.18).

Power as deployment, on the other hand, involves a "move from controlling actors to the systems of ideas that normalize and construct the rules through which intent and purpose in the world is organized" (p.19). It "focuses on the concrete practices through which power circulates and is productive in daily life" (p.20). They consider that this notion of power has productive effects "as it circulates through institutional practices and the discourses of daily life" (p.18), one of which is the production of "boundaries and permissible paths for the new citizen" (p.18).

Popkewitz and Brennan (1998) see these two interpretations of power as "complementary" and both are useful in this study. Power as sovereignty focuses on "larger historical structures through which daily life is constructed" (p.20) while power as deployment is "a political as well as an intellectual strategy for disrupting that knowledge/power relation through making visible and open to resistance the systems of ideas that construct the subject" (p.20). To use only the construction of power as sovereignty would lead to a critical analysis of the actions of the managers involved in this study, setting up a dualism whereby the managers are the oppressors and the teachers are oppressed. This would serve to give a distorted picture of the complex power relationships which were at play during the enaction of collaborative professional enquiry. Power relations, which are embedded in the larger historical, hierarchical structures present in the institution of 'school', work in the interest of school managers over teachers. These are acknowledged and are central to the analysis of the data in this

study, while a focus on the concrete practices through which power circulates is also important to help to make sense of the data. Popkewitz and Brennan (1998) note that the "idea of the deployment of power gives focus to how the subject is disciplined through the rules of knowledge per se" (p.18). I therefore explore the practices which illuminate the ways in which subjects are disciplined, and the ways in which boundaries and possibilities are constructed.

Foucault rarely uses the term "power" on its own, as he argues that it exists only within relationships. He states that what characterises power:

> is that it brings into play relations between individuals (or between groups). For let us not deceive ourselves; if we speak of the structures or the mechanisms of power, it is only insofar as we suppose that certain persons exercise power over others. The term "power" designates relationships between partners… (1983, p.217).

However he goes on to say that:

> The exercise of power is not simply a relationship between partners, individuals or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others. Which is to say, of course, that something called Power, with or without a capital letter, which is assumed to exist universally in a concentrated or diffused form, does not exist. Power exists only when it is put into action, even if, of course, it is integrated into a disparate field of possibilities brought to bear upon permanent structures. This also means that power is not a function of consent. In itself it is not a renunciation of freedom, a transference of rights, the power of each and all delegated to a few (which does not prevent the possibility that consent may be a condition for the existence or the maintenance of power); the relationship of power can be the result of a prior or permanent consent, but it is not by nature the manifestation of a consensus (1983, p.219-20).

This is of great importance when investigating the relationships and exercise of power within schools. The pyramidal hierarchy, intrinsic to current educational establishments, has relations of power integrated into its structure. A person becomes a teacher, and has

an expectation that the school managers will exercise power over their professional

actions. Tacit consent is perhaps involved although no explicit statement of consent is

made. In my professional experience there is little evidence of discussion and plenty

evidence of unquestioned assumptions and presumptions about who exercises the power,

and how. Teachers do not renounce a professional freedom, and indeed are told they

have it (individualizing, professional responsibilities) but are homogenised by the way

they are positioned within the structure thus encountering what Foucault calls the

"political 'double bind' which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of

modern power structures" (1983, p.216). This 'double bind' is clearly illustrated in the

world of the teacher where professional Standards, such as the *Standard for Chartered*

Teacher (GTCS, 2002) describe in great detail desirable "professional values and

personal commitments; professional knowledge and understanding; professional and

personal attributes; and professional action" (2002, p.1). This sets out a blueprint for CTs

to follow in relation to their identity and perceived competence. It states what others

deem CTs should believe, know and be like and how they should act. As described in

chapter two, fully registered teachers and headteachers have similar blueprints, and all are

used to 'assess' their performance at annual reviews (SEED, 2002). It is the personal

responsibility and duty of each individual teacher, CT and headteacher to behave in a

carefully specified way which has been described for them by the state. Their registration

to practise is dependent on their compliance and perceived competence as observed by

their line managers (GTCS, 2002a). In this way the individualizing power of the state is

felt by all participants in CPE, while clear expectations are set out for groups of

individuals, or collectives, namely teachers, Chartered Teachers and school leaders, thus

66

setting a scene which expects compliance and creates obstacles to individual resistance.

When discussing relations of power in schools, much of the literature and research

focuses on relationships between staff and pupils (*e.g.* Popkewitz and Brennan 1998;

Allan, 2008) rather than between members of staff, which is the focus of this work. It

would seem that the former tend to be characterised by explicit demonstrations of power,

while the latter shrouds more overt manifestations of power behind professional

politeness and convention. Foucault (1983) acknowledges the veiled nature of power

relations when asking whether:

> one must seek the character proper to power relations in the violence which must
> have been its primitive form, its permanent secret and its last resource, that which
> in the final analysis appears as its real nature when it is forced to throw aside its
> mask and to show itself as it really is? (p.220).

Fairclough (1992) goes further. He quotes Foucault, in his own interpretation of the way

in which power is integral, and hidden by necessity, within relationships:

> Power is implicit within everyday social practices which are pervasively
> distributed at every level in all domains of social life, and are constantly engaged
> in; moreover, it 'is tolerable only on condition that it masks a substantial part of
> itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms' (1981:
> 86) (Fairclough, 1992, p.50).

As outlined in chapter two, the current policy discourse favours distributed leadership,

which necessitates democratic relationships, and yet there is little discussion about what

this means in terms of relations of power. It is possible that a move towards distributed

leadership will simply involve more complex 'masks' being utilised. As the processes

inherent within CPE involve a distribution of leadership, Foucault's construction of

power as relational is used to try to identify and understand the nature of the power

relations which appear to be present. His definition of a relationship of power as "a mode

of action which does not act directly and immediately on others" but "acts upon their

actions: an action upon an action" (1983, p.220) helps me to focus my analysis on the

subtle and complex actions upon actions within the practice of CPE by its participants.

Gore (1998) contends that the study of educational change has "paid little attention to the

microlevel functioning of power in pedagogy" (p.232). She uses Foucault's analytics of

power in her research of pedagogical sites, as she believes that the "range of practices and

relationships possible in the classroom … was limited" (p.232). I would contend that

paying attention to "the micro-functioning of power relations" (p.232) between

colleagues within the practice of CPE will allow a fresh look at the complexities of

professional re-formation and development and will enable an exploration of the 'masks'

which are utilised and "the forms of resistance against different forms of power"

(Foucault, 1983, p211) which are apparent amongst professionals.

Foucault highlights a number of areas which contribute to my sense-making as I examine

the micro-functioning of power relations between colleagues. These are the

power/knowledge knot, techniques of discipline, technologies of the self and forms of

subversion and resistance.

The power-knowledge knot

Foucault (1977) draws attention to the inextricable link between power and knowledge.

He notes:

> that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power
> relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any
> knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power
> relations (p.27).

Hoskins (1990) interprets Foucault's statement by noting that "power relations shape and direct modes of knowing and knowledge" while "knowledge relations shape and direct modes of power" (p.49). Jansen's (1991) studies of censorship, which she believes to be "a feature of all human communities" (p.4) leads her to contend that "knowledge and power are still bound together in an inextricable knot" (p.4). She states that:

> the knot that binds power and knowledge has two loops. Power secures knowledge, but knowledge also secures power. Systems of power-knowledge contain both emancipatory and repressive elements. They do not just set limits on human freedom, they also make it possible (p.7).

She explains this further by noting that:

> In all societies the powerful invoke censorship to create, secure and maintain their control over the power to name. … Because this fundamental censorship is largely unrecognised, its influence is insidious (p.7-8).

Her articulation of the insidious nature of a censorship which attempts to control the power to name is pertinent to this study, as there is evidence in the data of constraints on what can be thought and said, and indeed on what can be known and how different types of knowledge is valued. In my analysis of the data I focus, then, on the ways that the power-knowledge knot constrains *and* enables the exercise of power and how that shapes the kind of knowledge that is allowed and valued. I also focus on the ways in which knowledge shapes the kind of power relations which are possible.

Techniques of discipline

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1977) outlines the technology of discipline, focussed initially on the individual by the state. He then charts the ways in which discipline meted on the individual by the state influences and controls behaviour until it becomes

embedded within the culture, requiring little further intervention by the state. He

examines the "projects of docility" (p.136) associated with the training of soldiers to

illustrate that such "discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, 'docile' bodies"

(p.138). He notes the presence and utilisation of the technology of discipline in other

institutions such as schools, hospitals, prisons and workshops. Clearly its presence and

application in schools is of interest here. While Foucault's examination of the history of

discipline and punishment focuses on the birth of the prison, it makes clear the roots of

social control, which continues to have direct and stark influence on the work of schools.

Foucault (1977) outlines several techniques of discipline, all of which have direct

relevance to schools in the 21st century, and which contribute to my understanding of

power relationships within the practices of CPE. He notes that "discipline sometimes

requires *enclosure*, the specifications of a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in

upon itself" (p.141, *original emphasis*). He goes on to say that enclosure is not enough in

itself to ensure docility, and argues that in addition discipline requires "partitioning", or

the distribution of individuals within the enclosure. He claims that the aim of

partitioning:

> was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate
> individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each
> moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to
> calculate its qualities or merits (p.143).

A further technique of discipline described by Foucault (1977) is that of rank, which

"individualizes bodies by a location that does not give them a fixed position, but

70

distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations" (p.146). He uses the example of the school class to illustrate the powerful effects of rank, arguing that ranking, whether according to age, performance, behaviour or any other classification "made the educational space function like a learning machine, but also as a machine for supervising, hierarchizing, rewarding" (p.147). He notes that ranking allowed the classroom to become a space in which students came "under the scrupulously 'classificatory' eye of the master" (p.147). In our current educational context this technique of discipline is enacted upon students, staff and schools alike, and the power exercised by the 'scrupulously classificatory eye' of the many techniques of surveillance embedded within a "performative regime" (Ball, 2003, p.226) serves to influence practice at many different levels.

Ranking is part and parcel of the work of a school in the 21st century. Schools are ranked according to exam results and published HMIe reports. Within those reports leadership is judged and those leaders evaluated by the classificatory eye of HMIe as weak are named and shamed. Quality of teaching is similarly monitored against prescribed criteria and this task falls upon school managers and is then checked by HMIe. Teachers assess leadership practice and report to HMIe in confidential questionnaires, and school leaders assess teachers' practice and are accountable for this. The focus on rank and performance means that a culture of surveillance is assured.

Foucault goes further, using the 'panopticon' as a metaphor for surveillance that is integral to the technology of discipline. He states that "the exercise of discipline

presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation" (1977, p.170) and that "the old simple schema of confinement and enclosure … began to be replaced by the calculation of openings, of filled and empty spaces, passages and transparencies" (p.172) which enabled surveillance and control. He raises the issue of windows placed on the corridor wall of each classroom in early Ecole Militaire, an architectural feature still seen in schools today. He also notes that toilet doors allowed the heads and legs of pupils to be visible, again a feature not uncommon in modern schools. Foucault goes on to say that the "disciplinary gaze" (p.174) requires a hierarchy of supervision and illustrates this with the example of the development of parish schools in the 15th century in France. As the number of pupils rose the 'eye of the master' was inadequate to the task and so the use of further layers of supervision in the form of monitors, tutors, observers became common. Foucault argues that "by means of such surveillance, disciplinary power became an "integrated" system" (p.176), and "although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a 'head', it is the apparatus as a whole that produces 'power' and distributes individuals in this permanent and continuous field" (p.177). The resonance with current systems in schools is striking and calls into question the innocence and benevolent intent surrounding the current move towards distributive leadership (HMIe, 2007b) and collaborative practice in schools. Again this has very clear implications for the practice of CPE.

Foucault's analysis of discipline continues as he considers "control of activity" (1977, p.149) by firstly looking at the timetable, with its consequent compartmentalisation of a day and then the prescription of what takes place within allotted time blocks. He argues

that "the principle which underlay the time-table … was the principle of non-idleness" (p.154) again a familiar concept to those who work in schools: the students' curriculum being divided and allocated portions of time (LTS, 2000) and teachers' time being apportioned between specific, named activities (SEED, 2001). Leaving no time for idleness, Foucault continues, ensures that a body is "manipulated by authority, rather than imbued with animal spirits" (1977, p.155).

In considering the ways in which these techniques of discipline affect the individual body, Foucault shows that for greater control individuals must be brought together and operate as one. He offers the example of the mutual improvement school of the 17th century in which older pupils teach younger pupils thus ensuring that each pupil is occupied at all times. This, Foucault avers, does not happen on its own but requires "a precise system of command" (p166) which he calls "signalization: it is a question not of understanding the injunction but of perceiving the signal and reacting to it immediately, according to a more or less artificial, prearranged code" (p.166). He goes on to describe signalization as "a technique of training, of *dressage*" (p.166) and offers a picture of school where "few words, no explanation, a total silence interrupted only by signals – bells, clapping of hands, gestures, a mere glance from the teacher" (p.166) ensure docility and control behaviour. Such signals continue to abound; one need only to think of the effect on school teachers of the delivery of a small brown box with the signifier HMIe stamped upon it to realise that such techniques of discipline and control are alive and well in the 21st century.

It is clear that the techniques of discipline summarised above illustrate very specific ways in which power is exercised within and upon organisations and the individuals therein, in ways which are invisible and pervasive. My own frames of reference have been disturbed by the concepts outlined by Foucault in relation to the "project of docility" (1977, p.136), but the concepts also make sense in relation to my experiences of the world. Its success is apparent in my own lack of challenge, as a practitioner, to the daily organisation of schools, the use of functional buildings, divided into classrooms, with or without staff bases, timetables, subject divisions, subtle hierarchies etc. etc. Its success is also clear in the narratives of the participants of CPE.

Technologies of the self

Foucault's (1985) later work goes beyond the deterministic notion of techniques of discipline which work to ensure docility, as he considers technologies of the self. In *The Use of Pleasure*, Foucault (1985) looks at the reasons that sexual behaviour came to be "conceived as a domain of moral experience" (p.24). His definition of morality is helpful, assuming an acceptance that education is a moral endeavour and that teaching has a moral purpose (Fullan, 1993). Foucault (1985) states:

> by "morality" one means a set of values and rules of action that are recommended to individuals through the intermediary of various prescriptive agencies such as the family (in one of its roles), educational institutions, churches, and so forth (p.25).

He believes that these sets of values and rules can be explicitly stated and clearly understood but are also "transmitted in a diffuse manner" (p.25) thus becoming a subtle and pervasive technique of discipline, which leads individuals to undertake ethical work

74

on themselves, not only to "bring one's conduct into compliance with a given rule, but to attempt to transform oneself into the ethical subject of one's behaviour" (p.27). He acknowledges a further definition of morality saying that it also:

> designates the manner in which (individuals) comply more or less fully with a standard of conduct, the manner in which they obey or resist an interdiction or a prescription; the manner in which they respect or disregard a set of values (p.25).

Besley (2005, p.77) notes that "for Foucault both technologies of domination and technologies of the self produce effects that constitute the self" and this would seem to be the case for the teachers in this study. Foucault's notion of "ethical work (travail éthique) that one performs on oneself" (1985, p.27) adds a further dimension to the analysis and understanding of the narratives of all the participants in CPE, in particular when considering their professional re-formation.

Subversion and resistance

It has already been reported that Foucault believes that power and resistance are inextricably linked, and that he contends that we need to "refuse what we are" (1983, p.216). In drawing attention to "the forms of resistance against different forms of power" (p211), he points to a particular kind of analysis:

> To use another metaphor, it consists of using this resistance as a chemical catalyst so as to bring to light power relations, locate their position, find out their point of application and the methods used. Rather than analyzing power from the point of view of its internal rationality, it consists of analysing power relations through the antagonism of strategies (p.211).

In analysing the data, a focus on the strategies used by teachers, Chartered Teachers and school managers sets out to identify different forms of resistance used, thus bringing to

light the complex power relations at play. One analytic device I use is to identify and

explore the metaphors used by the different constituents in CPE.

The use of metaphor

Karl Weick (1979) discusses Ortony's (1975) work on the use of metaphor in language,

and outlines three main benefits. The use of metaphor allows us to offer "a compact

version of events without the need for the message to spell out all the details" (1979,

p.47). Metaphors also allow people "to portray what they cannot portray literally"(p.48).

Lastly Weick highlights Ortony's point, "that metaphors are closer to perceived

experience and therefore are more vivid emotionally, sensorially and cognitively" (p.48).

It is important, however, to acknowledge hegemonic discourses which affect the way that

we see the world and influence our unquestioned belief systems. For example Humes

(2009) discusses the use of economic metaphors within educational discourse to illustrate

the way in which metaphors can expose the ideology of the writer, saying that

"economic metaphors have become so embedded in education that we are sometimes

unaware of their implications" (p.69). Ballard (2003, p.26) goes further, outlining a

major concern about the use of such discourse:

> Naming and treating people as 'providers,' as 'human resources,' as 'learners,'
> producing 'educational outcomes,' and as sites for 'performance management,'
> also, I believe, act against inclusion. This language constructs depersonalised,
> unitised 'others' who we can know primarily, perhaps only, in terms of criteria
> created and sustained within the discourse of an individualistic and mechanistic
> ideology.

So in exploring the narratives of teachers and managers regarding their experience of

CPE it is essential to be aware of the ways in which policy discourse influences and

positions them. While the metaphors they use may well allow us to get closer to their

perceived experience, it will be important not to presume a personal or professional

commitment to that way of thinking though Ballard (2003) does suggest that equally we

should not presume resistance. He presents Ball's (1999) argument that some teachers

will embrace the "performative institution" (Ballard, 2003, p.18), which will alienate and

exclude others.

The belief in the professional value and purpose of CPE was strong among the teachers,

Chartered Teachers and managers. The metaphors used by the teachers in their narratives

tell stories of their "arduous journeys", unsure of the path but ultimately worthwhile.

They show optimism about both the moral worth of their travels and the benefits accrued

on the way, despite the winding route, and obstacles encountered. The managers use

different metaphors: those of parenthood, presenting themselves as knowing what's best

and requiring to challenge their charges in order to ensure they follow the right path.

They also use metaphors of gamesmanship, highlighting tricks and games used to ensure

that the correct path is followed. These will be explored in more detail in chapters six

and seven.

Methodological approach

Having outlined my theoretical framework I now consider and justify the methodological

approach taken within this study. Again this has involved a transformative journey, in

which I have taken tentative and then more confident steps away from a constrained

understanding of how social scientists can investigate and interpret the world. While

intuitively being uncomfortable with the positivist message, I previously had no grounds

on which to question it, or on which to base a challenge to the authoritative power of objective reality which continues to be peddled in policy documents and in media reporting on educational matters. I have however taken a qualitative, interpretivist stance, and explore the relations of power within the practice of collaborative professional enquiry using the case studies method.

To articulate how CPE was experienced and put into practice, involved an in-depth knowledge and understanding of the culture of the contexts in which it took place. To begin to understand and be able to relate what the practice of CPE offered in relation to professional re-formation and development in each of the schools studied involved an understanding of the relationships and personalities of the people who were telling the tales, and of the organizations and the social and profession networks in which the activity took place. I was in a privileged position in this regard as I was known in a number of ways in both of the schools. I was not therefore a "professional stranger" as described by Van Maanen (1988, p2). The relationships that were already established between myself and most of the participants inevitably influenced what took place, how they presented their interpretations and how I interpreted their interpretations. Flyvbjerg (2001) highlights Giddens concept of the "double hermeneutic" (p.32). He quotes Giddens, who notes that in the study of the natural world, "the world does not answer back" (p.32), however in the study of the social world the double hermeneutic takes account of two levels of self-interpretation at play:

> First are the self-interpretations among those people the researchers study … The second aspect of the double hermeneutic concerns the researchers' self-interpretations. Just as the people studied are part of a context, research itself constitutes a context and the researchers are a part of it. The researchers' self-

understanding and concepts do not exist in a vacuum, but must be understood in relation to this context. Context both determines and is determined by the researchers' self-understanding (pp.32-3).

This is an important feature of these case studies.

The case study as a method

In undertaking this research I have been very concerned about the 'so what' question.

Gergen (2001, p.5) states that within the postmodern paradigm, to "do science is not to

hold a mirror to nature, but to participate actively in the interpretive conventions and

practices of a particular culture". It should be reiterated that the interpretation of the data,

and all that was observed throughout this study was firmly located within such a

paradigm. This study is an attempt to offer an interpretive account of an exploration of

collaborative professional enquiry in two contexts, though I acknowledge that the

language I have at my disposal inevitably limits that grand plan. There is no intent to

draw any causal links or offer a warrant for change (Gorard, 2002). There is no intention

to generalise, define, explain or offer a 'truth'. Its main purpose is to offer an account of

practice that will allow practitioners to reflect on their own experience in context thus

contributing to an increase in their understanding of it. The aim of the work is therefore to

contribute to understanding, not to offer explanations. Stake (2000) notes that:

> When explanation, propositional knowledge and law are the aims of an inquiry, the case study will often be at a disadvantage. When the aims are understanding, extension of experience and increase in conviction in that which is known, the disadvantage disappears (p.21).

Furthering his support of the case study method, Stake (2000) also notes that "one of the

more effective means of adding to understanding … will be by approximating, through

words and illustrations of our reports, the natural experiences acquired in ordinary

79

personal involvement" (p.19). While I wish to add to understanding I note that in attempting to approximate through words and illustrations the natural experiences of others, my position in relation to their experience was crucial. My interpretation of their interpretations of their experiences of CPE was greatly influenced by my own experience of the world, my own underlying assumptions and beliefs and, in this case, by my own interpretations and understandings of the contexts in which the CPEs took place. This is considered in detail below, and I would argue that articulating an understanding and appreciation of my place within the case study adds rather than detracts from the enterprise. A case study then seemed an ideal method with which to explore the practice of CPE within the theoretical framework outlined previously. It is a tried and tested method which has particular usefulness for the study in hand. Stake (2000, p.25, *original emphasis*) assures that "this method *has been* tried and found to be a direct and satisfying way of adding to experience and improving understanding".

Stake (2000) suggests that the outcome of a case study is influenced less by the investigator than other kinds of studies when he notes that:

> What is happening and deemed important within those boundaries (the emic) is considered vital and usually determines what the study is about, as contrasted with other kinds of studies where hypotheses or issues previously targeted by the investigators (the etic) usually determine the content of the study (p.23).

While this may be the case I would argue that it is not always so. The investigator who undertakes a case study is likely to dictate what they are looking at, and therefore the focus of what is happening. They also decide what is 'deemed important'. In this case study I, as the researcher, decided what I wanted to look at, and therefore gathered

particular evidence. In doing this I kept my focus on my area of interest, power relations within CPE, thus perhaps ignoring and missing other informative data.   As the researcher, therefore, I decided what I deemed important. I decided what data to gather, what questions to pose, when and to whom and most crucially how to interpret and analyse that data.

In Goffman's (1959) account of the performances enacted within teams he refers to intent, when discussing truth-telling and deceit. Reality is also an enduring theme within his treatise on the ways in which people present themselves in everyday life. One example of this is that he notes, "There seems to be a general feeling that the most real and solid things in life are ones whose description individuals independently agree on" (p.92). This would seem to indicate a simple belief in triangulation as a method of validation. His apparent belief that there are 'real and solid things in life' also suggests a positivist outlook. Laurel Richardson (2003) however outlines the postmodernist move from triangulation as a method of validation to "crystallization" that "provides us with a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial, understanding of the topic" (p.518). In my analysis and interpretation of the data I am not concerned with evaluating narratives as truth or deceit, nor identifying what is 'real and solid'. I acknowledge that my analysis and interpretation will be partial, though by using the Foucauldian framework outlined above to consider the data from a number of perspectives my intention is to offer a more complex and deepened understanding of the relations of power at work.

My place as researcher

There was never an intention or a possibility to be an objective observer, as I was known

in both the school communities in a number of guises. Goffman (1959) uses the metaphor

of performance when considering:

> the way in which the individual in ordinary work situations presents himself and
> his activity to others, the ways in which he guides and controls the impression
> they form of him, and the kinds of things he may and may not do while sustaining
> his performance before them (*preface*).

I will presume to borrow this metaphor and suggest that I position myself as a

'knowledgeable critic' in giving this account. I knew something of worlds of the

teachers, CTs and managers, having played both professional and personal roles in each

setting. I knew something of what went on 'back stage', particularly in one setting. In

gaining permission from them to write about their experiences with CPE they were

opening themselves to being written about with little power or control over what would

be written. This is perhaps similar to the experience of performers who open themselves

to scrutiny by the very nature of their public performances. I was also the university tutor

of the CTs involved and therefore had a specific and current role which brought into

sharp relief a particular relationship of power in my role as academic supervisor.

Foucault (1977) discusses the power embedded in the act of examination. He notes that:

> The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of
> a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it
> possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a
> visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them (p.184).

At an early stage, to minimise this effect, it was decided that I would not mark or assess

the work of the four CTs involved in this research. Nevertheless I was part of the CPD

team which had set the examination task and they knew their written work would be judged and examined by one of my academic colleagues. I continued as their supervisor and offered formative feedback in relation to their written drafts, and thus had influence in the way they told their stories. The tangled web does not end there, as almost more importantly, the dramas that the students were involved in were 'written' and 'directed' by the CPD team given that they were only 'performing' in a CPE because they were asked to do so as part of their Masters programme. The tutor team at the university therefore held a powerful position and I was part of that team.

As stated above, I knew about the two school contexts from professional and personal perspectives and was known in both as someone other than a researcher. The following gives some of the background of my knowing and being known:

My place within the Primary School

- *I had been a parent*: I have two children. Both spent seven years as pupils there. As a parent I had been, in general, compliant and supportive of the school, and both children were generally motivated, compliant and successful pupils. Neither of the Chartered Teachers taught there when my children were pupils, though some of the participants had. I had no negative experiences with any of the teachers as a parent.

- *I was a School Board member:* I was an active member of the School Board so was known by many of the teachers as both parent and board member. I had been supportive of the staff group while on the school board and was often in the

situation where I was supporting them and their wishes in conflict with the then Headteacher.

- *I had been a colleague*: During my children's time at the school, I was a teacher in the same local authority area, working with pupils with specific learning difficulties across the authority, and on occasions worked with pupils in the school as a visiting specialist. The year after my second child went to secondary, I was appointed Assistant Headteacher of the school, working alongside the current Headteacher

- *I am a friend and neighbour:* I made a number of continuing friendships with members of staff and live in the town.

- *I was the Headteacher at a neighbouring school*: I left to become Headteacher at a nearby school within the same local authority, and was therefore known in that capacity also. I had appointed one of the Chartered Teachers in that school before she transferred and therefore she knew me as her previous Headteacher.

- *I was Course Director of the Chartered Teacher programme*: In addition to the leaders of the CPEs, one of the participants had embarked on the course so I was therefore known in that capacity also.

My place within the Secondary School

- *I had been a parent:* My two children each spent six years at this secondary school. They had good relationships with most teachers and, again, were generally successful, motivated and compliant students. They had been directly taught by both of the Chartered Teachers involved. There were some teachers in

the school with whom my children had less positive relationships and on all occasions it seemed to me that there were faults on both sides. Some of the teachers and managers in both schools had had direct previous contact with me while others were new. I consequently presume that different teachers I interviewed had different pre-conceived perceptions of me, as I did of them.

- *I had been a fellow professional:* I was known as the ex-Assistant Headteacher of their associated primary school and ex-Headteacher of another school by both of the CTs and most of the participants.

- *I am a friend and neighbour:* I had a number of existing friendships with members of staff in the secondary school and am the next-door neighbour of one of the participants.

- *I was Course Director of the Chartered Teacher programme*: Several teachers at the school including both leaders of the CPEs and one interviewed participant had embarked on the course and I was therefore known in that capacity also.

I had therefore experienced the cultures from a number of perspectives, justifying the notion of the 'knowledgeable' critic. I was aware at the outset that these pre-existing relationships would affect the way in which I would interpret their accounts, and also the ways in which the interviewees would relate to or 'perform' for me. It became clear, however, that I had under-estimated the size and importance of these effects. The implications of these relationships cannot be removed from this story, and nor would I wish them to be. I hope to show that they have contributed to a better-informed critique, and a richer description.

It is self-evident that each of the interviews took place at a particular time and in a particular place. Returning for a moment to the theatrical metaphor, these facts were important when one considers each transcript as an account of a performance. The temporal and physical setting of a performance sets a particular scene. Some of the interviewees chose to be interviewed together while others were interviewed individually. All of the teachers were interviewed in their school building, while some of the interviews undertaken with the CTs took place at the University. All of the Chartered Teachers' interviews took place outwith school time while some of the participants were enabled to be interviewed during school hours, though this was not the case for all. One of the school managers was on secondment to a government department and chose to be interviewed during the working day in her new place of work, while the other was interviewed after school hours, in school. I believe that these details were important and contributed to the dynamics of the interview situation.

When analysing the data it also became clear that the relationship between audience (interviewer) and performer (interviewee) was not clear-cut. Goffman (1959) acknowledges that his metaphor is not without difficulty, noting that on stage there are three groups involved: the player, the other players and the audience, while in real life these are "compressed into two: the part one individual plays is tailored to the parts played by the others present, and yet these others also constitute the audience" (*preface*). In the case of the interviews undertaken for this study, for the reason already outlined, I was not an objective audience asking questions and listening impassively and without prior knowledge to the responses from the more knowledgeable performers. The

respondents did, as Goffman suggests, 'tailor' the part they played "to the parts played by others present" (1959, *preface*) and that included me, as interviewer. This was particularly relevant, and may have had significant impact on the data, where interviewees chose to be interviewed in groups. I have no way of knowing whether or how their performances were tailored to the parts played by others present, and reflect on this in some detail in chapter eight.

The data have been drawn from, amongst other places, the transcripts of several semi-structured interviews undertaken over a year. These interviews were transcribed by myself as verbatim records of the encounters, in an attempt to capture the nuances of language that add meaning. Goffman (1981, p.1-2.) notes:

> Everyone knows that when individuals in the presence of others respond to events, their glances, looks, and postural shifts carry all kinds of implication and meaning. When in these settings when words are spoken, then tone of voice, manner of uptake, restarts, and the variously positioned pauses similarly qualify. As does the manner of listening.

In using quotes from interviews I have attempted to offer some of the non-verbal context in order to more faithfully represent the encounter, and yet again I acknowledge this will have been influenced by my interpretation of that encounter. Because I was already known in a number of roles, and had established relationships within the research settings there were some situations when questions were asked which unconsciously (or consciously?) held unspoken messages. This was the case for answers also, where respondents answered in some situations with tongue in cheek or with a knowing look that suggested my agreement, or that they knew that I knew what they really meant. Goffman (1981, p.2) comments that "the movements, looks and vocal sounds we make as

an unintended by-product of speaking and listening never seem to remain innocent" and I believe this to be so and yet I found these nuances difficult to record and difficult to reproduce.   I have also considered the ethical issues that surround my attempt to do so. I have had to reflect on whether I was interpreting their looks and gestures, and the meanings between the words as they meant them or whether I was inserting my own understandings. Were they communicating to me verbally as interviewer/interviewee but non-verbally as friend/friend?   They were certainly aware that they were being taped and while the words used would be captured and stored, the non-verbal communication would not.

It would be impossible, however, to take account of all the nuances, or the unspoken and, in some cases, unnoticed relationships amongst the different players. For example it is noted that both headteachers, who delegated their deputes as my contact, were male while all CTs and both managers interviewed were female but I do not investigate what, if any impact, gender issues had on the stories. Nor do I explore in any depth, the autobiographies of the teachers who participated with the CTs in the CPE. So, for example, I take no account of the number of years they have been teaching, unless specifically stated by them, or their particular values and attitudes to teaching in general. It is possible that both of these examples would have an influence on their experience of CPE, but the scope of this research did not allow such depth, however intriguing these areas would be.

The research

I set out to undertake a case study to focus on the phenomenon of CPE rather than the cases and contexts themselves. Stake (2005) refers to this kind of case study as instrumental. He explains:

> I use the term instrumental case study if a particular case is examined mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization. The case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else. The case still is looked at in depth, its contexts scrutinized and its ordinary activities detailed, but all because this helps us pursue the external interest. The case may be seen as typical of other cases or not (p.445).

The questions of typicality and representativeness are important ones. The two schools I selected are representative of others in Scotland as they are run by a local authority rather than a private organisation, and are subject to the same rules and policies as schools across the country. They could be said to be atypical however as, at the time of the study, they offered favourable contexts to study the practice of CPE due to a local authority initiative which actively encouraged enquiry as central to the improvement agenda.

Stake (2005) notes that when selecting a case the most important thing to consider is what the case offers in relation to what can be learned:

> The researcher examines various interests in the phenomenon, selecting a case of some typicality but leaning toward those cases that seem to offer *opportunity to learn*. My choice would be to use that case from which we feel we can learn the most. That may mean taking the one most accessible or the one we can spend the most time with. Potential for learning is a different and sometimes superior criterion to representativeness, Sometimes it is better to learn a lot from an atypical case than a little from a seemingly typical case (*original emphasis*, p.451).

The two schools chosen were easily accessible, as I was already known in both, and had little problem obtaining permission to undertake my research. They are associated schools within the same local authority cluster and therefore offered an opportunity to study a primary and secondary school which drew from the same population of pupils. In addition, both schools had two teachers undertaking the Chartered Teacher programme, two on the first stage of leading a CPE and another two at the final stage. These two features offered a wider base for study as I was able to look at two similar schools rather than two separate schools in disparate areas in which only one teacher was available in each. The management and members of staff were generous with their time, allowing me access to interview at various times throughout the CPEs. For these reasons I believed that these two schools offered enhanced opportunities to learn about the practice of CPE.

The schools

The two schools, one primary school and one secondary school, are located on a shared campus in a prosperous commuter town in the central belt of Scotland. To ensure confidentiality I will name the secondary school SS, and the primary school PS. The practice of CPE was supported in these two settings by the four particular teachers who were working towards a Masters degree leading to Chartered Teacher status. This degree has two major work-based elements, the largest of which requires the student to initiate and facilitate CPE leading to improvement in pupil attainment and achievement. Evidence for this improvement, along with evidence of the collaboration that took place

and the impact on teaching and learning in school, accompanies a reflective account of the process and product.

At the time of the study, the primary school had a roll of 514. It had recently undergone major refurbishment at the same time as a new primary school was built in the town. As a consequence PS lost an annex and over two hundred pupils to the new school. When this case study took place the Headteacher had been in post for ten years. However over the previous three years a significant number of teachers, including the long-serving Depute Headteacher, had retired within a short space of time. There had therefore been considerable change in its recent history, though attainment in Maths and English Language remained high and were deemed very good by the Inspectorate.

Two commonly used indicators of the social profile of a school community are the proportion of pupils entitled to free school meals and the attendance figures. In PS free school meal entitlement was well below the national average, while attendance figures were well above the national average. The vast majority of its pupils transferred to the associated secondary school (SS) at the completion of their primary education.

The Secondary School had a roll of 1224 pupils, at the time of the study. The Headteacher had been in post for 12 years and many of the staff had worked in the school for much of their careers. It was a high performing school in terms of pupil attainment, and was regularly over-subscribed. Due to its popularity, there had been much building work over the previous few years and this had resulted in enhanced resources and facilities. Like its associated primary school, the free school meal entitlement in SS was

well below the national average, and attendance figures were well above the national average.

The participants

In each school two aspiring Chartered Teachers led a CPE. The number of teachers involved in each CPE varied, but 14 were interviewed in total. In both schools data were also gathered from a Depute Headteacher. I will name the aspiring Chartered Teachers who led the CPEs in PS as CT1 and CT2, and those in SS as CT3 and CT4. Although each was working towards Chartered Teacher status while leading the CPE, to simplify and in the interest of brevity, I have chosen to use the term CT rather than 'aspiring CT' throughout. Each teacher interviewed is numbered from T1 to T14. All interviewees, except for one, were female. To protect the male teacher's anonymity, I intend to refer to all interviewees as 'she'.

When referring to the members of the senior management team interviewed in both schools, I shall call them PSM and SSM. In each school, I met with the Headteacher when initially negotiating access to the schools. Both Headteachers subsequently delegated the management of the CPEs to their Deputes. Table 1, on page 94, summarises the information above.

The current discourse around headship focuses on leadership over management practices but Gronn (2003, p.273) questions "the validity, utility and worth of binary or dualistic distinctions".   I have been aware that in telling this story I have tended to name these

Depute Headteachers as managers rather than leaders. On reflecting on this I realised that I unconsciously accepted the dualism, linking management tasks with supervision, organisation and control, but Gronn (2003) would question the rationale behind such categorisation. He goes on to cite Nicholls (2002) who suggests that effective organisations require extraordinarily talented managers but sees no need for them to be named as leaders. Sennett (1998) makes an even stronger point. In a discussion about modern 'team-working' he notes that:

> A fiction arises in modern teamwork at work: employees aren't really competing against each other. And even more important the fiction arises that workers and bosses aren't antagonists; the boss instead manages group process. He or she is a "leader", the most cunning word in the modern management lexicon; a leader is on your side rather than your ruler (p.111).

Interestingly, while the discourse of leadership is dominant in Scotland at this time, the term 'school or senior management team' is commonly used to describe the group of people who 'lead' the school. The *Standard for Headship* (SEED, 2005) perpetuates the dualism of leadership and management, as it states that effective headteachers "require both to lead and to manage" (p.4). It defines these actions as follows:

> Leadership develops shared vision, inspires and creates commitment and embraces risk and innovation. Management develops systems which limit uncertainty, even out differences, and improve consistency and predictability in delivering the service (p.4).

This definition of leadership tends to illustrate Sennett's point that leaders manage group processes though it is not clear whether there is an intentional element of cunning and calculation in the policy rhetoric. I also acknowledge that 'the manager' is as much "an indefensibly unitary construction" (Stronach *et al.,* 2002, p.109) as the teacher or the nurse and this message is reinforced by Ball (2005), who reminds us that "while we may

be constantly tempted to speak about 'the professional', and indeed 'the manager' and 'the leader' – these are neither collectively nor individually unitary, nor coherent and fixed identities" (p.7). With this in mind, and in the interest of brevity I will, however, refer to the Depute Headteachers as managers throughout.

Table 1: Participants

Primary School - PS		
Chartered Teacher	**Participants**	**Manager**
CT1	T1-T5	PSM
CT2	T6 – T8 (one of whom was CT1)	PSM
Secondary School - SS		
Chartered Teacher	**Participants**	**Manager**
CT3	T9 – T13	SSM
CT4	T14	SSM

The data

In gathering data, I interviewed three of the Chartered Teachers twice, and one on one occasion. I also interviewed some of the group members involved in the CPE in each case, at varying stages of the process, and one of the school managers in each setting. I produced verbatim transcriptions of all these encounters.

I met with CT1 initially along with five of her group then met her individually after the CPE was over. At this second interview she reflected on the group interview as well as on

the process and product of the CPE. I interviewed CT2 along with one member of her group at an early stage of the CPE, then again later with two other members of her group, one of whom was CT1. I interviewed CT3 individually at the early stages and again at the end of the CPE. I also met with five of her group, three individually and two together. Gathering data from the CPE led by CT4 was less straightforward. I interviewed her once, and met with one of her group during the enquiry.   She did not write up and submit her dissertation within the lifetime of this research as she gained promotion within the school. She took leave of absence from the academic programme, and for this reason her voice is present less often. It is interesting to note, however, that the CPE went ahead, an illustration of the dislocation between the professional and academic elements of the enterprise.

I had access to the written descriptions of the outcomes of three of the four CPEs, artefacts generated as assessed dissertations for a Masters degree. I also serendipitously had access to the written account of the process as described by one of the managers, which was generated as an assessed assignment for the Postgraduate Diploma in School Leadership and Management (Scottish Qualification for Headship) at a different University. Lastly, by chance, HMIe inspections took place in both settings during the year in which the second CPEs were taking place. I therefore have access to both published inspection reports. Table 2, below, outlines the data collected and its relationship to the participants.

Table 2: Data

Person/school	Interview 1	Interview 2	Written artefact
CT1	Interview with T1 – T5	Individual interview	Dissertation
CT2	Interview with T6	Interview with T7 – T8	Dissertation
CT3	Individual interview	Individual interview	Dissertation
CT4	Individual interview		
T9-T11	Individual interviews		
T12-T13	Joint interview		
T14	Individual interview		
PSM	Individual interview		SQH portfolio and report
SSM	Individual interview		
PS and SS			HMIe Inspection reports

The interviews

In all cases I gained permission to audiotape the interviews and transcribe them. When interviewing the CTs I began each interview asking them to tell me the story of their CPE so far, and thereafter followed their track of interest with probes as appropriate. When interviewing the participants I used the following semi-structured interview schedule:

1. Can you tell me how you became involved?

2. Why did you become involved? What did you think would be the benefits of being part of the group?

3. What did you do? What did you contribute to the process / product?

4. Can you describe what you think CPE is?

5. What were the effects of being part of CPE in this case, for you? For your pupils? For your colleagues?

6. Do you think it has contributed anything to learning in school?

7. Do you think anything has changed as a result?

When interviewing the school managers I used a different interview schedule. I began both interviews by asking them to consider the working definition of CPE that was informing the work of the teachers then asked the following questions:

1. What are your thoughts on the working definition of CPE?

2. Does this differ from your own understanding of CPE?

3. Is there a difference between a CPE group and a traditional working group?

4. What are the issues surrounding the management of CPE from your perspective?

5. In terms of the SCT, how do you see the role of the CT?

6. How are your qualified CTs being used in school?

The analysis

The ultimate purpose of this work is to contribute to the ongoing dialogue and praxis in order to meet the moral obligation (Gage, 2007) of education research *i.e.* to contribute to improved educational action. The analysis of the data helps to generate "descriptions and re-descriptions" (Biesta, 2008, podcast) which lead to the generation of explanations and understandings. It is hoped that this in turn will assist in the identification of ways in which we can work to make sure that leaders at different levels in an organisation hear and understand each other, thus developing supportive and complementary work processes.

As already stated, I transcribed all the interviews verbatim, attempting to capture the nuances of the encounters. Thus began the analysis process. I transcribed, read, re-read and re-listened to the data in order to become familiar with it and to 'hear' what was being said to me. In the first instance, I drew out two themes which appeared to emerge: legitimation and issues of power and control. There was evidence throughout the data that all the chartered teachers and both of the managers were concerned about what kind of action was allowed to take place, and by whom. For example the chartered teachers' leadership of the groups appeared to be legitimated within school due to their engagement with a University course and also due to the local authority initiative; and yet it appeared that this legitimation was partial. The initial analysis of the data suggested that the managers were uncomfortable with handing power to the CTs, illustrated by the example of PSM talking of her need to 'project manage' the enquiries, and 'give the groups a remit'. The CTs involved experienced this action as disempowering and controlling. I realised that these issues were of great importance to the participants and to their ability to practice collaboratively; I therefore re-visited my theoretical framework and re-considered my research questions.

I generated a large number of further themes, and drew up an extended grid allocating data to relevant subheadings:

- Sustainability of focus of intervention / CPE
- CT contribution / leadership style
- Role of CT / what changed
- Teacher contribution / role
- Teachers being positioned positively and negatively
- Management interference /agency
- Management understanding of CPE
- Subversion / Resistance

- Structural issues
- Difference in practise / essence of CPE / CPE as CPD
- Place of HE / qualification
- Influence of accountability regime
- CPE – a different way of working?
- Discussions about working definition

This helped to tease out the issues but I realised that these themes required further refinement. I continued to zigzag between the data and my reading, and Foucault's genealogical study of discipline and punishment seemed to offer a helpful way to look at the data in a more sophisticated way, allowing me to resist the binary positions of manager as powerful and teachers as lacking in power. Scheurich and McKenzie (2005) note that Foucault's Discipline and Punish (1977) "is literally a panoply of critical tools and ideas that can be used …" (p.856). His writing on techniques of discipline and the notion of power as relational certainly drew my attention to the more subtle interactions which were evident within the data.

I began to explore the ways in which, for example, policy and policy discourse worked as techniques of discipline to ensure docility in both managers and teachers. According to Scheurich and McKenzie (2005), the notions of 'distributive leadership' and 'communities of learners', both ideas highly relevant to this study, are amongst a number of 'new' techniques of power in education. They comment that:

> these … focus on controlling or managing the "soul" of educators rather than just their behaviours, which , to Foucault, is much more oppressive than techniques of power that seek to control only behaviours (p.857).

With these new understandings I went back to the data, reading through all transcripts and written artefacts once more. Foucault's concepts functioned as an apparatus through which to read the data, leading to the production of a particular assemblage which in turn

performatively constituted the data in particular ways. Through this process, the focus of the analysis became the ways in which the individual teachers, chartered teachers and managers were positioned and positioned themselves and others; and the effects of that positioning.

In the first data analysis chapter I consider the ways that teachers and managers in school are positioned, suggesting that the school managers are positioned to behave in particular ways which support technologies of discipline and that the teachers are similarly positioned to be accepting of this. I explore the productive and masked nature of power within the practice of CPE and the range of practices and relationships that were deemed possible. In doing so I suggest that Chartered Teachers perplex and disturb established relations of power and their position is currently fluid: neither teacher nor manager. In the following chapter I consider the effects of this positioning, and how the Chartered Teachers experience and negotiate their in-between location. In the final data analysis chapter I explore in more detail the teachers' and Chartered Teachers' claims regarding the benefits of CPE in relation to their professional re-formation and development, in light of the exploration of power relations within the schools.

Chapter Five: Active Positioning

The review of the literature on professionalism and professional practice in chapter three led to the conclusion that active professionalism (Sachs, 2003) continues to be aspirational for most teachers. Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002) acknowledge that its development involves "creating new forms of power at all levels of a community" (p.355). I have argued that the professional actions associated with CT status involve pro-activity by the teachers concerned. I have also argued that current policy rhetoric suggests a willingness to engage in the creation of new forms of power in the guise of distributed leadership, though it contains no apparent acknowledgement of the disturbing nature of such an enterprise. In this chapter I explore the ways, within the data, in which the different participants in CPE are positioned and position themselves with regard to active professionalism, and the consequential change to relations of power. I explore the productive and masked nature of power within the practice of CPE and the range of practices and relationships that were deemed possible.

The techniques that discipline and position both teachers and managers in schools lead to limits and boundaries, which are evident with regard to the ways that people at different levels in the organisation are allowed and expected to behave towards each other. These techniques are apparent within the case studies, and illustrate the ways in which individuals are distributed and the multi-faceted accountability regimes to which they are subject. I, therefore, focus on these techniques of discipline to frame my analysis.

The distribution of individuals

The crucial element of collaborative professional enquiry, as led by the Chartered Teachers in this study, is that they were asked by the academy to identify an area of interest and/or concern to them and some of their colleagues. It was supposed that the teachers themselves would identify this area of interest and identify and engage colleagues who shared it and with whom they would collaborate. While it was presumed that the focus of the enquiry would be consistent with the school improvement plan, agency of the participants was central. It emerged that this requirement caused considerable perturbation in both schools.

The process of identifying the areas for enquiry was straightforward for CT1, CT2 and CT3. CT1 worked with colleagues in the Infant Department to evaluate a new resource, Let's Think, and investigate its potential; CT2 and her colleagues chose to look at Assessment is for Learning (AifL) in the context of Writing and CT3 and colleagues from seven different departments in the school also looked at AifL, focusing on feedback and feedforward. CT4 had more difficulty identifying an area for her enquiry and in the end looked at outdoor education and its contribution to personal and social development. The managers in both schools gave explicit support to the action of these teachers and their groups. As already stated, they were also supported by the local authority's commitment to school improvement through professional enquiry. The CTs therefore had overt support for their leadership roles.

In PS, however, a decision was taken to involve all teachers in a CPE and therefore an element of coercion was introduced. PSM indicated that the decision to mandate participation was an attempt to engage and include rather than a conscious desire to distribute individuals in order to control their activity. She described its genesis:

> We did an exercise last summer which I thought was great. We all sat down together and brainstormed all the things that we know are out there that we're supposed to know something about so we created this whole list and people were in different groups and then their group basically had to bid, if you like, what was going to be our main focus on the improvement plan for this year ehm and I was feeling really great about that, I thought great that's distributed leadership and decision making and everything and then we had HMI in and one of the strong features that came up in the staff questionnaires was that they feel that they're not, feel they are given decision making opportunities.

The teachers did not, therefore, appear to experience this exercise as the distribution of decision-making. It was certainly evident from CT1's group that many teachers felt that decisions had been imposed on them, and indeed, for some, there was a high level of resentment that this was the case. At the first interview I asked members of CT1's group why they had become involved in the CPE. T1 immediately responded "I didn't really have the choice". T4 suggested that this affected the quality of her engagement when she said, "I think maybe because you're enthusiastic about something, it rubs off on the children if you're happy to do something whereas if you're forced to do something – you've got to do it and you really don't put your heart and soul into it". This was re-iterated by T2 who noted "Yes, I'd rather do something that is valid, something that I had signed up for, something that has direct value rather than …". She did not complete the sentence. This was repeated when interviewing CT2's group. CT2 and T6 noted that their group had some volunteers who wanted to be involved, but that the staff had "had to opt in to one group within a choice of three". T6 added, with laughter in her voice, that

the group she chose was "the lesser of three evils", perhaps providing an example of "cynical compliance" (Ball, 2003, p.226). CT2 also highlighted coercion in relation to both membership and the focus of the enquiry: each teacher had to become a member of a group *and* the nature of the enquiry was not necessarily that of their choosing.

As PSM noted, HMIe did indeed report that the school "did not involve all staff enough in agreeing priorities" (HMIe, 2006, p.8). A similar message was noted in SS, which was inspected the year before. T14 noted that when HMIe visited "one of the questions ….was how much do you feel you are asked to contribute to the whole school policies and a lot of us felt we could contribute an awful lot more." This was confirmed in the published HMIe report, which noted that "around a quarter of staff thought they should be more effectively involved in discussion of school priorities and in decision making" (HMIe, 2005, p.13).

Paradoxically, the teachers in PS reported to the Inspectors that while they believed the school to be well led, "they would have liked senior management to give a clearer indication of their expectations in relation to some aspects of the school's work" (HMIe, 2006, p.2). So, while apparently happy with the leadership in the school, the teachers were looking for clear indications of management expectations having already voiced a desire for greater decision making opportunities. This seems to suggest a tension for teachers who were wishing to take on more responsibility, and indeed were positioned by the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) to do so, and yet who were working within a system which continued to position them as belonging to a 'lower caste' (Van Maanen,

1988, p.88). This subservient role appeared to de-motivate the teachers though they felt they had to comply. Such ambivalence resonates with MacDonald's (2004) findings that despite being given permissions to work more collegially the teachers' actions perpetuated the existing hierarchical system.   Indeed CT1 noted that even within her group the teachers were initially reluctant to share leadership functions with one member saying "You just tell us what you want us to do and we'll do it". There would also, therefore, appear to be a real tension for the school managers who were sent mixed messages with regard to what teachers wanted, and how they should be positioned.

This tension was illustrated by PSM who expressed satisfaction that her actions encouraged participation in the identification of school priorities for improvement but was disappointed by the comments made to HMIe by members of staff. In what appeared to be an attempt to understand the behaviour of the teachers, she commented:

> Well I think one of the things on that note was it's given your average class teacher to understand that although we're going to plan collegially and we're going to negotiate what we're focussing on, that doesn't mean that they can all get what they want.

This illustrates an age old frustration with democracy: where a decision is made by the majority, the minority will be disappointed. PSM seemed to imply that teachers reported lack of involvement in the decision making process simply because they were not assigned to their group or topic of choice. Teachers were positioned, in this instance, as being naïve of the processes involved in collegial decision making and petulant in their disappointment at not getting their own way.

In contrast, the foci of the enquiries which took place in the secondary school were generated by the teachers themselves, and participation was voluntary. When asked about her thoughts on mandatory participation SSM described the unresolved nature of this professional dilemma. She acknowledged the inherent difficulties of coercion and outlined her perception of the issues which arose in the school as a result of its absence:

> Well we don't have that in SS against my judgement. When I spoke to HT about this, that I would like in SS every single teacher to be forced to be in a working group of some sort about a cross school issue because unless you put them into one they're not going to go. Now I know that holds a whole can of worms in its own right but the trouble is if you don't, you get the same people putting their hands up and you get the same people never moving forward or hearing other people's thinking or engaging in some sort of professional dialogue about their pedagogical approach blahdeblah so you want to make them go in….. You know we always go through this: do we invite, do we open it up?

The use of the phrase *"to be forced"* in line two positions many teachers as reluctant, and by saying "because unless *you put them* into one they're not going to go" SSM outlined her belief that without force some teachers will not engage in whole school development work. She reinforced this by saying "you want to *make* them go in", and yet the level of participation from the teachers in the school suggested that many are willing to be involved, are interested and see value and purpose in enquiry. Indeed T14, who when interviewed was involved in her third CPE, stated that she thought:

> there were an awful lot of us around the school who wanted to do something but weren't quite sure how we were going to do that. Now maybe in other schools there might be another way you know, the school might say that kind of thing is important and go for it and there's your support, but historically that hadn't been happening openly around this school.

She identified CPE as:

> a good vehicle for us to have the opportunity to go the Board of Studies and say this is what we want to do and for them to say yes and that's fine and here's your

support, which we may have felt we wouldn't have got had we not had that reason before. They might have just looked at us strangely.

This would appear to reveal a dissonance between the perceptions of the school manager and at least some members of staff. It also suggested that the practice of CPE marked a change in relationships within the school, whereby teachers were beginning to proactively seek opportunities to become involved beyond their classrooms, thus challenging the expectations of their managers that they needed to be "forced". It must be noted however that the teachers participating in CPE in the secondary school who were interviewed were, by and large, enthusiastic and pre-disposed to pro-active behaviour. CT4 did not find all colleagues as willing when she was trying to initiate her enquiry. She commented that when trying to engage colleagues in the early stage of her CPE she met with a group of interested teachers and asked them to let her know if they wished to become involved. While T14 did wish to join the group another colleague "came back the next again day and said "Not on your Nellie" and basically said she wasn't getting involved because she was too lazy and didn't want the hassle".

In the primary school PSM did not seem to have considered that the teachers would be happy to engage and participate of their own volition. She too talked of needing to encourage teachers to become involved by offering an incentive:

> the way I presented it was this can count all towards your 35 hours CPD. You can get involved with working groups and so on and everybody signed up for it.

The language used here suggests choice and yet that was not how the staff understood what was said. Despite being disgruntled at having 'no choice', more than one teacher in

PS appears to have been keen to be involved in CPE. T2, for example, explained her

rationale for becoming involved in CT1's group:

> Well I thought something would come of our doing Let's Think properly because we had been trying to deliver it and not succeeding and hopefully by doing it all together something would come out of it that would help us.

T6 also explained the reason that she joined CT2's group:

> I decided to sign up for the action enquiry group because I wanted to be part of something that would benefit the whole school and to be part of something with other staff in the school. Ehm I knew from last groups, other action enquiry groups it was a lot of work and from the people that I spoke to they seemed to be quite positive about it and that the work paid off, so I wanted to be part of that.

Both of these reasons suggested a motivation to participate for intrinsic and highly

professional reasons. PSM's ambivalence was understandable, however, when one

considers that T2 followed up her previous statement by saying "Can I be honest? I

thought well that would be my CPD hours – I might as well fill it in with something that I

am interested in". If PSM only heard or took account of the latter statement, or indeed

this was the only message communicated to her, it is easy to understand why she

positioned teachers as needing extrinsic motivation and/or coercion to ensure their

engagement. Her continuing ambivalence was evident in her presentation of coercion

within a framework of choice:

> It was always my intention to have everybody investigating something of their choosing, well that we had short listed ehm, so we had that experience last year and this year I've really pushed for everybody is doing this. We're all going to look at one thing; some of you might want to help co-ordinate and plan and devise what we're going to look at and how we're going to look at it but it still seems to have come as a shock to the teachers that they are all to do the action enquiry, you know, all have to sort of take part.

It was her intention that, in the first year, teachers would investigate 'something of their choosing' that had been short listed and therefore controlled by herself, though in year two she decided that the school would focus on one area and teachers were presented with choice in relation to the role they could play within that whole school enquiry. The dilemmas for the two school managers can be understood from a Foucauldian perspective. The teachers can be seen as being positioned as "docile bodies" (Foucault, 1977 p.138) with the managers using or wishing to use the technique of "partitioning" (p.143) to distribute individuals and to secure participation. The teachers are positioned and distributed in CPE groups in order to:

> establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communication, to interrupt others, to be able to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits. (p.143)

Such grouping facilitates the supervision of activity, and as headteachers are positioned by the *Standard for Headship* (SEED, 2005) to "set high expectations, support and encourage good practice and regularly monitor and evaluate the quality of learning in the school" (p.4), it is no surprise that the school managers felt the need to exercise power in this way. The dilemma highlighted by SSM between autonomy and control is unsurprising when one considers that the SfH also exhorts school managers to:

> demonstrate a clear commitment to collegiality and to developing, empowering and supporting effective teams and individuals. This includes building school capacity by developing leadership in others. (p.5)

PSM's use of the technique of partitioning allowed her to exert a level of control over teachers' activities, monitoring and evaluating conduct and performance.

Foucault (1977) presents "control of activity" (p.149) as a further technique of discipline, which is underpinned by "the principle of non-idleness" (p.154). PSM positioned the teachers as unwilling, and by making engagement in an action enquiry compulsory she was able to control their activity and ensure their participation. By offering an extrinsic reward in the form of using up their compulsory CPD hours to encourage the teachers' participation, she further positioned them as irresponsible, unwilling and unable to see the benefits of action enquiry in relation to outcomes for pupils.

The data suggest that even though they positioned them as reluctant and that they perceived coercion to be for their own good, the managers were reluctant to overtly 'force' teachers to participate. It would appear however that covert 'force' was used. Foucault noted that power was "tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanism" (1978, p.86). Sennett's (1998) notion that the collaborative team work ethic is less benign than it may at first appear would seem to reinforce Foucault's assertion. Sennett (1998) considers the position of the leader of a team who attempts to manage process, facilitate and mediate rather than direct:

> People still play games of power in teams, but the emphasis on soft skills of communication, facilitation, and mediation changes radically one aspect of power: authority disappears, authority of the sort which self-confidently proclaims, "This is the right way!" or "Obey me, because I know what I'm talking about!" The person with power does not justify command; the powerful only "facilitate," enable others (p.109).

This change appeared to be at the heart of the managers' dilemma. They appeared to experience a loss of authority when attempting to offer autonomy to the teachers, while also trying to drive forward an improvement agenda for which they were accountable. Hatcher (2005) reports on a piece of research by Moore *et al.* (2002) which suggests that their dilemma is shared by other school managers. Hatcher notes that in their study of eight headteachers Moore *et al.* found that some achieved staff compliance by playing 'games of power'. He gives an example of one headteacher who used:

> her authority to coerce staff into her mode of thinking and operating within the
> school, and thereby implementing the cultural and structural reforms required by
> government at the local level. She masks this process, however, by couching it
> within a values-laden discourse of collegiality and 'trust' (Hatcher, 2005, p.260).

This kind of behaviour was evident in PSM, who explained the rationale behind her school improvement plan in detail. She then noted that she "needed to raise staff awareness of changes to school planning, and gain consensus for a focus for improvement" - a focus that she had already decided upon.

Later in her written testimony, she commented that she created the rationale for change by herself "based on my own knowledge of local authority plans". She claimed she did this for altruistic reasons as she believed "staff needed a high level of direction". Her maternalistic approach was further reinforced by the statement that "by the end of the school session staff had more ownership of the process and it was possible for them to be more involved in generating ideas and justifying their views on where we should go next". Perhaps she is beginning to release her grip of the reins. It is easy to forget we are talking about members of an all graduate profession. It is also easy to portray PSM as

disingenuous, naïve or both though she noted that she was "aware of how much control I continue to have over the content and structure of the next rationale and improvement plan". She was also aware of the issue that she was in danger of "overly manipulating in order to secure compliance". She went on, however, to reflect a concern raised by Hatcher (2005) that "there is the danger that teachers may take advantage of the opportunity offered by distributed leadership to challenge and resist the dominant policy agenda" (p.260). In voicing her concern that she was required "to ensure that participative management structures or openness do not create a forum for individuals to also manipulate or pursue personal agendas" it appeared that PSM acknowledged, by the use of the word 'also', that she had manipulated to ensure the agenda of management was met. The assumption appeared to be that while managers may have to manipulate, they must ensure that teachers do not.   Her statement seems to illustrate the tension generated by the clash of the discourses of participation and accountability, and that this clash positioned both teachers and managers in very ambiguous ways.

The tension and confusion integral to the masking process are further illustrated by PSM's use of language:

> I *presented* staff with a broad Improvement Plan that *required* them to become
> actively involved…. The Improvement Plan was *purposefully* broad at this stage
> forming an improvement 'skeleton' which staff *could* 'flesh out' and *contribute* to
> by *signing up* to participate in one of three working groups.

There would seem to be tension in the discourse used, illustrated by the italicised words. In considering where the power lay the manager 'presented' something which 'required' a particular, pre-determined course of action by the teachers. This was structured

112

deliberately in such a way as to offer a mask of participation to the teachers in that they were being allowed to 'flesh out' a pre-designed skeleton plan, and were actually required to contribute by signing up. The data from the teachers involved (CT1 and T1-5) suggested that they were aware of being positioned in this way, and offered a less than satisfied picture despite their universal compliance.

On more than one occasion, PSM explicitly stated that she supported the move towards collegial and collaborative working. She claimed that the CPE groups had allowed the school to move away from "top down management to more a participative leadership style that promoted teamwork and collegiality". Her written reflections, however, suggested a lack of engagement with the knotty issues surrounding participative leadership. In Hatcher's (2005) critique of the literature on distributed leadership he argues that:

> There is an inevitable contradiction in schools between 'authority' and 'influence', between the benefits claimed for distributed leadership and the constraints imposed by hierarchical management with the headteacher at the top. An authentically participative professional culture cannot be achieved within existing government-driven management structures (p.261).

It seemed that PSM aspired to promote a participative professional culture. There was little evidence, however, that she reflected on the effects on this aspiration of requiring people to do something, and assessing, monitoring and evaluating their progress using hierarchical observation techniques.

Of further interest are the differences between PSM's written and oral testimony. Her written reflections were for submission as part of an accredited CPD programme and it was important that she presented her work as a Depute Headteacher in a particular way, to meet the requirements of the academy, and her professional body. Unfettered by such constraints when interviewed about the work of a particular CPE group, she presented her story differently. Orally she seemed to be happier to admit areas where her perception of reality was at odds with her aspirations. There were also areas where her testimony was at odds with the testimony of CT1 and CT2. For example PSM noted that it was her decision to delegate "part of the leadership responsibility to designated Team Leaders", while CT1 and CT2 claimed to have initiated their groups, rather than have the leadership delegated to them. All therefore claimed a leading role in the development of the groups as indeed they were required to do by the professional Standards which framed the courses that they were undertaking. PSM also reflected on gaining active commitment and cooperation. She reflected on "what had driven so many staff to opt in to the new system", claiming that "this new way of working resulted in more teachers being involved in decision-making than usual". She failed to reiterate the 'requirement' to participate. In contrast this requirement loomed large in the data from the teachers involved in the CPEs led by both CT1 and CT2.

Accountability regimes

The current policy context puts demands on school managers to be accountable for the quality of teaching and learning that takes place in a school. They are accountable to their managers within the local authority and to the government. Through them the

government ensures that its agenda is imposed and implemented. Foucault (1977) notes "the success of disciplinary power derives no doubt from the use of simple instruments; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination" (p.170). School managers are subject to the normalising and disciplinary gazes of their managers and in turn subject teachers and their practices to the same scrutiny.

Foucault (1977, p.170) notes that "the exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation", and observation is central to the audit culture as currently practised in schools. The narratives of the school managers suggest an unquestioned acceptance of this audit culture, which positions them as having the authority and the responsibility to ensure that teachers perform in a way that is consistent with current policy imperatives. This authority is also unquestioned within the narratives of the teachers though there is evidence that they are unhappy with the way it positions them. In chapter four I noted that power relations within schools are embedded within the historical, hierarchical structures, and these largely favour managers over teachers. There is a supposition that managers know better, and that teachers' activity and performance needs to be, and can be, assessed and judged.

In addition, it has already been stated that Foucault argued that "the examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement" (1977, p.184). Foucault does not define the examination as such, but describes familiar school examinations as well as the practice of medical examination of

115

patients. He argues that examination is "the technique by which power, instead of emitting the signs of its potency, instead of imposing its mark on its subjects, holds them in a mechanism of objectification" (p.187). While teachers, once fully registered, are not subject to formal written examination, their performance is subject to review against competence frameworks, and monitoring and evaluation of their teaching and the learning that takes place in their classrooms. The performance of Headteachers is also reviewed, in their case against the *Standard for Headship,* and is subject to the constant disciplinary gaze of their line managers and the Inspectorate on their regular visits. Thus teachers at all levels are 'examined' to ensure their objectification and continuing categorisation as a Fully Registered Teacher, a Chartered Teacher or a Headteacher. Their performance is constantly observed and normalising judgements are made.

I will now consider the part that normalising and observational scrutiny play within the practice of CPE.

Normalising judgement

In an extended discussion about the commitment of fellow school managers to encourage and allow teachers to lead professional enquiries in line with the local authority initiative, PSM appeared to turn her normalizing gaze on herself by comparing her practice with that of more experienced colleagues. She noted that her personal preference was to work collegially "and not be a dictatorial person" and then seemed to question the wisdom of this when suggesting that it perhaps indicated a "naïvety at not having been a head of a school yet". She wondered if "there are headteachers out there who have had their

fingers burned by trying to do that (distribute leadership) so that they pull the reins in and want to manage it for themselves". Reflecting on more experienced colleagues' reluctance to offer autonomy she was willing to justify her own espoused enthusiasm as naïvety, suggesting a lack of confidence in her values. She went on, "You look at it on the surface and you think that's a job taken away from me but you have to be so far ahead with your thinking that you can shape the working group if they're starting to go off track or lose focus". This last utterance exposed her quandary, and she concluded that "it's more of a challenge for a headteacher to hand over power to other people and its more time consuming".

PSM seemed to speculate that time and the primacy of product were issues for fellow school managers when saying "maybe that's why they don't do it, because they can manage it themselves and get things done". The accountability agenda would therefore appear to have discouraged school managers from taking the risk of 'letting out the reins' let alone handing them over to others, and yet the policy discourse appeared to ask them to do so. So PSM would seem to have been trying to achieve what was asked of her as a manager, to 'get things done'. She would also appear to have tried to get things done in the way that was expected of her by the policy rhetoric on distributive leadership. When reflecting on the difficulties that these two imperatives imposed on her she appeared to favour the first of the two, acknowledging that the most important thing was to 'get things done'.

Underpinning the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) is the assumption that teachers are

"committed and talented professionals who aim to develop and realise the potential of

every child" (p.3). The same assumption is embedded within the *Standard for Full*

Registration (GTCS, 2006) which sets out the behaviours with which teachers should

conform. The narratives of the school managers in this study suggest that this assumption

is not shared by the whole profession. I have already argued that in both schools the

teachers are positioned as different to the managers: reluctant, unwilling, lacking in

commitment and in need of encouragement and support to engage in the improvement

process. The managers positioned themselves as more knowledgeable and supportive of,

but needing and willing to challenge, staff. In addition, PSM positioned the teachers in

her school as innocent and naïve or restricted in their thinking, illustrated by such

statements as:

> you know the action enquiry thing is a lot like development planning and
> improvement planning, and teachers aren't used to thinking that way … I think
> there's an automatic assumption, well they do forward planning so they'll be good
> at this and they're not always.

She went on to say "teachers aren't going to know what's hit them, do you know, to be

thinking at that level". So in these two statements PSM appeared to reveal that when

using her normalising judgement, the teachers were found to have a deficit of both

knowledge and understanding. She did, however, go on to contemplate some of the

reasons that this may be the case. She noted that the type of CPD courses available to

teachers were different from those available to managers and did not perhaps meet the

needs of teachers if they were to be offered opportunities to develop their role in school.

She stated:

> I think they need to start to put on courses for teachers that used to be, oh they're the courses you do when you're wanting to be a manager … you know it's the courses that used to be reserved for if you were the elite; you were allowed to go on those big expensive courses if you were wanting to seek promotion.

This statement revealed two further issues. Firstly it appeared that she saw the responsibility for the teachers' development lying outwith the school. This is consistent with a lack of discussion about the impact of being involved in CPE on participants' skills and abilities, and therefore her apparent lack of focus on developing capacity and capability for leadership within the school. Secondly, the statement appeared to reveal that she felt that teachers need to be more like managers. The use of the term 'elite', with its normative connotations, suggested her belief that only the best teachers go on to be offered the opportunity to become managers and that previously such courses were 'reserved' for them. This does suggest that she thought change was necessary though her ambivalence emerged when she went on to question the role of the teacher, and also the current practices in the school:

> I don't know if it's a teacher's job to actually construct the plan but I think it would be great for them to know more about how you do an improvement plan or a development plan and all the factors that go in to it, cos all we do every year is just like throw the pieces of paper at them and we never really go through each of the columns, what that means and why it's there. We say there's the development plan for this year.

Her statement revealed that she had identified an example of management practice in school, which restricted and limited the knowledge and understanding of the teachers. It also appeared to reveal an unresolved dilemma in relation to teachers' involvement in tasks she perceived to be the domain of management.

A further statement from PSM, when discussing her enthusiasm for the use of CPE in school, suggested that she positioned teachers and CTs differently:

> I've been really excited by the whole local authority approach ehm but I can see the huge shift that that takes, even for your Chartered Teachers, it's a challenge for them to be involved at that level. But for your average teacher who is maybe just ticking over towards retirement, I don't know where they come in. I think they're bamboozled.

It appeared that she believed managers like her were excited by this approach, though it challenged aspiring CTs. Teachers, however, were characterised as nearing the end of their career and 'bamboozled', with no place in this way of working. Such reflection is not mirrored in the data from the teachers or in my own understanding of the school. Of the eight teachers I interviewed in PS two were over fifty years old, one was a young person in her third year of teaching, one was already a CT, another had begun the CT course and several others had voiced an intention to embark on it in the near future.

It is interesting to look at the ways in which the two managers positioned the four Chartered Teachers who led the CPEs in contrast to their positioning of teachers. Historically the relations of power between managers and teachers within traditional hierarchical structures were well established. Both teachers and managers knew what to expect. Relations between managers and Chartered Teachers were not, however, bound by any historical precedent.   It is also worth remembering that these teachers had chosen to put themselves forward for the CT programme and, unlike those going for a promoted post, were not chosen, did not have to gain permission from their managers nor receive external affirmation of their abilities as teachers to do so. The school managers used their "normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to

punish" (Foucault, 1977, p.184) to make judgements about the CTs performance, and in doing so there appeared to be a certain unease regarding their lack of formalised control.

In every case the CTs were positioned as exceptional, and by definition outwith the norm: they were not like 'normal' teachers. PSM noted that "CT1 particularly last year did such an amazing job on her project, the sheer volume of work that she produced you know because of that I think that might have inadvertently daunted other people and they were seeing that that's what action enquiry was". Similarly SSM positioned CT3 as someone whose behaviour was daunting to colleagues:

> I can see that when she invites them now to groups and she's talking to them some of them are saying 'bloody hell I'm not doing that' you know and although she gets pretty positive feedback I suspect some of them are going away and doing zip because it frightens them, it actually scares them the level at which she's working and I think they are almost intimidated by it but they fully respect her. She commands their absolute respect as a professional and she is so badly needed in school, to be that evangelist, that enthusiast for things. So all really very positive.

Similarly CT4 is described as follows:

> She's smart, she is professional to the nth degree and if she got to tap that side of herself, her manner of speaking you know which does it, then she will win them over, and she will manage to gather the data, produce the goods and she has been a real again evangelist for collaborative enquiry, talking to other people, going round the school. She involves herself in a lot of work outwith her department so she's very much a new professional. She's not bogged down in 'I only work in the subject blah, blah, blah'.

These statements highlighted areas of ambivalence and contradiction for both PSM and SSM. PSM was perhaps placing some of the blame for teacher disaffection on to CT1. SSM on the other hand noted that CT3 commanded respect but intimidated, that she got positive feedback but frightened some into inaction and yet that she was badly needed in

121

school.   CT4 would have to "win them over", while CT1 and CT3 frightened their colleagues with their own ability, enthusiasm and work rate. They were, therefore, positioned by their managers as being politically unaware of the way their enthusiastic and exemplary behaviour influenced the behaviour of others.

The veiled criticisms in the utterances above were compounded in other places in the interviews. For example SSM seemed to reveal an underlying assumption that successful teachers are dependent on good leaders/managers when she suggested that CT3's exemplary performance was mediated by her Principal Teacher (PT), who held a more formal, traditional role within the hierarchy and had been appointed rather than opted in to the position:

> I mean we have got some very, very good principal teachers and CT3's got one. You know, I don't know how much she'd have got where she is without her PT although the two of them do that [she bangs her fists together head on] at times they also do that – they raise their game. Now without her PT there, or a different sort of PT would CT3 have got on? The answer's probably no, you know.

There appeared to be a reluctance to give credit to CT3 in her own right. It could have been perceived that the department in which CT3 works would be less successful without CT3, irrespective of the ability of the PT. SSM also noted that CT3 had recruited two PTs to her group, and used this as an example of there being a "lot of trust in school" as there were PTs who were "willing to engage with CT3". The PTs were given the credit for engaging with CT3 but SSM did not seem to consider that they engaged with her and the group because of what they could get from that experience, as is borne out from their own explanations.   One described why she became involved:

> I said to CT3 that I was very single minded in that I had my own agenda and that really if what I was doing as part of the group helped her that was fine but I

wasn't going in for an abstract reason … I was going in with very specific targets. And I must say I actually just kept that way, I didn't get involved in what others were doing. I didn't get involved in areas of discussion that were outside what my leading intentions were because I really didn't want to lose the focus of what I really wanted to do and I was using it as a tool to use, to achieve an outcome that I wanted to do.

She then identified a more personal reason for her participation:

I've maybe got four / five years teaching left in me and I thought what I didn't want was to tail off, I actually wanted if possible to get my final level of teaching back to really where it was in the beginning informed by some kind of empirical sort of knowledge so that was a wee sort of good angel bit there so that was definitely, I thought this could make me a better teacher.

The second PT similarly identified her desire to take her own department forward in relation to formative assessment. Interestingly she also positioned herself as co-facilitator of the group:

The main thrust, and CT3 and I had discussed this a while back about getting involved in collaborative teaching and in particular looking at Formative Assessment, was the idea of engaging this whole argument that's going on in education just now about pupil responsibility and trying to give the responsibility back to pupils … so that was one of the kind of immediate things that brought us on to this … it led me to the idea that if you can do it first and if you can understand it and be able to kind of translate that properly though to colleagues that you're working with it's far better … well I did this and this is how it worked and this is how it didn't work is of more value to my department than just simply giving them information sheets and asking them to go and do something.

So the first PT was explicit and up front that she became involved to meet her own needs, both professional and personal. The other appeared to position herself as co-leader with CT3, addressing an issue that they had identified together, which would incidentally contribute to her own work. Such a partnership was not reflected in the data from CT3. It would appear, therefore, that these PTs were not willing to engage with CT3 because they

trusted her, but because they had realised that becoming involved would address their own needs.

SSM appears to argue against herself when she implied that the way PTs exercise their relations of power within their department is not always constructive:

> If there are one or two very powerful voices that hold a position of authority such as the head of department who then says we are not gathering this data then the people in the department find it very hard to go against that so they act as a block to the gathering of that evidence because no teacher's going to go against their principal teacher and gather the data because most of them are too aware that they've got to have a working relationship with that person to go against them and gather it.

The ambivalence around the positions and positioning of CT and PT appear to be evident from SSM's aporetic statements. On the one hand CTs need PTs to 'get on', and on the other hand PTs can block, and their voice cannot be resisted.

It would have been surprising if the introduction of Chartered Teachers had not disturbed and challenged the role and position of Principal Teachers in schools. CT1 explicitly questioned how the role of the CT "might impact on that of PT". She envisaged two discrete roles, with the CT assuming a supportive role linked to the development of effective learning and teaching, and the PT retaining responsibility for monitoring and quality assurance. The statements in the paragraphs above suggest that this would not be straightforward for subject PTs in secondary schools, who traditionally carried a responsibility for effective learning and teaching within their department. CT1 made her comment from the perspective of a primary teacher, and her observation may be more consistent with practice in that sector.

The final example of the use of normalising judgement comes again from SSM who

totally endorsed the use of CPE, when she noted that she thought "this is the only way to

change practice". She went on, however, to voice some doubt about the leadership of

such groups being invested in teachers, even exceptional ones such as CT3 and CT4. She

said:

> Both of them I would say have issues however with working with other people …
> And I guess it's the managing people side that I feel that they need support on and
> both of them needed it for different reasons.

She identified CT3 being "like I used to be", while CT4 was "a different kettle of fish".

Though she judged CT4 to have "come on a lot in terms of her managing people … she's

still got a side to her that will have everyone running for cover, everyone! Just staying out

of the way here!" It would seem then that both PSM and SSM used normalising

judgement to differentiate the aspiring CTs from teachers in general and managers in

particular.

Hierarchical observation

In using the panopticon as a metaphor for surveillance, Foucault talks of the "disciplinary

gaze" (1977, p.174) which requires a hierarchy of supervision which extends beyond the

head of an institution. Inspection is an ever present and unseen threat, which ensures that

schools are under the constant disciplinary gaze of local authorities. The headteachers in

turn are positioned to turn their disciplinary gaze on their colleagues, illustrating

Foucault's suggestion that "by means of such surveillance, disciplinary power becomes

an "integrated" system" (1977, p.176). The effect of this integration is to ensure docility,

and in a roundabout way this appeared to contribute to some teachers' willingness and

desire to participate in CPE. For example, one participant in the CPE led by CT3, noted

that she was happy to be involved because she thought that an inspection was imminent

and that CPE would 'please' them. She noted "I would like to think that if an HMI came

he would be pleased that our department are looking at this and trying to put it in

operation". A more sinister note was sounded when she went on to say "It's coincidental

that if you're on song with this and HMI do come then that's something that they can't

get you for". This last comment was accompanied by laughter but does suggest the

underlying belief that HMIe are indeed 'out to get you'. This seemed to illustrate how the

threat of inspection modified the actions of others from a distance in time and space, and

influenced this person's engagement with CPE.

CT3 admitted to using the threat of inspection as a call to action. She noted that

colleagues were encouraged to take part in CPE when she showed them the benefits in

her own classroom and a further future benefit:

> I used to say if HMIe came in and said why are you doing this in this way and you
> said we've tried this, and this worked and this worked, we evaluated it you know
> and this worked and this worked and here's the evidence of it actually, and now
> we're trying this. I said wouldn't they be singing and dancing?

She also appeared to take on a disciplinary gaze towards her group when she noted that

she had "an absolute audit of everybody's CPD" and introduced the suggestion of a lack

of trust when she added, with laughter "but I haven't seen what they've read at home".

She talked about this in the context of her frustration at the lack of genuine engagement

in the CPD process, and put forward her theory that this was due to teachers being

"driven by a culture" which values product over process encouraging a "right – finished,

finished, finished" mentality rather than genuine engagement with processes with undefined outcomes. She too, therefore, positioned her teacher colleagues as somewhat reluctant and in need of encouragement. Her testimony further demonstrated her position as a Chartered Teacher in no-man's land. She aligned herself in some respects with the school managers, and yet still felt 'driven' by a culture with which she disagreed.

The culture to which CT3 referred was informed by a move towards evidence-based practice, as exemplified by HMIe's self-evaluation tool, *How Good is Our School?* (HMIe, 2007a). SSM acknowledged that members of staff in SS were unhappy with the level of accountability that was prevalent in the school. When discussing the importance of evidence-based practice she noted:

> I think some of our staff are very reluctant to gather data that they see as being a measure of what they perceive as their accountability … I don't completely understand but we've met quite entrenched attitudes about being accountable.

She also invoked the threat of HMIe when attempting to modify the actions of others, when she commented:

> They've got to understand in this new era we're talking about showing that you make a difference. I mean where's your evidence? I keep saying, I mean for the inspectors, where's your evidence if they ask for it?

In a series of statements by SSM it became clear that although CT3 was highly regarded by the management team in her school, they still had a need to manage her time and activities, and see evidence or proof of her endeavours. While SSM noted that the management team was "completely 150% comfortable with whatever she did … nonetheless we were interested in getting the findings and wanted to know what was

127

happening". She went on, "the difficulties for me or us as a management team looking over it lay in the idea that she was running ahead". So despite being 150% comfortable with the ability of CT3 the school manager felt it necessary to check her pace, *i.e.* pull her back, and check on her work, by asking the group to present their findings to the management team. She reported that the group initially resisted, saying "no, we are not presenting them to the Board of Studies at this stage". This presented her with a real dilemma.

The solution that she arrived at was to ask for a progress report to the management team from all working groups in the school, including the CPE group. She articulated two purposes for this activity:

> One, to inform my colleagues because I didn't think they were really conversant with all the detail of what was going on, and two, that worked really wonderfully to get the people doing the projects to actually focus on what they had really found out because you forget, you forget that this makes them nervous.

She therefore masked the technique of surveillance behind the discourse of collegiality and support. The teachers in the group, under CT3's leadership, were positioned as requiring the manager's gaze to ensure that they focused on their data. They were also positioned as 'nervous' of such scrutiny. A further statement revealed that, despite one of the stated purposes of this exercise being to inform senior management colleagues, they were clearly sceptical beforehand as SSM stated "ironically afterwards my three colleagues on the SMT said actually that was a really good idea". This suggested that, perhaps, this purpose was not central to the activity.

Similarly PSM expressed a need to check on the progress of the CPE group led by CT2. After her own extended medical leave she reported, with some surprise, that the work of the groups had continued in her absence and on her return she "assessed" their progress and "put in place monitoring and evaluation activities in order to support the thinking and future actions". This was experienced by the group as a lack of confidence in their ability; that their work needed assessed, evaluated and supported and that they could not be trusted. Rogers and Frieberg (1994) consider trust to be an essential characteristic of the relationships that must exist if effective learning is to take place. They use the term 'prizing' when attempting to define the attitude of acceptance of the worth of others. "It is a basic trust - a belief that this other person is somehow fundamentally trustworthy" (p.156). Their belief is that to facilitate learning one must have "a profound trust in the human organism and its potentialities" (p.160) and they illustrate this with the recollections of a teacher who had worked with an inspirational school leader. "She trusted us to do the very best job possible and in turn we trusted the students who came to us to do the very best job possible" (p.115).

It seemed that the teachers and Chartered Teachers involved in CPE in both schools were not trusted to do 'the very best job possible' as PSM and SSM both revealed a level of concern about handing over full autonomy to the groups. When considering the place of the Chartered Teacher, SSM noted that there had been no directives from the local authority regarding their role though there had been dialogue within the SMT. "We have discussed it, what our expectations are, how much we can manage them, how much we need to keep our hands off them". She acknowledged the difficulty in getting the balance

right between "where we give them just autonomy, and where we keep the check on them … You don't want to continue intervening, and how to be supportive by saying how is it going, you know, for a manager is actually quite hard".

PSM similarly noted that "it's still necessary for somebody on the management team to be driving it (CPE) and I think the tricky bit of it is at the moment knowing how to drive it without taking it over". SSM, however, observed that her headteacher was "very, very good at giving people space to get on with what they want to do themselves … People trust that HT is not going to shake their cages too much about issues, or drive them in certain directions". This trust seemed to be integral to the relationship between the headteacher and the teachers, rather than being integral to all relationships within the school. While she said that "there has to be that mutual trust there first [before managers can allow autonomy] and I think there is an element of trust in the school", there seemed to be an assumption that apart from the headteacher, trust emanated from managers to teachers and not the other way round. The 'mutuality' was hard to find where managers felt the need to assess and evaluate the work of the teachers, and where teachers were positioned as restricted professionals.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have described the ways that a variety of techniques of discipline actively worked to position the different players in CPE. The analysis of the data suggests that established relations of power were under considerable strain and that the managers experienced a series of professional and personal dilemmas which appeared to be

produced by the tension between the discourses of accountability and collegiality. Despite this tension both discourses seemed to work to ensure teachers' compliance, if not their approval, one more overtly than the other. The teachers did not appear to be fooled by the masking of the relations of power and appeared to position the managers as oppressors who subjugated them. The Chartered Teachers were 'othered': different from teachers and yet not managers. Their in-between status was articulated as they did not fit into the homogenised group of 'teacher'. Their experience of this in-between location will be explored in the following chapter.

Chapter Six: Experiencing the In-Between: The Effects of Positioning

In the previous chapter I suggested that relations of power between teachers and
managers, including Principal Teachers, seemed to be established and largely accepted
without challenge. The Chartered Teachers, however, appeared to perplex the managers
and disturb relations of power, and so occupied some in-between place. I have already
outlined that CTs were positioned by the policy context as enhanced classroom
practitioners who had no locus within the management structure of a school and that
within the two case study schools, the managers positioned the CTs as exceptional but not
ready to take on more formal management roles. They positioned them as requiring
supervision and support to ensure that their practice met the requirements of the
management team. I now consider the effects of this positioning, and how the Chartered
Teachers experienced and negotiated both within and from this in-between location. In
doing so it is useful to note that Foucault (1977) asserted that:

> We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms:
> it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In
> fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and
> rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him
> belong to this production (p.194).

While some negative effects were apparent, it was also the case that the altered relations
of power did appear to contribute to the production of a new 'reality'. I therefore focus
on both the negative effects and on the creative ways that power was exercised,
contributing to the re-formation of professional identities.

Before looking in detail at the effects of positioning it is worth considering these four CTs in particular. The aspiring CTs who are the main characters in this story may be atypical of the growing number of CTs in school. They were in the vanguard: CT1 and CT3 were in the first cohort of teachers who embarked on the programme and were amongst the first 35 graduate Chartered Teachers in the country. CT2 and CT4 were in the second cohort. All four have been influential in the early stages of the creation of the identity of Chartered Teachers at a national level, though there continues to be little certainty regarding the nature of the role. It should be noted, therefore, that they could be unusual amongst their peers as they embarked on the CT programme before they knew what was ahead of them in terms of both the course and their future role. It may be, for example, that these particular teachers possessed a high level of self-confidence and/or a pre-disposition to innovation and risk taking.

Sennett (1998, p.84) notes that "risk is a matter of moving from one position to another". In his exploration of the effects of 'new capitalism' on workers he argues that the workplace now tends to be less tightly organised with looser networks within each organisation which enable more movement. These ideas seem to be pertinent to the lived world of the Chartered Teacher whose presence appears to be contributing to a loosening of hierarchical structures within schools. He notes that "the "holes" in an organization are the sites of opportunity, not the clearly defined slots for promotion in a traditional bureaucratic pyramid" (p.84). This is similar to the notion that Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002, p.342) put forward when they noted that there was possibility of "resistance and reinvention" for those at the bottom of the hierarchical "food chain" and resonant

with Stronach *et al.'s* (2002) "in-between-ness of professional work" (p.126).

The effects of coercion

I argued in chapter five that, in SS where engagement was voluntary, the school manager was concerned that the benefits to the school were partial. She was concerned that the assumed benefits in relation to the professional development of those who participated were lost to those who did not. She voiced concern that there were "pockets of totally switched off people" but was unable to persuade her headteacher to impose participation. Where participation was mandated, in PS, it appeared that commitment of teachers was reduced and by definition any assumed benefits to their professional development were compromised. In an analysis of the evaluative data regarding benefits of participation in CPE, which will be examined in detail in chapter seven, it is notable that there appeared to be no fewer benefits reported by the groups where membership was coerced than those where membership was voluntary. Despite the teachers in the primary school reporting reduced commitment and motivation because of the directive approach of their manager, both they and their pupils appeared to gain as much from the process as their colleagues in the secondary school. Once they became engaged there appeared to be a high level of commitment to their peers within the group, and to their pupils. The CTs would seem to have been able to engage their colleagues and enable them to identify a positive purpose for their participation.

In addition, CT1 and her group highlighted an apparently unintended effect of the coercion. When reflecting on the benefits of the outcome of the CPE, they recounted that

they had been successful in highlighting the potential benefits of a new pedagogy and changing the level of resources available to support this. CT1 noted "I think because they had pushed everybody to be involved in an enquiry, I think they really had to support us in what we were doing - our recommendations are saying this is how it has to be". She also noted that it was "quite motivating for people, to realise that you were going to get such strong evidence to show that something needs to be different". So it appeared that the CPE group was empowered by the evidence generated by their enquiry to argue for a change in practice. They believed that the fact that enquiry had been imposed as a way of working added to the weight of their argument.

Trust and mistrust

A theme that was shot through the stories of all the participants in CPE was that of trust and mistrust. In particular the discourse of accountability drew participants' attention to feelings of being mistrusted and being unable to trust. O'Neill (2002) in the BBC Reith lectures questions the "supposed 'crisis of public trust'" in professional and public servants. She argues that rather than a crisis of trust she believes us to be working within a "culture of suspicion" (2002, Lecture 3, p.1) that is apparently fuelled by its supposed remedy: that of a "new accountability" that "takes the form of detailed control" aiming at "ever more perfect administrative control of institutional and professional life" (p.2). Hierarchical surveillance was one of the techniques of discipline which was used to position the teachers and CTs in both schools in an attempt to achieve such control. O'Neill (2002) believes that current accountability regimes "damage rather than repair trust" (p.5) and hierarchical surveillance appeared to have the effect of increasing

mistrust between different participants in CPE. Ballard (2003) succinctly links mistrust

to this technique of discipline noting that "the relentless assessment, auditing and

surveillance systems … are the mechanisms of low-trust institutions in a low-trust

environment" (p.18). He looks more deeply into the way that teachers are positioned and

offers a rationale for this:

> From the premise and ideological belief that we are all motivated by self-interest,
> arises the position that we are not to be trusted. We need incentives to make us
> work; our schools and other institutions must operate in an environment of
> marketplace contestability so that we must constantly be threatened to perform or
> perish, and we must be watched and endlessly reviewed, assessed and audited to
> ensure that the purchaser (e.g. employer, student, parent) gets maximum
> (efficient) and quality benefit from the provider (e.g. teacher, lecturer, principal)
> (p.17).

This goes some way to explaining the political imperatives and influences on the

managers in this study and yet, in my teaching I regularly ask aspiring Headteachers,

Principal Teachers and Chartered Teachers to reflect on the characteristics of motivating

leaders with whom they have worked, and they invariably identify both trust and respect.

Professionals want to be trusted and treated with respect by their colleagues. However

the accountability regime embedded within the current context would seem to work

against this.

A further shift in the exercise of power, and one that appeared to open up "sites of

opportunity" (Sennett, 1998, p.84), was that CPE seemed to challenge the existing

systems of power-knowledge. Foucault's (1977) statement that "there is no power

relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor knowledge that

does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (p.27) is pertinent

when considering a statement made by CT3:

> There is still a mistrust of (CPE) because you could have people going off and
> looking in to things they might look into, and you might come up with some
> evidence that actually I don't really want to know … That teachers were thinking
> about what they were doing, and influencing the practice rather than just
> following a policy: there is just this scepticism about it.

Unsaid but implied in this statement is that it is the school managers who mistrust CPE

and are sceptical about it, not the teachers. If teachers ask questions and explore issues

and this in turn produces knowledge outwith the control of the school managers, then this

directly impacts on the relations of power that exist as illustrated in the example of CT1's

group gathering evidence which was strong enough to influence policy within the school.

It is also interesting to note CT3's confusing use of pronouns suggesting her ambivalent

position and begging the question if she is one of the people who might come up with

evidence or is she a manager who really does not want to know. This is seen again in her

next utterance where she states "People are happy for this to happen if we believe what

you're doing and the way you're doing it but they worry that not everyone might do it

like that and it might not be a good thing".

It is also worth recalling Jansen's comment that "systems of power-knowledge contain

both emancipatory and repressive elements" (1991, p.7) as there appears to be evidence

that the practice of CPE contains a combination of both.   For example, CT1 described a

dilemma caused by the political nature of her group's actions. She made use of a citation

from Coghlan and Brannick (2005, p.70) who note that enquiring within your own

organisation has "a subversive quality about it. It examines everything. It stresses
listening. It emphasizes questioning. It fosters courage. It incites action. It abets reflection
and it endorses democratic participation". CT1 noted that this was not an easy or
comfortable process. She went on to say "Our group had to contend with and consider
this culture change which certainly provoked some feelings of concern among us". Her
use of the verb "contend' and her articulation that the behaviour associated with
professional enquiry involved a change in culture highlighted the notion that within her
context such change was contentious. It is therefore not surprising that the group voiced
concerns. Yet all this took place in the same context in which PSM claimed that CPE
allowed the school to move away from "top down management to more a participative
leadership style that promoted teamwork and collegiality". CT1 did believe that the
process of CPE was "enabling staff to move from a passive to a more participative role"
but voiced a number of caveats in relation to sustainable change: she surmised that
members of staff were "most likely to embrace this way of working if we continue to be
involved in identifying areas in need of action". She also warned that the school "will
need to recognise the importance of encouraging a climate of trust, openness and
support".

Trust therefore appeared to be a necessary element of CPE and the perpetuation and even
growth of mistrust seemed to be an effect of at least some of the techniques of discipline
used. Sennett (1998) notes that "bonds of trust … develop informally in the cracks and
crevices of bureaucracies as people learn on whom they can trust. (p.141). This would
seem to be illustrated by the example above where trust and respect appeared to be

growing within CT1's CPE group between the teachers and herself, and yet was still in its infancy between the CT and her managers. This is unsurprising as Ball (2000) argues that performativity regimes serve to modify the actions of professionals subject to them, noting that "the space for the operation of autonomous ethical codes based in a shared moral language is colonised and closed down" (p.17). He cites Hanlon (1998) when stating his belief that this leads to "a contest over the meaning of professionalism which has at its centre the issue of 'trust' –, 'who is trusted, and why they are trusted is up for grabs' (p.59)" (Ball, 2000, p.17). I would suggest that there appears to be evidence from both schools that CPE has the potential to reconstitute and reopen this space, though it would seem that the managers were still struggling with the notion of trust because the space in which they operated had not been re-opened by CPE. Indeed they seem to be in a situation which had rocked their previously stable expectations regarding relations of power. This was illustrated by their dilemma of no longer knowing how much they needed to 'keep their hands' on or off the teachers. At the same time there seemed to be evidence that the teachers themselves were becoming more confident, as they identified the climate in which they felt trust would flourish.

A final example of the importance of trust is seen where the CPE group led by CT2 wrestled with the nature of the management support that they enjoyed. They described the benefits of management support in relation to resourcing, where PSM facilitated the working of the group through her 'gifts' of time and financial and secretarial support. However they experienced this help as disempowering, identifying her power and their powerlessness in the giving and receiving of these gifts. CT2 used a quote from Durrant

and Holden (2006, p.96) to illustrate the group members' desire "to be trusted, not over-directed" but went on to note the group's agreement "that it would be more positive to regard any apparent take-over bids by management as an offer of support rather than a lack of trust". To support this statement CT2 quoted Coghlan and Brannick (2005, p.71) saying that the group had needed to "work the political system" to ensure the success of their CPE. Coghlan and Brannick (2005, p.71) do indeed suggest that one needs to be "politically astute" when enquiring within one's own place of work, and caution those who do that they need to be "able to work in ways that are in keeping with the political conditions without compromising the project or your own career" (p71). Rogers and Freiberg (1994) discuss these political conditions, noting that:

> politics has to do with control and with the making of choices. It has to do with the strategies and maneuvers (*sic*) by which one carries on these functions. Briefly, it is the process of gaining, using, sharing, or relinquishing power and decision making. It is also the process of the complex interactions and effects of these elements as they exist in relationships between people, between a person and a group, or between groups (p.211).

This would seem to capture the process of CPE well. It is to the strategies and manoeuvres used that I now turn in looking at the ways in which participants used the metaphors of the game and gamesmanship in their narratives.

Games and gamesmanship

One way that the managers appeared to make sense of the shifting positions was apparently revealed by the reference to a kind of 'gamesmanship' employed on several occasions. It seemed that subterfuge was sometimes used when attempting to modify the actions of others. For example when explaining that the CPE led by CT3 was embedded within the school improvement plan SSM noted "CT3 and I played a wee trick to be sure

it would appear (laughter). You've got to". It is interesting that this 'wee trick' was not

replicated for CT4 who identified the lack of inclusion within the school improvement

plan as her CPE's main stumbling block. She reported that she had originally secured

permission for the focus of her CPE from the Headteacher but barriers were experienced

in relation to time. When discussing these barriers with SSM, she was told "well you

didn't ask me". CT4 reported:

> What she was saying was if you want something to work you have to go through
> the right channels and approach the right people, and I suppose that reflected
> naïvety on my part in that I had presumed if I had a conversation with HT, and a
> meeting with HT and legitimised it with him, that legitimised it within the school
> when in fact it didn't.

CT4 seemed genuinely perplexed about the turn of events, and even showed a level of

empathy towards SSM. She said "you know she's not being deliberately difficult".

Indeed SSM's uncertainty about the rules of the game was evident in a series of rhetorical

question that she asked:

> When do you interfere? When is it support? When is it support and challenge? If
> my job is to support and challenge I need some involvement at some level with
> the project. At what level am I involved with it?

The gamesmanship metaphor was also used by CT3, when talking about her role in

leading a CPE. She noted that she did not want to position herself as 'an expert'. She

said "in a way you almost had to play an interesting role of putting yourself over as, I

don't know… it was sort of playing their game as opposed to them playing mine". It is

not exactly clear what CT3 means by 'playing their game' rather than them playing hers

though SSM may have shed light on this when she reflected on the stage after CT3 had

completed her CPE. Once she had become a Chartered Teacher, CT3 was given a more

141

formalised role within the school to roll out the Assessment is for Learning initiative, the

focus of her CPE. SSM reported:

> I deliberately stepped back from it because I was going to do some of the
> workshops with her but we decided that her credibility is, because she's in the
> classroom still and as soon as you put on the mantle of 'I'm here as depute head
> and I'm doing it' you're sending out different messages … In fact when I've
> reflected on it a little bit, what CT3 and I have done this year, in some ways I
> think I was wrong not to stick to my guns and say to her 'no, I'm going to do
> some of the workshops' because I was then sending out a signal saying actually
> the school management team are saying you've got to do this. She can't say that.
> Well she can but she's been reflecting that it doesn't have the same impact.

This suggests again an underlying belief that teachers need either to be persuaded or told

to change their practice and that persuasion is best done by 'one of their own', though on

occasions they do need to be told. Where CT3's credibility was put to work, the power of

the manager was masked by using peer persuasion under the cloak of collegial,

collaborative working. SSM's reflections suggested that CT3 argued to be allowed to

lead these workshops on her own, and that SSM agreed against her better judgement.

Interestingly, later in her interview she reflected again on this situation, and on the second

occasion described distinct roles for herself and CT3 in relation to the workshops. She

noted:

> So CT3's delivering all the workshops, talking about how successful it is in the
> classroom, giving her evidence of it and upping the game with all the teachers,
> and I'm monitoring the quality assurance side and I'm looking at departments and
> I'm saying to PTs, what have you done on this?

I am not sure whether SSM was positioning CT3 as a co-conspirator describing their

work as 'a partnership', or whether, in trying to make sense of this new order, she was

reverting to a more familiar role which positioned CT3 as the 'trainer' in relation to

classroom practices while she checked the effectiveness and impact of that training. It

did seem to herald some sort of solution regarding role and status for SSM, though it is less clear how this was experienced by CT3.

Gamesmanship carries the connotation of being slightly underhand and manipulative, and Coghlan and Brannick (2005) note the "fine line between acting in a politically astute manner and acting unethically", and they acknowledge that "working as a change agent cannot always be done with openness, honesty and transparency" (p.71). Lack of openness, honesty and transparency does seem to be a feature of these genuine attempts to distribute leadership to CTs by the managers. PSM encapsulated the continuing ambiguities and uncertainties when she noted that teachers were:

> keen to be group members but nobody wants to take on a lead role in the group, so I can see a danger of, 'Oh, that's the CT's job' but maybe it's not, maybe the CT is there just to advise, not to lead. So it almost creates a wee, a kind of secret level of management in the school.

The notion of a 'kind of secret level of management' is very intriguing. There seemed to be a sense that the managers were working through the CTs and yet PSM's ambivalence was illustrated in the diffident language used in the following statement:

> I would say that I'm feeling like I don't know how we can use CTs … CT2 has obviously, like has kind of led a group but I asked CT1 if she would like sort of be in the group as well so they're being used in that sort of advisory, coordinating capacity but I'm a bit stuck as to what we can expect them to do and not do.

CT2 had 'kind of led a group' and CT1 was 'sort of' in the group. Both were being used in a "sort of advisory" capacity. She commented further that there had been no discussion within the management team in the school regarding their place. Nor was she aware of any discussion at authority level but reiterated again "we need to work out how

we're going to utilise their skills but I think there's a feeling of not sure what we should be asking them to do".

In discussion with CT2 and her group it became apparent that the group did not experience CT2's leadership as a 'kind of secret level of management', and saw PSM as firmly holding the power. Where PSM appeared to believe she was offering support and working in the best interests of the school, the group felt 'taken over' by her management decisions. In describing the early stages of the work of the group, CT2 described the democratic process undertaken by them to decide on the focus of their enquiry. They had identified their focus which related to an area of concern for the group: the use of learning intentions and success criteria to improve writing and to encourage learner responsibility. The school managers then decided that they wanted every teacher in the school to focus on this, and so instead of the group investigating their area of interest for themselves, they were put in a position where they were leading the whole staff in the enquiry.

CT2 reported that "this was not perhaps what the group thought should happen, but for management reasons they wanted to do it with everybody". So having given the go ahead for the group to take forward an enquiry into an area of interest, full autonomy was taken away. While noting that the group did not agree with the decision, neither CT2 nor any member of her group reported a challenge to this management decision. They reported only resigned irritation. Indeed CT2 showed a level of empathy with the school managers, commenting that giving autonomy to a group was "probably quite scary for

144

them".   There was a frustration however that this imposition impacted on the meticulous preparatory work that the group had done, and that the rest of the staff had not "had time to think about it" or read the relevant literature that the CPE group had identified and read to inform the enquiry. A level of cynicism about her own level of autonomy was demonstrated by CT2 when asked about the group's plans for analysis of their data. She outlined what they had planned to do and then said rather wearily "unless PSM has got other plans".

CT1 and her group appeared to have the same experience. She had gained permission from her school managers and had negotiated the involvement of all Primary 2 and 3 staff in the enquiry. When the management team decided they wanted all staff involved, they asked two teachers to move from CT1s group in order to utilise their skills elsewhere. The managers also wanted all groups to start at the same time, so CT1 voiced her frustration that "the rules of the game had changed" and that "initial progress and pace were being dictated by the understanding of all groups and controlled by management". A barrier had been put in her way making it impossible to lead in the way that she wished. It was apparent that she did not believe herself to be part of a 'kind of secret level of management' in the school. On the contrary, when the group was issued with a remit prepared by PSM, who believed it to be "crucial … you have to give the group a remit as a manager", CT1 noted that "this was useful in that it provided a starting point and a structure, but prescriptive from my point of view as facilitator with supposed responsibility for the project".

Towards the end of her interview SSM reflected on the nature of collegial practice within

her school, and it appeared that she believed the work done by the CTs was vital:

> I still worry that it's not there because to me it means people, teachers
> individually taking responsibility for themselves and others and working in that
> way and there is still a hierarchical element in school that means that people see
> aspects of their professionalism as someone else's job so that collegiality is
> missing but I mean I don't think it is something you get quickly anyway, it's a
> culture change so it will be slow and I think the likes of CT3's project, CT4's and
> they are crucial in moving forward. This is the way we're going to work now
> folks, how do you feel about it? Without upfronting and saying that, you can't see
> them all buying in, and being happy to work like that.

SSM noted that there was 'still a hierarchical element in school' and seemed to

acknowledge that this discouraged teachers taking responsibility for their own

professional behaviour and actions. The last three sentences appear to suggest that the

CPE projects were doing the work of a Trojan Horse - a vehicle with which to trick

teachers into working in a more collegial way - without 'upfronting' and telling them to

do so. She returned to the games metaphor when she concluded:

> We're not there yet with the autonomous professional. The reality in schools is we
> know it's not. We can talk a good game and hear about it but it isn't there. I've
> got to remember that my school is probably further ahead in the game than a lot of
> other places because people are willing to engage with each other and do cross-
> collaborative work, talk to each other, think about their teaching and learning, be
> reflective but likewise I know there are complete black holes in the school where
> they've not got a … what to do. That's the way it goes [laughter].

Her comments that they could 'talk a good game' and that their school was probably

"ahead of the game" despite the apparent "complete black holes" did seem to highlight

the ambivalence experienced by SSM with regard to collegial and collaborative practice.

They also suggested an acknowledgement of her awareness that there was a gap between

the discourse and practice of collegiality.

There appeared, then, to be evidence of the use of a certain deviousness which veiled and masked the way that power was exercised or returning to the games metaphor, a liberal interpretation of the rules. I suggest that the strategies and manoeuvres employed by the participants in CPE and their managers can be understood as attempts to modify the actions of others, and in so doing demonstrate the productive nature of power within CPE.

A new kind of leadership?

A further effect of being located in an in-between position appeared to be the ambiguous nature of the CTs' leadership role. Their status gave them no formal authority, unlike that of a PT or senior manager and yet they were being expected to 'lead' the CPE. Reminiscent of Sennett's collaborative leader (1998, p.109), they were given the power to "only facilitate". The problematic nature of such leadership was evident in the testimony of CT3 when she reflected on the early stages of leading the CPE. Her interim report submitted to the University was entitled "Sailing 'Unchartered' Waters: A voyage of discovery or up the creek without a paddle?" This would seem to reflect a less than straightforward journey. She spent some time within this report considering the difference between the role of facilitator and leader, coming to the conclusion that she was happy to accept a "muddled definition"; a definition which seemed to reflect her ambivalent stance on a number of issues. For example, she reflected on her need to "monitor and control the pace and progress of the project", though not its direction. One of her colleagues, however, reported that CT3 was controlling the direction in some way

when the comment was made that she "had a very clear vision of roughly where we should be going but wanted our input as well".

While CT3 considered that she did not hold "any real power within the group" she was willing to acknowledge the power of resources (*e.g.* her greater knowledge of current thinking about formative assessment) and her power as the initiator of the CPE. On that note, she asserted her belief that it was "an advantage that the initiator of the group was not in a management position since this has put everyone on an equal footing" and yet later in her written testimony she noted:

> I believe that we all felt I had ownership of the group in the early stages …
> In the last few months I have altered my practice to share my work with others, and indeed see sharing as a key role. In the past I was happy to retain ownership of work into which I had invested a great deal of time and personal effort and did not wish to give without getting something in return.

The language she used suggested that she still saw the work as 'hers' to share, rather than being genuinely collaborative, though there was an acknowledgment of change over time. Indeed the uncertainty and ambivalence she felt regarding the 'ownership' of the enquiry was further illustrated as she noted, when interviewed:

> because it is collaborative I'm not bossing people about and lining people up but I do find that difficult. But I am very much the one that is, that knows where everyone is, but I'm not controlling people. I'm not … I'm trying …

Her diffidence and uncertainty were evident in her unfinished phrases.

CT2 also reflected on her place within the group. She noted that she didn't think that she "contributed anymore than everybody else ... it was very, very equal". When this statement was reflected back to her, however, she replied:

I think perhaps the only thing would be that every now and then, particularly towards the end of the year you were having to sort of pull it together and make sure it was still happening because everybody gets so busy and obviously I had a very strong motive for having it finished so perhaps ehm, pushing it, keeping it moving a little.

Two members of her group agreed. One said "Yes, I would say you were the backbone of it though and you were leading the discussion as well and, you know, organising", while the other added "very much and even with the, all the evidence that we collected it ended up as your work". T8 concluded "I think to drive it forward you do need someone ... it definitely needed somebody and CT2 was really sort of positive and really sort of – you did keep it going really". So CT2 also appeared to be ambivalent about the nature of her leadership role, and unsure of her warrant to lead. Like CT3, she seemed to want to declare an equality and democracy within the group that on reflection she acknowledged was not there.

It is possible that the ambivalence and tension experienced by both CT2 and CT3, stuck in an in-between space between leadership with and without authority, was due to their previously unquestioned acceptance of the traditional leader/follower relationships. In aspiring to be lead collaboratively without "position power" (DuBrin, 1995, p.144), CTs were in a space where they had no experience on which to model their behaviour. Connolly and James (2006) look at a range of factors which lead to successful collaborative working. They use the literature to support this exploration and cite Mattessich and Monsey (1992) who, amongst other factors, identified the need for a "skilled convenor" (Connolly and James, 2006, p73) to lead the collaboration. This is perhaps a useful way to name the work of the CTs. Connolly and James (2006) also cited

Bryk and Schneider (1996) when commenting that "individuals are more likely to trust those with whom they have established good relationships" (2006, p.79) and Sarason and Lorentz (1998) who "acknowledge the role of co-ordinators who have no formal power but whose knowledge and personality are significant in enabling collaboration" (2006, p.79). This concurs with DuBrin's (1995) contention that the use of referent and expert power, both elements of personal power, is more likely to lead to commitment than the use of coercive power, which often leads to resistance or the use of positional power, which is more likely to lead to compliance without commitment. It would seem that the Chartered Teachers' ability to lead had to rely on their credibility as experienced, trusted and skilled colleagues and their expert power as informed initiators of the action.

The Chartered Teachers appeared to be encouraged in their pursuit of their aspiration by the teachers who articulated their appreciation of this different style of leadership. T7 noted that the meetings of the CPE group led by CT2 were "always good fun … it wasn't a meeting where you were feeling 'oh no I've got to turn up'". She claimed that CT2 was "someone who doesn't dominate a meeting but when she did speak, it was words of wisdom". Underlying this statement would appear to be a feeling of peer support and co-construction of knowledge and understanding rather than a power relationship where teachers were given information by their more knowledgeable managers. The CTs' in-between position therefore appeared to offer them the opportunity to engage in this more collaborative style of leadership, allowing an enhanced level of engagement by the teachers themselves. Perhaps they were enacting the kind of leadership that was envisaged by George Bush (2000) who was reported to say "I have a different vision of

leadership. A leadership (*sic*) is someone who brings people together". This will be further explored in chapter seven.

The data suggest that the CTs experienced a shift in their relationship with their managers. For example, despite her frustrations described above, CT1 did begin to empathise with her manager, and wondered whether "as management become more comfortable with sharing responsibility … we might see a change in this prescription". She also reported an informal discussion with PSM, who had "confirmed that it felt "scary" to relinquish this control". She went on to say:

> I felt I could closely identify with our Depute Headteacher with regard to wanting to control everything and being reluctant to hand over more responsibility to the group, yet this was important to encourage the group to take ownership of the project.

CT3 also appeared to change her relationship with her management team as the CPE progressed. She shared an early entry in her learning journal in which she recorded a meeting with the HT to "negotiate permission" and the possible focus of her CPE. Her relationship at that stage was as a worker asking permission from a line manager to undertake action not normally associated with their role. Less than a year later, she noted that it was "interesting to have the opportunity to discuss the bigger picture of L&T issues with senior staff as opposed to discussing firefighting issues!". This then seemed to denote a change in the nature of her engagement with her managers, perhaps a change in status as such opportunity had not been afforded to her before. She also observed a change in relationship with one of the PTs in her group, saying "our whole relationship has changed in a way … She now sees me, she will have conversations with me cos she

sees me as someone who she respects, my opinion … She has seen me quite differently

through this and she sees me as having changed".

So CPE seemed to have disturbed the relations of power which had existed between these

aspiring Chartered Teachers and their managers, and changed the perspectives of both

groups. The CTs appeared to have begun to see some issues from the managers'

perspectives and in so doing started to transgress by crossing and re-crossing the line

drawn between 'teacher' and 'manager' which had appeared to be seen by the managers

as "uncrossable" (Foucault, 1977a, p.34). SSM summed up her confusion when she

noted her belief that teachers should decide early whether they want to be a manager or a

Chartered Teacher. She stated:

> I am not convinced that if you do Chartered Teacher you then should jump to
> management. I'm not saying you shouldn't if that's what you want but after all
> the spirit of the thing was you were staying in the classroom as a practitioner
> doing this sort of thing.

That SSM perceived that the move between CT and manager required a 'jump' reinforced

her perception of the differences and distance between the two roles. She went on to

suggest that CTs were not sticking to the 'spirit of the thing' by attempting to make that

leap. There was no evidence from the CTs that their move into the in-between position

was an attempt to 'jump to management'. On the contrary there was evidence that they

were trying to resist this. It seemed to be evident, however, that from this in-between

position the CTs appeared to be more able to empathise with a management viewpoint.

It would appear then that the emergence of Chartered Teachers had disrupted the

established ways that relations of power had been exercised in schools, and both the CTs

and their managers were working hard to create new ones. It seemed that this work was

problematic as neither the CTs nor the managers appeared to be clear about the new rules,

both using a variety of tactics and strategies to make sense of the game. There is no

apparent evidence that CPE had encouraged the growth of trust between the CTs and

managers, though there appeared to be a willingness and enthusiasm to engage with the

practice and each other. There is evidence, however, that the CTs were beginning to form

a new professional identity while continuing to "dwell in ambiguity and uncertainty"

(Sennett, 1998, p.85).

This ambiguity and uncertainty was illustrated in the discussion about the working

definition of CPE as introduced in chapter one:

> Collaborative professional enquiry is an enquiry into an area of joint professional
> concern and/or interest, undertaken by more than one colleague within a work
> setting or settings, which focuses on assessment and intervention to effect
> progress in pupils' learning. Evidence is gathered and evaluated to demonstrate
> this process, and its product.
>
> It is designed to contribute to the professional development of those who engage
> in it, and therefore is a collegial affair which takes place amongst colleagues for
> the benefit of the whole school community, enabling teachers to co-construct a
> bank of knowledge, which becomes an evidence base about their own practice and
> the business of effective learning and teaching.
>
> A distinguishing feature of CPE, as we are constructing it, is that it is initiated and
> led by the teachers themselves and while it is likely to be consistent with the
> school development or improvement plan and supported by managers within the
> school, they do not drive it.

At the end of the enquiries I asked participants and the school managers to reflect on this definition in light of their experiences. In general, the participants were supportive of the first two paragraphs, suggesting that it was fairly consistent with their experiences. SSM alone sounded a note of doubt saying that:

> I think that describes what I would hope to see happening – that people working together, teachers encouraged, engaged, developing themselves as they do it. Evidence-based definitely.

That she only 'hopes' to see this happening casts some doubt about her perception of what she did see happen.

The third paragraph, however, gave the participants greater cause for comment and concern. I spoke to CT1 and CT2 together, along with a member of CT2's group, T6. CT2 started the ball rolling by saying "Yes, the last paragraph here, ehm, about the fact that it's supposed to be led by the teachers themselves, because I think that it would probably be fair to say that it isn't, would you agree?" T6 replied "Yes, it says that managers within the school they do not drive it - but it is driven by a manager". She went on:

> I think as well, I think some other action enquiry groups could be more driven by management because I don't think you've just let it happen you know, you're saying I'll take this group and you're trying your best to be the leader.

This last statement suggested that CPE had constituted a site of contestation for CT2. T6 acknowledged that CT2 had to refuse and resist, 'trying her best' to maintain her role of 'leader'. When I suggested that we perhaps needed to drop or revise that paragraph, both CTs disagreed. CT2 responded:

> Or we try to make it happen. Cos I think it is something even from the reading I have done, that it *should* be initiated and led by the teachers and it *should* be

supported by managers and they *shouldn't* drive it – I think, if it's to be what it's meant for, or what I understand it to be. But that is not to say that is what actually happens in practice of course.

CT1 noted:

> I really liked the last paragraph. I think because I think that's how it should be as well ehm but I've written in my notes, 'I don't think that there is as yet a clear understanding that management should take on the position of passenger'.

The notion of manager as passenger rather than driver is intriguing. CT1's assertion regarding the position of management seemed to be reinforced by PSM, when she noted:

> I agree with it all, ehm down to the bottom bit 'consistent with the school development plan, supported by managers but they do not drive it'. I think at the moment ehm it's still necessary for somebody on the management team to be driving it and I think the tricky bit of it is at the moment is knowing how to drive it without taking it over.

By using the phrase "at the moment" more than once she acknowledged that things may change in the future. 'At the moment', however, she believed that the managers needed to drive.

A slightly different picture emerged in the secondary school. When CT3 and CT4 were asked about their thoughts on the definition they too focused on the last paragraph. CT3 simply said "Yes, I mean it's not happening". CT4 went into more detail, linked to her own experience of trying to gain legitimation for her enquiry. She said that the first two paragraphs were:

> absolutely fine … I have, the only thing that I thought that, you know – I wasn't sure about this last bit … I think this is very difficult to do … I found it was actually very difficult to ehm to make it 'consistent' with the development plan … Does the proposal go in to the school development plan because, which is in effect what CT3's did yeah because you know she agreed there was a little slot in the development plan and CT3's became part of the development plan or do you take a bit of the development plan and make it into a project? … I think 'linked

155

to' is better … Yes – it's 'linked' but it's not there in a nice box, and it's not there in tablets of stone saying that CT4 is leading a project on….

CT4 highlighted the importance of permission and legitimation from the managers. In her case the enquiry was not given the 'seal of approval' that CT3's had been given as it was not explicitly written into the development plan, and she believed that this had negative repercussions for its success. SSM made no comment about the difficulties that CT4 had in relation to the perceived lack of support she received. Indeed she articulated her support for the third paragraph, though her use of the subjunctive mood suggested that she was reflecting on what was still to happen, not what was currently happening. She commented:

> I think we've got to have that happen. I think it's got to be initiated and led by the teachers themselves. If we believe in teachers as professionals they are working in the classroom, they are constantly as professionals understanding about learning and what's going on in the learning environment so we've got to trust them; that they then say well actually there is a way we can make a difference here. The way we can do it is… I would expect certainly as a manager to be put forward a plan that I could buy into … I suppose it says, "to be supported by, to be consistent with" yes it would have to be.

Her underlying assumption does seem to be that while she recognises the need for managers to trust teachers, it is the teachers' job to first persuade their managers that they are trustworthy. Teachers have to explain and justify what they plan to do, and the manager has to approve, to 'buy into' that plan and give permission. This is illustrated when she further commented that an important part of CPE is "the bouncing around of it with someone in senior management who is clearly saying to you 'actually hey that's a really good idea, away you go and run with it'".

It appeared, however, that SSM was selective in the permissions that she was willing to give and the trust she was willing to place in the CTs, contingent on the nature of the plan or task and her level of trust in the person involved. For example CT3 and CT4 seemed to be given different limits and boundaries, as discussed above. In addition, despite positioning CT3 as exceptional as seen in chapter five, SSM noted "I could say to CT3 I wanted an Assessment Policy by the end of this year, I wanted an Assessment Policy group but I wouldn't have actually probably let her chair that". Her use of the phrase 'actually probably' seemed to suggest her ambivalence and perhaps illustrated that she felt some ambiguity over the policy that CTs should not be given management responsibilities (LTS, 2005). When this policy directive was reflected back to her she appeared, however, to lose her uncertainty when she noted "Yes, that is absolutely as it should be. That is the way I like it to be, that's the way it works". As an aside, it is interesting to note that in saying that "the evidence that (CT3) has gathered would be one of the biggest ways of informing the policy" it appeared that she believed that CTs could be involved at one level, but not another.

Conclusion

The nature of leadership enacted by CTs did appear to be problematic for all those involved. To extend the 'driving' metaphor, it seemed that the CTs were happy to drive and the teachers were happy to be passengers who navigated and on occasions took over the wheel. The school managers did not appear to be ready to allow the CTs to drive enquiry, perhaps seeing them as having a provisional licence and being ready to sit their test. The evidence suggests that the CTs sometimes also had to struggle to hand over the

wheel, though they were much more likely to do so. While expressing a desire to allow others to drive, the school managers still felt the need to be the driver themselves and were unable to take the role of passenger or bystander. This explains why the Chartered Teachers found themselves dwelling in "ambiguity and uncertainty" (Sennett, 1998, p.85).

Chapter Seven: The Contribution of Collaborative Professional Enquiry

In the previous two chapters I have discussed the environment in which CPE took place,

focusing on the relations of power between the teachers, Chartered Teachers, Principal

Teachers and school managers. Weiskopf and Laske (1996) consider whether the process

of emancipatory action research (EAR) camouflages "the establishment of new power

relationships rather than frees the people concerned from arbitrary restrictions" (p.125).

It appeared that the establishment of new and subtly different power relationships, in

particular between CTs, PTs and managers, did take place as a result of CPE, with its

similarities to EAR. Attempts to hold on to the control, while trying to meet the

expectations of both the accountability and the collegiality agendas appeared to lead

managers to mask the ways that they exercised power. At the same time, the CTs tried to

enact a more democratic, participatory model of leadership, though they acknowledged

that this was not easy. Despite these tensions and struggles, a strong message came

through from the teachers themselves that CPE was a 'good thing' and that they enjoyed

working in this way, appreciating what it offered them in relation to their professional re-

formation and development. So despite the angst already described, and aware of the

tensions, the teachers quietly collaborated and enquired into their practice. In this chapter

I look at their stories in some detail.

The teachers highlighted many benefits that they believed were gained from their

participation in CPE. These are encompassed in the themes below.

- Enhanced professional knowledge and confidence
- Professional and personal satisfaction

- Working together and sharing experiences
- Benefits for pupils

I will focus on the narratives of the teachers and the CTs in this section as they, not the managers, were actively involved in the process of enquiry. The themes that I have identified are inter-related and inter-dependent which makes it neither possible nor desirable to present the findings in neat categories, however I will use the headings to structure and frame the analysis of the evidence.

Enhanced professional knowledge and confidence

It appeared that the teachers believed that CPE enhanced their professional knowledge in a number of ways. They reported benefits to their understandings of the specific areas of enquiry and of educational theory. One teacher, in CT1's group, noted that "a year ago" she had not known anything about 'Let's Think', their area of investigation. She reported that she was now more confident than before and put this down to "taking part in it and the fact that T4 trained and showed us all the stuff and let us play about with it for a wee while". The developing confidence of this group in relation to their knowledge and understanding of the focus of their enquiry enabled them to articulate a viewpoint to the management team, backed with evidence. T2 noted that what they found out proved "what we had suspected all along, that the way we'd been delivering it was impossible". So in undertaking this enquiry, a group of teachers had gathered evidence that allowed them to back up their professional judgement in order to persuade their managers to allow a change in pedagogical practices for the benefit of the pupils.

T14 also reported improved understanding of the foci of two of the enquiries in which she participated. When reflecting on her participation in the enquiry led by CT3 she reported:

> I felt far more confident in my assessment, both types, formative and summative. I felt far better, far more confident than I was. And the general picture, I felt far more confident as a professional, I suddenly had my finger on one of the pulses that were quite important so that was really good. I felt that I wasn't just an English teacher anymore, I was a teacher and that was what I'd really wanted from the start.

Reflecting on her participation in CT4's enquiry, she noted:

> well it's not so big but it's given me more confidence to speak out about how I feel about the guidance department and the social education lessons and the programme because being the new girl as such you know, was it really my place to say c'mon let's change that I'm not happy with that so this has given me more of an opportunity to say here's why I want to do this so let's do it.

In Foucault's (1985) work on practices of the self he writes about the "ethical work that one performs on oneself, not only in order to bring one's conduct into compliance with a given rule, but to attempt to transform oneself into the ethical subject of one's behaviour" (p.27). T14 would appear to have used CPE to do work on her self in order to transform from a subject specialist, which she seemed to find a constrained position, into 'a teacher'. Her involvement in guidance and social education, and her desire to become simply 'a teacher' rather than an 'English teacher' suggested that she had a strong ethical sense of what a teacher should do and be like in relation to pupils. The work of the CPE group seemed to give her permission to make the desired changes to her self, and allowed her to resist being positioned as a subject teacher only and act out a different professional self. It also appeared to enable her to find her voice as 'a new girl' within the guidance department, allowing her to act in accordance with her own values. Indeed, when trying to articulate her understanding of CPE she noted:

Well, based on my experience it's working with your colleagues on an important educational issue really, and gaining an awful lot from working in a cross-curricular way. I think I went into teaching to be a teacher who happened to teach English. I wanted to be in the community of school, and work with my colleagues and so working collaboratively has given me the opportunity to do exactly that and not be stuck in guidance or English but to move something forward in a cross-curricular way and that's the most important thing for me; it's been a vehicle for me to do that.

One of the primary school teachers, T6, also seemed to be working on herself as she noted a desire to develop her understanding of her own teaching through the practice of CPE, and reported what she felt she had gained. She said:

In my own experience from university and things looking at theory and linking it to practice, I feel I had to take that a bit further and I felt it would be a good thing to reflect on my own teaching, how to improve … I think one thing I'm getting from it is I'm already doing some of the things, sharing learning intentions. And a thing I'm getting from it is making sure I'm doing this properly and using my knowledge of learning intentions to actually help with pupils' learning. For example, using success criteria and referring to them, and also it has developed my knowledge of the theory that goes behind it and hope that it will improve my teaching of writing, taking time to plan it and maybe be more focussed.

A member of the same group, T7, also noted the need to keep abreast of current thinking regarding her teaching. She said "I think sometimes there's a danger of being left behind in education and ehm you've to keep your eyes and your ears open and this seemed a good opportunity … and this was actually happening within school".

These two teachers seemed to be suggesting that CPE allowed them to engage with theory and thinking about teaching, beyond the normal practice within their context. It offered them a structure within which they could engage in professional dialogue and enquiry about current policy initiatives, allowing them to keep up to date and to evaluate and change their practice using well-considered evidence-based professional judgement.

Again these teachers appeared to be working on their professional selves, examining and making sense of the theories that informed their practice and working towards improved outcomes for their pupils.

CT3 identified a further interesting point in that she appeared to believe that CPE led to theorisation by her colleagues in the group. She noted:

> Many of the teachers in the group stated at the outset that they instinctively knew what worked well in trying to engage pupils but through the process of the enquiry they began to verbalise their thoughts and by doing so in the company of others they began to contextualise and clarify their thinking into professional knowledge.

Eraut (1994) identifies a number of issues which he believes hinder the process of theorization by teachers:

1. The general lack of professional discourse in schools
2. The nature of teaching encourages the development of short cuts and routines at the start, and valid theoretical ideas get consigned to storage never to be retrieved
3. Educational theory can rarely be applied 'off the shelf'; implications have to be worked out and thought through.
4. Individual disposition of the teacher to theorize (p.70).

It would appear that CPE may have allowed the teachers to overcome these constraints as it seemed to offer them a space to engage in professional discourse, allowing them to retrieve some of the public theories 'consigned to storage' while also allowing them to articulate some of their own private theories. At the same time this allowed them to consider some of their 'short cuts and routines', encouraging review and change. For those who chose to become a member of a CPE group, it could be argued that they displayed a pre-disposition to theorize, but even so, the evidence from the enquiries

would appear to suggest that the process of undertaking a collaborative enquiry enhanced this ability.

Some of the teachers also reported that their professional confidence improved due to their enhanced professional knowledge, and the consequential improvement of the quality of their teaching. Indeed one of the participants, already a PT, noted:

> the effect for me was confidence. It gave me access to a wider picture … I increased my confidence and I had CT3, I had CT3's ear … I think the confidence spread to the pupils because I was actually for the first time very, very focused on the areas that we were working at … I was always nose to the ground, sniffing about here like a bloodhound.

Another teacher in CT3's group noted that CPE made her "concentrate on formative assessment" and gave her "a bit more of an incentive to look at how I taught and to make some minor changes you know and see the benefit of those and I think the pupils benefited because I did that". Rather self-effacingly she reported, "I think on the whole it made me a slightly better teacher and I mean I've been teaching 29 years". It is not clear from her statement whether she was being modest, or whether she felt that the enquiry had only a little impact on her practice. The comment that she had been teaching for 29 years suggested to me that as an experienced teacher she was surprised that it had any impact at all. She went on to report that she intended to work with colleagues in her own department in the following school session to introduce formative assessment strategies. I believe this suggests that participating in the CPE not only impacted significantly on her own practice, but in turn is also likely to impact on that of her colleagues.

It would therefore appear that CPE offered the teachers a space in which they could work on themselves as teachers, examining their practice in ways which encouraged them to ask questions, engage in professional dialogue with their colleagues and act differently. They variously reported looking and being given an incentive to look, focussing and becoming more focussed, keeping eyes and ears open and having the ears of others; keeping nose to ground and sniffing about; being made aware and being given access to a wider picture; taking part, playing about, speaking out and being listened to; having a finger on the pulse and developing knowledge and increasing confidence. The teachers' use of sensory imagery is striking as they reported increased interaction with their environment and those in it.

Professional and personal satisfaction

Many of the participants described the practice of CPE as motivating, pleasurable and interesting. One teacher talked about the excitement of "sharing what we had seen and what we'd observed", while another said "I just think the findings were really interesting". CT1 believed that gathering "strong evidence to show that something needs to be different" was "quite motivating for people". There was also a sense of satisfaction from the teachers because they felt they were making a difference to their pupils. CT1 noted that the group "were feeling really positive about the fact that, yes we feel that this is definitely making a difference and the children were really enjoying it and we're enjoying teaching it".

T13 reported that CPE "got you far more enthusiastic about the whole idea … I think you fired each other into action. You just wanted to get started. We were almost trying to run before we could walk". She discussed, in particular, the difference between the experience of being involved in a CPE and being a member of a traditional working group, or going on a course. She noted that "there's been groups looking at school policy things, not so much developing for the pupils". Being part of the group allowed her to "find about eh, it satisfied my curiosity a bit at the beginning. I found out about feedforward and peer and self-assessment that CT3 was doing with the pupils and I think it worked very, very well". She elaborated on its direct relevance to her practice:

> It was counted as CPD time but going to a course is totally different. You can't apply it so easily. I'll never forget going to a course and learning how to do a database so I could work out my mileage from A to B or something – a piece of useful information (laughter)! But this is actually putting it all into practice and it just all comes together so it's been far more use and value than just a one off course.

A teacher in PS made the same point, noting that "if you attend a course on something like this it's up to you if you go back and actually implement it whereas because we were doing a study we were actually monitoring something so you're putting a lot more effort and thought into it".

So the teachers reported that they were sharing, observing, making a difference, enjoying teaching, putting in more effort and thought, were more enthusiastic and were firing each other into action. They appeared to find CPE interesting in that it satisfied their curiousity and was of more use and value to their professional development than a one-off course. They were monitoring their own progress and that of their pupils in relation to work that

166

they themselves judged to be of value. Such pro-activity and reported professional and

personal satisfaction is interesting in relation to the analysis in chapter five, where it was

asserted that teachers were positioned by their managers as reluctant, unwilling and

lacking in commitment, and in need of encouragement and support. It is also interesting

to recall that, as discussed in chapter six, no apparent difference was found between the

testimonies of the teachers in SS who volunteered to engage in CPE and those in PS who

were coerced in terms of the benefits accrued. While one primary teacher, T4,

commented that where 'you've got to' do something 'you don't put your heart and soul

into it', she also reported that she had found the findings really interesting and that the

whole process was "so enjoyable".

Working together and sharing experiences

The teachers' stories suggested that they experienced CPE as a positive collaborative

event, which contributed to their own development, to pupils' learning and, in some

cases, to the culture of the school. T9 made the point that CPE enabled her to work "with

like-minded people who want to take things forward". She added:

> This side of things is very interesting because we've had a lot of departments
> involved, so it was nice and interesting to listen to other perspectives, how things
> work for other people so I think it's also to get more of a picture of how the
> school's working as well.

Indeed she identified the team building aspect of participating in CPE as one of the major

benefits. Listening to the perspectives of others appeared to be important. T10 noted that

"working within your department you kind of get set in your ways and your views" so

working with people that "you don't normally work with, they have different ways of

167

saying things". She went on, "it might be that someone else in the group could come up with a solution to what you have perceived as a problem. They might see it from a different angle". She seemed to value this and noted the importance of meeting together saying that "you have to meet collaboratively to be able to move forward, to maybe change what you're doing or at least talk it through". She further noted the importance of face-to-face dialogue:

> I think you've got to collect evidence and you've got to meet regularly … I would say because I think that keeps you on track, and it also, I think if you don't meet its not collaborative at all, you might as well go off and do your own project for a year.

Sharing practice was a recurring theme from the teachers when discussing the benefits of participating in CPE. In relation to the expertise of the CT leading the group, T7 noted that "CT2 is always a go ahead member of staff who shares her practice well and makes it sound an attractive thing to do, and I'd worked with CT2 before and it was a good experience and I learned a lot from it". The positive statements about sharing practice also drew attention to the importance of having time set aside to do so. For example CT1 noted:

> It's been good for us to be able to discuss things. That's been one of the benefits I've found of having a group like this, the fact that you can share these kind of experiences. Quite often you don't have time to but you make time to do things that are really important and that we want to do.

T6 drew attention to the reciprocal learning that took place amongst members of the groups, when commenting:

> I think you learn off the teachers. A lot of the teachers I'm with are quite experienced and you learn from their experience and questions that arise in the group about different things you've maybe not thought of yet, and it brings things clearer to your mind. It also reassures you that other people are having similar problems as well.

While T7 remarked:

> We had young teachers in the group as well and it was really nice to hear their perspective because they are also full of wisdom you know and it's fresh as well so you know it was nice having a chance to meet with other members of staff and stop long enough to listen to them.

It seems that undertaking CPE offered both time and space for teachers at different stages of their careers to engage with each other in ways that they valued and that enhanced professional relationships.

There were also comments which seemed to reveal that the teachers valued contact with their colleagues at a personal level. CT1 noted that she enjoyed "having the opportunity to work with people from other stages because you know I'm down here and sometimes it's quite isolated … and it was a very positive experience for me being part of that group working with people that I was more like". T4 made a similar point "being in the Nursery I don't have much involvement with the other staff so I, that was a benefit for me". T14 also suggested that there were social as well as professional benefits:

> I gained from that and also as I say personally it was really good for me to work in a cross curricular way and I felt I personally gained an awful lot from that. You walk round the school and you see somebody and you know somebody a lot better and that's much nicer.

The process of collaboration intrinsic to the practice of CPE appeared to give CT1's group collective confidence in their findings. CT1 stated that "because we had done this collaboratively as a group I think it just gave it, you know, kind of more strength and kind of made it more valid as an enquiry as opposed to just one person saying these things". T2 agreed and added "we could make recommendations that we thought might be, that

someone might pay attention to, whereas before we knew that whatever we were saying was just …" Her sentence remained incomplete. T7 also mentioned the benefits of the collective nature of CPE when she commented that she had valued the "safety in numbers, group support".

One teacher made a comment which suggested that she believed that CPE contributed at a systemic level. T6 felt that working more closely could herald longer term benefits for the teachers. She stated:

> it's not just you trying your best and actually getting nowhere. You feel that if everyone else is doing it eventually these children are going to come through and they're going to have learned it before and you're going to develop it rather than you yourself plodding on.

It therefore appeared that the collaborative nature of the group, which worked together without a manager at its helm, led to teachers listening to the perspectives of others and stopping long enough to do so; seeing things from different angles; having and making time; working with like-minded people at different stages of their careers; sharing practice and experiences, learning from that and moving forward, gaining strength and being paid attention to. It appeared that the teachers were 'noticing' their practice and changing it accordingly, and they were doing this in discussion with, and with the support of their colleagues whom they trusted. They were collecting evidence not primarily for others for the purposes of accountability, but for themselves and their pupils. There was no external judgmental gaze, but in contrast, the benign, encouraging, shared gaze of their colleagues. The collaborative enquiries were led by CTs from their in-between position, with its lack of power stemming from the role or organisation (DuBrin, 1995). It

appeared that this lack of positional power paradoxically gave the CTs a greater level of

credibility and influence over their colleagues, illustrating Sarason and Lorentz's (1998)

contention that 'co-ordinators' who are influential because of their knowledge and

personality rather than a reliance on formal power "are significant in enabling

collaboration" (cited in Connolly and James, 2006, p.79).

Benefits for pupils

The reports from the participants in CPE also appeared to suggest that undertaking

collaborative enquiry into an area of interest contributed positively to pupils' learning and

experience in both schools, in a number of different ways. Amongst other things,

teachers reported their own enhanced knowledge of their pupils and their learning. In

discussion, CT1's group talked about how their perceptions of the children and their

skills and dispositions were altered when they enquired into their practice:

> T1:You're actually looking at the way the children work in a way that we perhaps
> wouldn't have known - the children that become facilitators that you wouldn't
> expect, then that's really healthy; the ones that are quieter where in other
> situations they are actually noisy.

> T2: Yes, their performance has been amazing. At the end to hear them discuss
> about how they thought they had behaved in a group and being quite honest and
> quite open about it and making them realise what their behaviour was like. I
> would say that that had been really effective.

> T1: They are seeing themselves in a new light.

> T5: There are children who would normally just sit back, are quite animated.

> T2: Yes that's right and I think that they become more aware of what they have to
> do. Sounds wonderful!

Another primary teacher, T6, also experienced an increased awareness of how the pupils

learned. She noted, "It's made me aware of the importance of making children aware of

their learning". T7 added that she believed that CPE "forces communication between

pupil and teacher … it's forcing both children and teachers to sort of examine and try and

get progression". By working in this way, it appeared that teachers related differently to

their pupils, thus altering the relations of power between them.

In the secondary school, both T10 and T12 highlighted the benefits to pupils when

teachers worked together, across subject areas. T12 noted:

> We're all teaching different subjects, there're different assessment criteria but
> we've identified a mutual sort of need that the pupils require and we just felt that
> if we worked together, obviously the essential thing is to communicate with each
> other and you know see if there are improvements.

T10 reported that CPE allowed her to see "the whole picture because the thing is that

you've to recognise that children are going to all these different departments".

A further benefit highlighted by one teacher was that she noticed improved rapport and

empathy with her pupils. T9 explained that she had chosen to work with a high achieving

group, and pushed them to focus on areas which were difficult for them:

> It's been very interesting for this type of group to say to them look you have to go
> back to stage one, listen to criticism, work on it, reflect on it, all the things that
> we're supposed to be doing ourselves as professional teachers we're asking them
> now to do … but for some of them it's been quite a period of kind of questioning
> themselves … I mean we're not reinventing the wheel exactly … but we have to
> yeah we have to pull apart what the process has been up til now and again that's
> quite radical and it's good to say at any level of your teaching experience that
> you're willing to do that.

In making these links, it would seem that she acknowledged that learning had taken place for herself as well as for her pupils. While it appeared that she was suggesting that the process had involved a period of questioning for the pupils, it seems that it was the teachers who had to pull apart their teaching process: radical indeed.

T6 also appeared to see a link between the opportunities that CPE offered to the teachers and those that the teachers offered to their pupils. She said "I think we are always promoting independent learners within the classroom and that's what we're basically being given the chance to do. It's management allowing you to be independent". This is a complex statement which exposes an interesting paradox. This teacher noted that the group had identified learner responsibility as an area to address, because they felt that pupils had tended to be spoon-fed rather than proactive regarding their own learning. In comparing the teachers' attempts to encourage pupils to be self-responsible with staff 'being allowed' to be independent, the irony does not appear to escape her notice. In light of the discussions in chapter six about the gamesmanship which took place in an attempt to mask the exercise of power it would appear that this teacher, at least, understood what was happening and used the 'permissions' constructively and creatively.

The teachers also talked about the impact of their improved understanding of the area of their enquiries on their pupils. For example T12 talked about the insight she gained into formative assessment. She reported that she had a better understanding and had:

> become more conscious of when I'm writing comments on pupils' work. I think ehm just being more a reflective practitioner … of how I could change, or what I could do differently to encourage the pupils … to be more specific in what areas

they need to look at, just being more conscious of, for example, allowing the pupils to use these tools.

It is interesting that the notion of 'allowing' autonomy and freedom is raised once more, this time with the teacher 'allowing' her pupils access to 'tools' which enabled them to be more independent and self-reliant. T12 also found that she could now identify "areas of weakness" in her pupils' learning and help them to identify "what do they need to do to actually get higher marks". She went on to say:

They liked peer assessment … they appeared quite critical of each other but also at times quite supportive – 'that was a good answer', or you know just general, just through general conversations within the class you could actually pick up a positive vibe. Just through the conversations that you know it appeared a more positive learning environment.

Another member of the group led by CT3 believed her pupils "understood a bit more about teaching and learning, about assessment and achievement" at the end of the enquiry. T14 reported that she had noticed a continuing interest from the pupils who had asked to look back at their folder from the previous year to assist with current work. T10 also noted that her work for the CPE had "spin offs into other teaching groups … We talked about other aspects of formative assessment and because we had talked about those I found they were becoming more key in all my teaching as well".

In their end of enquiry evaluations, each CPE group reported particular benefits for their pupils in relation to the specific area of their enquiry. CT1's group provided evidence that their infant pupils reported that 'Let's Think' made them better at listening to other people, better at sharing their ideas and taking turns and better at asking questions. The teachers supported the pupils' perceptions about what had changed, adding that they

believed that the pupils were now more confident to try something new and take risks. The school's educational psychologist helped the teachers in their evaluation, video recording the first and last teaching session for two of the groups. Four specific observable behaviours were identified and the psychologist used an integrated video analysis and observation package to analyse the recordings. They also decided to code the amount of time the teacher was talking during each session. This was agreed after the taping had taken place, so the teachers were unaware that this would be measured while they were being recorded. It was found that the teachers' behaviour had changed. In the first session they talked for half of the time, while in the tenth week they talked for only 32% of the session, allowing for much more pupil talk. It was also found that on all four categories, "suggesting, predicting, explaining and responding", the pupils increased their rate of participation. This analysis supported the perception of the pupils and teachers, and was further supported when a local authority colleague observed a lesson. He indicated that he was impressed by the pupils' ability to use "collaborative and personal strategies for solving individual and group problems".

CT2 and her group examined the effects of sharing learning intentions and success criteria on pupils and their writing. They discovered that four out of the five classes demonstrated "marked gains in the pupils' attitude to writing and also in their opinion of themselves as writers". The pupils also reported that they understood better "how to make their writing good" and felt more responsible for their success in writing. The teachers looked at samples of pupils' written work and reported that most improvement was apparent in pupils who had lower attainment in the early stages of the enquiry. The

teachers believed that these pupils particularly benefitted from the clear articulation of learning intentions. One teacher reported that she was "blown away by the quality of writing" suggesting that she had observed real improvement in her pupils' written work, beyond her expectations. The teachers in CT2's group also highlighted a problem that they uncovered during the enquiry. They noted deterioration in areas of writing which were not the focus of the learning intentions and success criteria, detecting an attitude, particularly amongst older pupils, that "if it's not going to be assessed, I don't need to bother doing it properly". Having identified this they were able to address it, and CT2 believed that this demonstrated an increased criticality amongst her colleagues regarding their practice. The enquiry allowed and encouraged them to analyse the pupils' work in greater depth.

Lastly CT3 and her group, focussing on the use of feedback and feedforward across eight different departments, found that their "pupils were more actively engaged in taking responsibility for their own learning" by the end of the enquiry. Their school educational psychologist also assisted in the evaluation of their intervention, and using the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test in the SPSS programme, discovered that following the intervention pupils were more likely to engage in self- and peer-assessment. The teachers and pupils themselves identified this as the most significant change. Pupils expressed a preference for peer-assessment saying that it was useful because peers were "more honest and help you pick out flaws that you wouldn't have noticed". However 50% of the pupils also noted that self-assessment was useful, making comments like it "makes me think to myself what I have to work on" and it "makes you think more about what you are doing".

The teachers also commented on benefits of increased peer-evaluation. Apart from a decrease in marking because "pupils were able to give each other constructive feedback", they reported an increase in "on task pupil discussion" which took place "during peer-assessment about peer judgements, compared to the usual casual chatter that takes place in practical lessons in particular". Teachers also believed that, by the end of the intervention, the pupils had "a clearer appreciation of their role in their learning". Most reported that they were so convinced of the benefits of peer- and self-assessment that they were now using the techniques with other classes.

There appeared to be many benefits to pupils where teachers undertook a collaborative professional enquiry into an area of interest or concern.   An additional benefit was identified in the primary school. T3 noted that the work their group had done enhanced the relationship with the support staff in the school. She said that "from the children's point of view it's probably been really good because a lot of the children who will not work with the support staff normally are now doing that, so they are seeing them in a different light". While T3 focussed on the benefits for the pupils, this would also appear to imply that there were benefits for the support staff themselves.

Conclusion

Collaborative professional enquiry appeared, from the evidence in the research, to offer a wide range of opportunities to teachers to enhance their professionalism, increasing their professional knowledge and confidence and their personal and professional satisfaction. It would appear that there is ample evidence of the benefits of the practice of CPE to its

participants and their pupils, so it is interesting at this stage to reflect on whether this happened despite the effects of the positioning of the teachers and CTs or because of this positioning.

I have presented evidence that the CTs inhabited a space in-between teacher and manager, and that from this 'othered' position, within "the cracks and crevices" (Sennett, 1998, p.141) of the schools' management structures, they seemed to encourage the growth of a fertile environment in which the teachers were able to thrive. This metaphor leads me to imagine a somewhat sheltered, underground place from which the CTs led their colleagues in interesting and exciting ventures out of range of "the scrupulously 'classificatory' eye of the master" (Foucault, 1977, p.147). It resonates with childhood memories of Enid Blyton novels in which 'five' went adventuring away from the gaze of 'grown-ups', who inevitably would have spoiled their fun and restricted their risk-taking behaviour had they known what was happening. At the end of the day, the adventurers reported back only what their parents and guardians wanted and needed to hear.   Their carers were not bad people, only wanting the best for their dependants, though they sometimes appeared overly cautious and lacked understanding of what was important.

It has already been reported that the CTs and teachers did have the blessing and support of their managers to take part in CPE, just as Aunt Fanny and Uncle Quentin 'allowed' George, Julian, Dick and Anne with Timmy to investigate strange and intriguing clues (*e.g.* Blyton, 1942). However, unlike Fanny and Quentin who allowed their wards unbridled freedom, both managers reported that they felt the need to keep an eye on the

178

progress of the groups and both appeared to experience tension between giving freedom and retaining control.

I have argued that this hierarchical surveillance was a response to the way in which they were positioned, as managers, by the *Standard for Headship* (SEED, 2005) and the accountability regime encapsulated by *How Good is Our School?* (HMIe, 2007a). The CTs appeared to act as a buffer and a shield between the teachers and the managers thus enabling pro-active enquiring professional action by teachers, while re-assuring the managers that all was well. I would therefore argue that the benefits of CPE outlined in this chapter were made possible by the productive nature of the in-between position of the CTs which enabled them to counter the effects of the positioning of the teachers. From their uncertain position, it would seem that the CTs were able to help the teachers "to refuse" to behave in the ways that were expected of them and "to imagine and to build up what [they] could be ..." (Foucault, 1983, p.216). When reviewing the literature on professional identities, I cited Ball (2003) who argued that the opportunities for individual teachers to resist the influences of their positioning were limited, as the commercialisation of education had worked to colonize or close down "the space for the operation of autonomous ethical codes based in a shared moral language" (p.226). I would argue that collaborative professional enquiry, led by Chartered Teachers, appears to have gone some way towards re-opening that space and would go further to suggest that the uncertain and ambiguous position of the CTs allowed them to lead in a non-conventional but productive way.

At the inaugural event of the Association for Chartered Teachers in Scotland which took place at the Scottish Parliament on 21st March 2009, Professor Walter Humes, Dean of the School of Education at the University of the West of Scotland congratulated the Chartered Teachers for their action and initiative in setting up the Association. He warned them, however, not to allow themselves "to be grasped to the warm bosom of the educational establishment", commenting that "warm bosoms nearly always lead to trouble" in his experience (2009a, podcast). His strong message that the power of the Chartered Teacher would be derived from their position outwith the hierarchical establishment was consistent with the findings of this research. The data show that CTs did begin to empathise with the managers but were well aware of the need to resist the discourse of accountability in order to build ownership and autonomy in all participants. It appeared that this was an uncertain, ambiguous and disturbing space in which to dwell, but it also appeared to be productive in the affordances it offered in relation to credibility and the development of trust.

Chapter Eight: Reflecting and Revisiting

As I "sit before the blank page that must eventually carry the story of what (I) have presumably learned" (Van Maanen, 1988, p.xii), I realise the challenge in trying to convey to others what I think I have learned from the research process, and from the experience of undertaking a professional doctorate. My new understandings lead me to believe that what I have learned will not be directly transferable to others, however I do hope to be able to effectively communicate some of what I have learned - enough to contribute to professional discourse and dialogue in the areas of distributed leadership, collegiality and collaborative practice.

The initial aims of this study were to explore the practice of collaborative professional enquiry as framed by the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002) and enacted by four aspiring Chartered Teachers, and to evaluate the contribution that it made to learning in two schools. Early data analysis, however, highlighted the naïvety of such aims when it became apparent that the introduction of Chartered Teachers to an established hierarchical system was far more disturbing than had been imagined and so CPE became a subsidiary issue. The major issue that emerged from the data was that time-honoured relations of power within schools were questioned and challenged by the unknown 'Chartered Teacher', not "subjected to habits, rules, orders" (Foucault, 1977, p.128) governing the manager, nor the many techniques of discipline which ensured docility in teachers. The socialisation process, so effective in ensuring that teachers and school managers are clear about their place within the organisation, was not yet established for

Chartered Teachers and the policy context appeared to send a plethora of mixed messages which contributed to a lack of clarity about their role. The focus of the research, therefore, moved to an exploration of the relations of power in two schools, where Chartered Teachers were leading collaborative professional enquiry.

I discovered, through the process of my work, that I had a real affinity with the notion of Chartered Teacher. Their rather subversive position appealed to my inner rebel, and CPE seemed to offer them a cloak behind which they could enact an enhanced professionalism that had been stifled by years of policy induced constraint. The *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001) stated that it offered a "unique opportunity to address the question of teachers' esteem, professional autonomy and public accountability" (2001, p.3), and CPE appeared to me, at least in theory, to be the ideal vehicle to allow Chartered Teachers to take the lead to empower their colleagues to become more autonomous, thus raising esteem and confidence with regard to accountability. However as these real people recounted their experiences of leading, participating and managing the complexity of the endeavour became clear. Despite support and approval of CPE as a practice, the CTs came upon all sorts of barriers which were linked to relationships in school, particularly relations of power.

My first research question asked what CPE was, as framed by the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002). I have answered this in chapters one and two, where I have explained its emancipatory nature though this is unarticulated by the policy texts. In chapter six I recounted the strength of support from the Chartered Teachers regarding the

emancipatory element of CPE, and highlighted its disturbing nature for the school managers. The 'definition' of CPE offered in this work is therefore from a particular standpoint, a good illustration of the different ways that policy texts can be read and interpreted.

The second research question asked how CPE was experienced and how it was put into practice. This question was addressed in chapters five, six and seven where I reported on the experiences of all the different actors. Collaborative professional enquiry, unsurprisingly, appeared to be experienced in many different ways, not least because of the wide variety of reasons that people became involved. It was largely experienced as a 'good thing', a productive and satisfying way to work which produced good educational outcomes for pupils and contributed to the development of the teachers involved. However, when exploring *how* it was practised it became apparent that the good outcomes were not achieved without considerable discomfort and uncertainty for some of the players.   My findings highlighted the ways that school managers were positioned to, rather oxymoronically, discipline and control in a collegial manner. Charged with operationalising discordant policies, they appeared to turn to strategies and techniques to mask any explicit use of power over their colleagues, trying instead to use power in a relational way where their professional actions did not "act directly and immediately on others" but acted "upon their actions: an action upon an action" (Foucault, 1983, p.220). The Chartered Teachers seemed to do the same, though it appeared that they had to don two different masks: one to hide their attempts to control their colleagues at the same time as they tried to develop more democratic relationships within the group, and the

183

other to hide their embryonic identities as Chartered Teachers while working out the form that their new relationships with their managers would take.

The final research question is the most important: what did the practice of CPE offer in relation to professional re-formation and development? Its answer helps to address the essential 'so what' question. Before addressing this, I will reflect on the theories and methods used in my research and revisit some of the decisions I made along the way, considering how well the research was done. I will also consider the ethical issues which have been raised by the research process.

Revisiting theory

Forbes (2008) shares her reflections on the process of undertaking a professional doctorate. She talks about the importance of "encountering Foucault" (p.452), an encounter which encouraged her to begin to question previously unexamined acceptances and beliefs. I resisted my early encounters with Foucault as I found his writing impenetrable and, despite my increasing dissatisfaction with the performativity agenda outlined in chapter one, what I did understand challenged my certainty and acceptance about the essentially benign nature of governance in modern Scotland. I promiscuously, and rather anxiously, continued to engage with a wide range of theories but none was to my liking or satisfaction. As I zigzagged between my data and the theoretical texts, Foucault and his ideas became too difficult to resist. They began to help me to make sense of what I was hearing and reading from the participants in the case studies and so in the end I embraced him.

Embracing Foucault was not without pain and suffering as I took on the enormity of the impact of his thinking on my own thinking, particularly in the areas of governmentality and the techniques of discipline which underpin our social life and institutions. The challenges to my points of view and the ways that I made sense of the world were considerable so I was reassured when reading a paper by Atherton (1999) who suggested "resistance is itself symptomatic of a situation where the learning is experienced as 'supplantive' rather than 'additive'" (p.78). This was indeed supplantive learning for me, as the ideas swept away previously unquestioned assumptions about my professional world and my self within it. Atherton's paper reports on a study he undertook to explore the nature and extent of resistance to learning by adult learners, and he concludes that supplantive learning has an "accompanying element of loss" (p.77) as respondents reported "a loss of certainty" (p.81) with some even reporting confusion and depression. Embracing the theories of Foucault undoubtedly involved loss of certainty for me - indeed at one stage I felt myself slip into some sort of Foucauldian despair - but it also opened a doorway into a space where I could make sense in different ways. Foucault himself implies the internal struggle which is involved when confronting the limits brought to light by his analysis when he notes that:

> the critical ontology of ourselves has to be considered not, certainly, as a theory, a doctrine, nor even as a permanent body of knowledge that is accumulating; it has to be conceived as an attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits that are imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them (in Rabinow, 1984, p.50).

Making use of Foucault's theories has, therefore, had as much impact on my own understanding of and relationship with the world as it has had on my understanding of the data.

Foucault's theories also helped me to interrogate the policy context in a particular way. Codd (1999, p.52) argues that there are "deep-seated and problematic ethical assumptions" imbued within current policy discourses that reinforce and perpetuate externally imposed forms of accountability. He argues that not only are these forms of accountability ineffective in relation to maximising performance, but they also serve to reduce the level of moral agency necessary to ensure commitment and engagement by professionals. The Foucauldian framework I have used has enabled me to understand and surface some of these assumptions. It has allowed me to study their effect on teachers who were attempting to take a more active professional stance, and also their effect on the school managers who were tasked with the management of the teachers' performance.

Hoy (1986) notes that the range of topics that Foucault covered in his career is astonishing, and that "there may not be a single 'Foucault'" (p.2) and this would certainly seem to be the case. Indeed one of the reasons behind my initial resistance to his work was the enormity of the task so at this stage of my development as a scholar and researcher I make no claims to understand or even have a working familiarity with all of the topics covered by Foucault. For the purposes of this study, I cherry-picked from his body of work, finding and utilising those areas which served my purposes and these were described in chapter four. As I reflect on the process I believe that my decision to embrace Foucault was the right one as his analysis of techniques of discipline as social control enabled me to begin to theorise in order to generate explanations and understandings (Biesta, 2008, podcast) of the data before me. This process of theorisation is most definitely still a work in progress.

Revisiting methods

Foucault (in Rabinow, 1984) relates that he turned his attention to the history of sexuality because he was interested in the "study of forms of experience" (p.334). He argues that the "domain where the formation, development, and transformation of forms of experience can situate themselves" is the "history of thought" (p.334). He goes on to explain that thought:

> can and must be analysed in every manner of speaking, doing, or behaving in which the individual appears and acts as subject of learning, as ethical or juridical subject, as subject conscious of himself and others (pp.334-5).

Such analysis involves a focus on "types of understanding, forms of normality, and modes of relation to oneself and others" and Foucault argues that it is the play between these three axes that "give[s] individual cases the status of significant experiences" (p.336). In chapter four I noted that my main aim was to offer an account of practice which would allow practitioners to reflect on their own experiences and that the case study seemed to be an ideal method to allow me to do this. This decision was backed up by Stake's (2000, p.25) assertion that the case study method had been "found to be a direct and satisfying way of adding to experience and improving understanding". Foucault's theories and the case study as a method seemed therefore to complement each other in relation to my research intentions.

Kendall and Wickham (1999) point out that when using Foucault's methods one should look for contingencies rather than causes and they urge researchers to "be as sceptical as possible in regard to all political arguments" (p.9). They offer the example that one

cannot say that honey is sweet; only that it appears to be sweet and that one should not be "drawn on the question of whether it really is or is not sweet" (p.11). This is consistent with my assertion that I had no intention to draw causal links, nor to generalise or offer a 'truth'. I believe the case study method gave me a structure in which it was possible to gather and analyse data in ways which allowed me to consider the complex nature of the relationships within and around the organisations and the CPE groups. It allowed for a discussion about the participants' experiences as they were reported, and for me to offer an interpretation of what I thought that meant. With regard to the need for scepticism, I found it easy to be sceptical about political arguments where I saw what I interpreted to be asymmetric power relations. In the early stages of my analysis, however, I had to work hard to be sceptical of the viewpoints of the CTs and teachers, and would fall into the trap of presuming that their behaviour was a result of the (more powerful) behaviour of the managers. So Kendall and Wickham offer a useful reminder that to assert causality between one experience and another is to force your own interpretation and beliefs on to the experiences of others.

How well was it done?

Despite being relatively happy with the theoretical framework and methods used, there are a number of things I would do differently as I reflect on my experience of undertaking this research. At an early stage of my data collection I was surprised by a request from CT1 that her group would like to be interviewed as a group with her there rather than individually, and that they would like to see the question schedule beforehand. Meanwhile CT3 had set up the interviews in her school, and had arranged for me to see

most people individually, although two of the participants requested to be interviewed together. This raised a number of issues. Firstly all the teachers I interviewed about the experience of being involved in the group led by CT1 were interviewed in her presence, while CT3 was not present when I interviewed any of the teachers with whom she worked. This difference was replicated with the groups led by CT2 and CT4. The data from the primary school teachers was therefore gathered in different circumstances to that which was gathered in the secondary school. In both places the managers were interviewed separately, and in all cases I saw the CTs alone as well as seeing the primary CTs with their groups.

In considering the implications of this difference, there was never any intention to compare the experiences in the two sites and therefore I do not feel that the data were compromised in this sense. I believe that individual, paired and group interviews offered different riches, while all had possible weaknesses. The individual interviewees appeared to be able to reflect without fear of offence to colleagues, and were also free to offer their own interpretation unmediated by others. On some occasions I was unable to clarify issues at the time, because these interviews were by definition undertaken serially. The two teachers interviewed together appeared to gain confidence from the presence of each other, in that they tended to bat their answers back and forward, and build up answers in so doing. Perhaps these answers were richer than they would have been, and yet I felt that I got a sense of one experience of CPE, rather than two.

The group interviews were different again. On occasions, I was aware of a level of deference to the CT. The teachers would articulate their answers then look to the CT, apparently for approval. The CT occasionally then re-phrased the answer and reflected it back to me. This could be seen as a dilution of the evidence, but also as an expression of the way that the group had worked closely together and had been unified by the experience. It certainly allowed me to observe the relationships and relations of power between the members of the groups, something I was unable to do when I interviewed individuals. If undertaking a similar piece of research in the future, in order to maximise the benefits of the different configurations I would plan to interview subjects individually and in groups. On reflection, my lack of clarity at the outset allowed these variations to occur, though I am unsure if this was a good or a bad thing as I wonder about the effect on the outcomes if I had imposed either group or individual interviews on participants.

Another concern I have on reflection is whether in my identification with the pro-active, enthusiastic teachers I perhaps ignored the stance taken by the inactive, disengaged teacher. They were not the focus of my gaze because, by definition, there were few involved in the CPEs. Although some 'conscripts' were involved in CT1s group due to the coerced nature of the groupings in PS, by the time I interviewed them every teacher was engaged and on board, reporting only their initial disillusionment. On reflection it would have been interesting to hear from the reluctant teachers regarding their non-involvement as I believe that this would have added another layer to the story. The absence of their voices leads me to acknowledge the partiality of my findings.

Ethical issues

A major irony runs throughout: as the researcher and writer of a study which cited and used Foucault's notion of the examination as a technology of discipline, I was also the examiner. Ball (2000) sums this dilemma up when noting that his work is "part an exercise in autobiography", as "some of the oppressions I describe are perpetrated by me" (p.5). He comments that he is "agent and subject within the regime of performativity in the academy" (p.5), and I must note the same. I was aware of this from the start and while I supervised all four of the CTs in the research, an early decision was made and communicated to the students that I would not be involved in the assessment of their dissertations. In this way an attempt was made to reduce the power imbalance in some small way.

Another ethical issue was raised by one of the Chartered Teachers who noted:

> I felt restricted about what I wrote about my group because it was public knowledge to some extent … I wouldn't have offended anyone by writing sometimes the truth, so I focused in on the positive things that happened, which still was a good story because there were a lot of positive things.

As a teacher on accredited CPD courses that require written reflections on the experience of leading CPE and leading and managing whole school improvement plans, this comment leads me to reflect on the constraints built in to the assessment process which may jeopardise its validity. Where teachers and school leaders are asked to make claims against a professional Standard as part of an assessment process, it is in their interest to use positive, assertive language when claiming competence. This resonates with further concerns raised by Ball (2000) who suggests that "the multitude of 'performative texts'

and 'tests of performativity' with which we are continually confronted … increasingly inform and deform our practice" (p.1). He argues that "tactics of transparency produce a resistance of opacity, of elusivity – an escape from the gaze" (p.2) and it seems to me that the CT above may well be describing that very paradox.   In relation to the use of competence frameworks, Edwards and Nicoll (2004, p.121) note that:

> Competence measures are argued to be real and transparent, fair and valid. Demonstrations that you can do something in the context of practice or in simulations of practice become a key signifier of professionalism.

Where the academy colludes with this notion and asks for transparent reflection on practice against these governmental Standards of competence, we perhaps put our students in a position where they must fabricate or at least present the most favourable evidence. While this concern is not the focus of this research, it should be noted that it may have impacted on the written data offered by students, and indeed I realise, on my own interpretation of the data. This raises a professional concern which should be addressed with my colleagues.

Elliot (1991, p.14) uses the phrase "academic imperialism" when considering the same irony. He questions the morality of the actions of academics:

> Action research and the 'teachers as researchers' movement are enthusiastically promoted in academia. But the question is: are the academics transforming the methodology of teacher-based educational inquiry into a form which enables them to manipulate and control teachers' thinking in order to reproduce the central assumptions which have underpinned a contemplative academic culture detached from the practice of everyday life? (p.14).

This led me to question the rationale behind the Professional Enquiry programme, and thus what was asked of the CTs in this study. Were we manipulating and controlling

192

them, encouraging them to do the same with and to their colleagues in school? While our aspiration was to link the academic, school and classroom contexts (Eraut, 1994), were we getting near to this? Again these are not questions that I set out to answer in this research but are ones which need to be addressed with my colleagues, in relation to my continuing practice.

While the assessment regime to which the CTs were subjected and for which I had some responsibility, may have had constraining and deforming effects I also became aware, during the course of the research, of the legitimising, productive effect of undertaking an accredited course for both aspiring Chartered Teachers and Headteachers. When talking about professional learning, Eraut (1994, p.83) suggests that a course "confers legitimacy on activities that might otherwise be viewed with considerable suspicion". In this case study, the act of CPE was legitimised by both the University and the local authority initiative which advocated action enquiry as a vehicle for school improvement. The need for legitimation and permission is discussed in a number of places by the Chartered Teachers. Several use the phrase 'being allowed to' in their reflections, both oral and written. CT1 noted that the teachers were "no longer being handed another new initiative, and were being allowed to determine their own school priorities" though she was less sure if CPE offered a route to sustained change as she noted that it was likely that it would take some time for the teachers to "truly take on board the realisation of opportunities for assertiveness rather than acceptance". This raises the question whether such pro-active behaviour will be encouraged and 'allowed' when the course is over and

the local authority has moved on to its next initiative: again not a question to be answered here.

A further ethical issue is worthy of note. I strongly identified with the subjects of the research: the teachers, Chartered Teachers and managers. Ballard (2003) highlights such identification as an ethical issue. I could see the world from all their perspectives: I was the tutor of the CTs, working closely with them as they progressed through their Masters degree programme, and I had many years experience as both teacher and school manager. I recalled being an enthusiastic teacher whose pro-activity had been encouraged in some contexts and not in others, and felt their frustration when they felt undervalued. I identified with the pro-active teachers rather than the "not on your nellie" type of teacher, though I acknowledged their existence and effect on the way that others behave. I also felt oddly protective of the school managers in the study, which led me to reflect on my own behaviour when I was in their role. Had I worn the cloak of a democratic leader while ensuring compliance, and if so what were the effects of doing so? I realised that as a Headteacher I had colluded with those who managed, observed and judged me, and this must inevitably have had implications for the teachers with whom I worked. In chapter one I stated that I had attempted to be aware of the meaning schemes: the "sets of specific expectations, beliefs, feelings, attitudes and judgements" (Mezirow, 2000, p.18) that might influence my interpretations and analysis. I leave the reader to judge how successful I have been.

Lastly a more pressing ethical issue has arisen from the findings of this study. Heshusius (1995) relates the "other-self relationship to the teacher-student relationship" in her paper which is concerned with "self to participatory consciousness" (p.117). She notes that in asking student teachers to "just *be* with a youngster and listen" she was asking them to behave in a way which was contradictory to that "implied in the teacher identity to which they were aspiring" (p.118). This rang alarm bells for me as I considered the new relationships that we were asking the CTs to forge in their schools. In asking them to develop a participatory model of enquiry we were asking them to behave in a way which challenged current orthodoxies and contradicted the identity of teacher constructed in relation to the identity of manager. Perhaps the ambiguities and uncertainties experienced by the school managers were a reflection of their multiple identities, which include 'recollected teacher' as well as socialised school manager. To become the latter meant that they had to reject, or at least diminish, the former. This led me to consider whether I was behaving as 'an academic imperialist', manipulating and controlling the professional actions of the CTs by using the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (GTCS, 2002) as a technique of discipline, and asking them to take part in a process that was not 'natural' to their contexts (Johnston, 1994). This is a further professional dilemma which I am left to solve beyond the boundaries of this thesis.

Impact on my self

The whole experience of undertaking a professional doctorate has been life changing. This has been largely positive though at times I have felt overwhelmed as my life seemed to be entirely overtaken by the size and scale of the project. I began the process simply

195

because it seemed like the right thing to do, having entered academia after a long career in the compulsory education sector. My own daughter started at Stirling University as an undergraduate at the same time as I began my new working life. On her first visit to my room, which was situated at the end of a long corridor, she said, with tongue in cheek "No offence, Mum, but every room – Professor This, Dr That - then I come to your room and it just says Alison Fox". She put into sharp focus what I had already been thinking: this new job would require me to re-form from one kind of professional into another. At that stage I knew nothing of the literature on professional identities and only had hazy memories of undergraduate studies on socialisation, but intuitively I knew that I had to take myself in hand.

The professional doctorate seemed to provide the 'way to go', and I use the journey metaphor consciously despite its clichéd nature. At the end of the taught section, the then Course Director asked the cohort to offer a metaphor of the experience. At the same time he gathered metaphors from a cohort at the start of the EdD process and wrote a paper reporting on this small study (Edwards, 2006). In the paper he notes that metaphors of participation and journey predominated. I used a visual metaphor, an illustration from a children's book of a pirate ship, which seemed to me to encapsulate the whole event: sharks circling; planks to be walked; colourful parrots flying overhead in bright sunshine; the discovery of occasional pots of gold; evil looking pirates with eye patches and hooks for hands, and an inviting and enticing horizon ahead.

Edwards reflects on my pirate ship in some detail (2006, pp.11-2) noting the use of both journey and acquisition metaphors. He comments that the metaphor I used reflected "the struggle and risk experienced" (p.12) but also the rewards gained, thus reflecting the ambiguity of the experience to date. At the end of the whole process I stand by that metaphor and could overextend it, waxing lyrically about the stormy seas, doldrums etc. Suffice to say that throughout the period between then and now, there have been highs and lows. Regardless of what I believe the findings of my research might contribute to the profession, the process of doing it has contributed to my own re-formation from headteacher to academic in many different ways. Most significantly, my eventual acceptance of the invitation to explore the work of Foucault led to a re-evaluation of many of my unquestioned beliefs and assumptions. Such supplantive learning (Atherton, 1999) was painful, but in the Calvinist tradition on which I was weaned I accepted that there would be no gain without pain.

Foucault's writing on practices of the self highlighted another personal issue for me. Despite being roundly encouraged and supported by my husband, the time I have spent on this work has often felt highly self-indulgent, again in opposition to my Presbyterian upbringing. This research was not part of my paid work as I have no contractual duty to undertake research as a Teaching Fellow, and indeed our cohort was told during the taught phase that the EdD would be our 'hobby' for the next few years. The data collection phase felt like 'real' work, but when I was reading, thinking and writing, it felt like I was privileging my 'hobby' over other parts of my life: my elderly parents, my domestic responsibilities, my friends and so on. This led me to question my motives and

197

ask who I was doing this for, and why. The answer seemed to be that I was doing it for

myself, which led to a mixture of excitement and guilt. Foucault, however, came to my

rescue as I read his construction of 'morality', which he says refers to:

> The real behaviour of individuals in relation to the rules and values that are
> recommended to them: the word thus designates the manner in which they comply
> more or less fully with a standard of conduct, the manner in which they obey or
> resist an interdiction or a prescription; the manner in which they respect or
> disregard a set of values (1985, p.25).

This helped me to understand that I had choices, that to behave morally involved a

balancing act. As I complied more fully with the standard of conduct required of an

academic by completing a doctorate, I complied less with the standard of conduct

required of the daughter of elderly parents. So I had choices to make. Foucault goes on

to note that:

> an action is not only moral in itself, in its singularity; it is also moral in its
> circumstantial integration and by virtue of the place it occupies in a pattern of
> conduct (1985, pp.27-8).

I gave myself permission to spend the time required to complete this work as part of my

pattern of conduct, integrated with all the other parts of my conduct which were no more

or less important for me. Thus the process as a whole has been both liberating and

expansive in its contribution to the development of my own multiple identities. This was

illustrated by a recent experience when Foucault inadvertently played a part in the growth

of a further layer to my developing identities.

The front cover of my edition of *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality: Part 2*

(Foucault, 1985) has an image, appropriate to the title, of an 'upstanding' Greek god

receiving attention from a willing goddess. Having spent a weekend in the Outer

Hebrides working on my doctorate, I was flying home. Having checked in for my flight I was called to the security area whereupon I was invited to open my suitcase to take part in a random luggage search. I complied and on the top of my weekend detritus lay the aforementioned god and goddess in brazen pose. The Hebridean security man looked at me with suspicion and I considered suggesting that he open the book to confirm that one cannot judge a book by its cover. At the same time I hoped that he was not judging me by the cover of my book. I chose to respond with a dignified silence and was cleared to board. This episode caused me to reflect on my changing identities. I realised that I was happy to have complied less rather than more fully with the standard of conduct expected of a middle-aged woman in these religious islands. As I said, the experience of undertaking a doctorate has been both liberating and expansive.

Impact on my professional practice

The process of undertaking this research has involved extensive reading, and I have been shocked by what I realise I did not previously know or understand. For many years as a practitioner in the field I did not stray beyond reading policy texts and professional magazines. I was diligent in my attendance at CPD courses, all of which I now realise focused on the development of practical skills. Only when I began my Masters studies was I exposed to academic texts and critical thought, though in the limited field of Specific Learning Difficulties (dyslexia). This research has therefore impacted in a very specific way on my professional practice in that I feel my teaching has become more scholarly and I am able to draw from a much wider range of sources and from a deeper understanding of the issues discussed. Indeed already I have introduced the work of

Foucault, not only to a number of aspiring headteachers to help them to understand issues of power with which they are grappling within their schools, but also in a lecture to first year undergraduates considering how values and policies shape school structure and school culture.

My research has made me totally re-assess the MSc Professional Enquiry: School Leadership and Management (with SQH), the programme for which I am now responsible. As I complete this dissertation the programme is about to be reviewed in order to go to the General Teaching Council for Scotland for re-accreditation. What I have learned from the process and findings of this research will have a significant impact on the revised course as I will ensure that my understanding of the importance of relations of power within organisations is reflected in the curriculum and pedagogies used. I will put far greater emphasis on developing the political literacy of my students: encouraging them to ask, to listen to and to hear what people at all levels of the organisation are saying; to look and to notice what they are doing, and to ask why. I will ensure also that I pass on my increased understanding that has led me to challenge the empty rhetoric in much of the literature and policy texts, to help enable those aspiring to headship to go into this role with their eyes and ears wide open. I will also encourage them to continue to study, to see that the attainment of a Masters degree need not be the end of their quest for greater understanding of their professional lives.

Impact on wider educational practice

Perhaps the most important question to be asked at this stage in a research report is 'so what?'. So what can this understanding contribute to the profession? So what can this understanding contribute to the ways in which we, in HE, work with aspirant and serving teachers? So what if it *has* contributed to my professional and personal growth? What will change for others?

When attempting to draw a conclusion for an interpretive account such as this it is important to consider its warrant. Gorard (2002) draws attention to the much-publicised criticism of educational research and suggests that it is not the inappropriate methods or the quality of the evidence offered, but the relevance of the evidence leading to the conclusion that may be worthy of criticism. He does, however, rely on a research paradigm that looks for cause and effect, and explanation. As stated above the research reported here is an exploration and interpretive account of four teachers leading collaborative professional enquiry in two contexts. There is no intent to draw any causal links or offer a warrant for change (Gorard, 2002, p6). Its purpose is to offer an account of experiences and practice that will allow practitioners to consider their own experiences comparatively, and in so doing increase their understanding of it. There is also a grander desire to offer policy makers some food for thought, stimulating dialogue within educational communities about the ways in which professionals at all levels are formed, and the vital nature of relationships within the profession. It is with this in mind that I now consider 'so what' questions, and in doing so reflect on the final research question:

what did the practice of CPE offer in relation to professional re-formation and development?

The practice of collaborative professional enquiry did seem to offer the teachers and Chartered Teachers opportunities to enact a more pro-active professionalism, and their enthusiasm for this way of working was reported and analysed in chapter seven. The teachers reported that undertaking CPE enabled them to become the teachers they wanted to be, improved and re-invigorated their professional practice and led to a more satisfying professional life. It seemed, therefore to have much to offer the teachers in relation to their re-formation and development.

The practice appeared to offer different things to the Chartered Teachers. It seemed to offer them a cover behind which they could enable and encourage more democratic relationships with colleagues while engaging with their managers in new, more strategic ways. It also seemed to lead them into dangerous, unknown territory, where their position was undefined. It could be argued that this in-between space offered them a chance for emancipation: a freedom to invent and form their own professional identities as Chartered Teachers, though the evidence suggested that this was not experienced positively. It was a difficult place to be.

I have already noted that current policy texts valorise collaborative practices and distributive leadership without any analysis of the nature and location of power, with schools being encouraged to "move towards the collective leadership of an establishment

rather than dependency on the power of one person" (HMIe, 2007b, p.20). Insomuch as this research recounts the experiences of Chartered Teachers attempting to take on the mantle of collective leadership, I believe the findings suggest that there is still much work to be done in order to redefine, relocate and reconceptualise leadership in schools (Harris and Muijs, 2005). This, however, will require people at all levels of the educational community to acknowledge and understand the impact of current systems of discipline and control and their effect on relationships within schools. My findings support Onora O'Neill's assertion that we work within a "culture of suspicion" (2002, Lecture 3, p.1) where everyone's performance is monitored by others and where it is presumed that unless this happens teachers will not perform well. Seven years after O'Neill's lectures, the educational press have recently reported that:

> Hundreds of primary and secondary schools across the country intend to install CCTV cameras in classrooms over the next five years to root out bad teachers and check up on naughty pupils (Education Guardian, 2009).

Indeed one headteacher is reported as saying that the cameras they have installed "have made a "very significant" contribution to the rise" of their attainment figures. Foucault's statement that "the exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation" (1977, p.170) needs no further illustration. I am aware, therefore, that there is a mountain to climb.

I believe, however, that as increasing numbers of teachers move towards chartered status and relocate into the in-between space from which they can mediate and negotiate, it is possible that they will be in a position to help to redefine and reconceptualise what collective leadership actually could be as they challenge established relations of power. I

have argued that the nature of their in-between status appeared to be crucial to the success of the CPEs.   My concern is that the in-between location will be too uncomfortable, both for the CTs themselves and also for their managers and so they will inevitably be drawn towards the "warm bosom" (Humes, 2009, podcast) of the established hierarchy. This would be in the interests of the managers, in line with the old adage that 'it is good to keep your friends close, and your enemies even closer'. I believe that school managers and Chartered Teachers will need support to encourage continued professional pro-activity, in order to bring about the benefits for both teachers and pupils that are described here. It is therefore vital that discussion about the nature and location of power in schools and its impact on any change that is desired is seen as a first step when planning for change.

What should happen next? Implications for practice

The findings of the research suggest that collaborative professional enquiry has much to offer the profession and this has confirmed my commitment to its centrality within the programmes with which I am involved. I believe it is important to share the findings in order to encourage its practice in schools beyond the boundaries of accredited academic programmes. The teachers and Chartered Teachers reported a wide range of benefits for their pupils and themselves, and additionally it appeared that the practice of CPE had the potential to reconstitute and open up spaces to allow constructive, pro-active professional dialogue and action, particularly where teachers and Chartered Teachers are trusted to act in the best interests of their pupils.

Collaborative professional enquiry led by Chartered Teachers appears to offer a model for a new kind of leadership in our schools, however the research process and findings have highlighted the power and status differentials between teachers and managers in schools. At a recent conference I was sharing my findings, and at the end a graduate CT spoke to me, confirming that what I had found resonated with her experiences in school. She told me that in her primary school, members of staff ironically call themselves 'Primary Eight'. She reported no promotion to 'Primary Nine' on undertaking a highly successful CPE and gaining chartered status. Reflecting on my findings, I am pretty sure that the headteacher involved would have no idea that the way she exercised power de-professionalised her staff, particularly as there was a level of affectionate acceptance and resignation in the tone of the CT's voice. Despite its challenging message, I believe that it will be important to share my findings as widely as possible beyond the groups of teachers with whom I work in order to heighten awareness of the issues they raise. This will involve engaging with colleagues at local authority and national level, getting published in professional magazines and journals and speaking in a range of fora to encourage dialogue and debate. This process has begun, and already I am aware that my message threatens the status quo and, at the same time, is welcomed by some.

Currently teachers undertake Initial Teacher Education and then work in schools building up their experience for six years, after which they can apply for a Certificate of Eligibility from the GTCS before enrolling on a Chartered Teacher programme, leading to the professional qualification and a Masters degree. Alternatively teachers, after an unspecified period of teaching, may apply for promotion to Principal Teacher. Thereafter

they may choose to aspire to Headship and apply to their local authority for a place on the Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH) leading to that professional qualification and a Postgraduate Diploma. I would suggest that it would be wise to consider breaking down these barriers intrinsic to the national CPD framework in order to enable rich dialogue, joint discovery and knowledge creation. The two distinct pathways seem to distance and divide managers and teachers, encouraging the development of entrenched positions and dissonant discourses. I intend to explore this idea with some local authority colleagues, with a view to piloting a different kind of CPD programme which surfaces the issues raised by this research and leads school communities to question and adapt their leadership practices.

There is evidence in policy texts and government rhetoric that the Scottish educational community seeks to encourage difference, innovation and pro-activity in schools. Yet the findings of this research question whether that support is available to persuade, cajole, provoke and/or allow school communities to redefine and reconceptualise leadership in any radical way. While the accountability regime flourishes, supported by a plethora of techniques of discipline, I believe that the lived world of teachers will continue to be experienced as a 'pupil' in Primary Eight rather than the "committed and talented professionals" acknowledged by the *McCrone Agreement* (SEED, 2001, p.2). Mezirow (2000, p.24) notes that "Freedom involves not just the will and insight to change, but also the power to act to attain one's purpose". It can be seen that while the teachers involved may have had the will and insight to change their practice they did not have the power within the organisation to attain and sustain their full purpose. They were given

permissions to undertake CPE but there seemed to be little evidence that the structures

changed or that the schools were yet ready to accommodate these reinvented

professionals. Mezirow (2000) quotes Novak who claims that when learning takes place

which changes one's perspective "life is not *seen* from a new perspective, it is *lived* from

that perspective" (p.24). It appears that the changed perspective of the Chartered

Teachers requires them to live in an 'in-between' and uncomfortable world. Indeed, as I

write, three of the four CTs in the study have moved on and no longer work in

classrooms. One is now a lecturer in Higher Education, another moved to a promoted

post in a different school and a third is employed as a development officer at local

authority level. This perhaps is the strongest message to send to the educational

community, and should serve to illustrate the need to go beyond the rhetoric of

distributed leadership to examine and re-assess the effects of power relations between

professional colleagues in schools.

Sennett (2003) powerfully illustrates his contention that "inequality can breed unease"

(p.22):

> The beautiful and the ugly don't talk easily to each other about their bodies;
> people whose lives are full of adventure have trouble "relating" to the experience
> of people constrained within narrow routines (p.22).

It would appear that the promoted and the unpromoted don't talk easily to each other

about power, control, accountability, trust and respect.   It can be hoped that Chartered

Teachers will act as catalysts to start the dialogue and that this research will provide them

and others with, at least, a starting point for their conversations.

References

Allan, J (2006) After The Break? Interrupting the discourses of interprofessional practice. In J. Forbes (ed.) *The research and policy discourses of service integration, interprofessional and interagency working: ESRC seminar 1 proceedings.* University of Aberdeen: Research Paper 14

Allan, J. (2008) *Rethinking Inclusive Education: The Philosophers of Difference in Practice.* Dordrecht: Springer Publications

Atherton, J. (1999) Resistance to learning: a discussion based on participants in in-service professional training programmes. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, Vol.51, No.1, pp.77-90

Avis, J. (2005) Beyond performativity: reflections on activist professionalism and the labour process in further education. *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol.20, No.2, pp.209-222

Ball, S.J. (2000) Performativities and Fabrications in the Education Economy: Towards the Performative Society. *Australian Educational Researcher*, Vol.27, No.2, pp.1-24

Ball, S.J. (2003) The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy,* Vol.18, No.2, pp.215-228

Ball, S.J. (2005) SERA Lecture 2004: Education Reform as Social Barbarism: Economism and the end of authenticity. *Scottish Educational Review*, Vol.37, No.1, pp.4-16

Ballard, K. (2003) Including Ourselves: Teaching, trust, identity and community. In J. Allan (ed*.) Inclusion, Participation and Democracy: What is the purpose?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Besley, T. (2005) Foucault, truth telling and technologies of the self in schools. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, Vol.6, No.1, pp.76-89

Biesta, G. (2008). *What is Educational Theory?* Podcast [online] http://www.ioe.stir.ac.uk/events/seminars/index.php Accessed 3rd December 2008

Blyton, E. (1942) *Five on a Treasure Island.* London: Hodder and Stoughton

Boreham, N. (2007) *Interprofessionalism and the Collective Dimensions of Professional Practice.* Keynote presentation at the Second Professional Lifelong Learning Conference University of Leeds July 2007

Buchanan, Y. and Redford, M. (2008) Undertaking Professional Enquiries. In J. Reeves and A. Fox (Eds) *Practice-focused Learning: Developing excellence in teaching.* Edinburgh: Dunedin Press

Bush, G.W. (2000) *On Governing* in http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/7809160.stm Accessed 23rd July 2009

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical: Education, knowledge and action research.* Geelong: Deakin University Press

Carr, W. (1995) *For Education: Towards Critical Educational Enquiry*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Codd, J. (1999) Educational Reform, Accountability and the Culture of Distrust. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol.34, No.1, pp.45-53

Connolly, M. and James, C. (2006) Collaboration for School Improvement. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership, BELMAS*, Vol.34, No.1, pp.69-87

Coghlan, D. and Brannick, T. (2005) *Doing Action Research in Your Own Organization (2nd Edition).* London: Sage Publications

Crow, G. M. and Glascock, C. (1995) Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol.33, No.1, pp.22-43

Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G. and Sammons, P. (2006) The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal,* Vol.32, No.4, pp.601-616

DuBrin, A.J (1995) *Leadership: Research Findings, Practice and Skills*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co

Durrant, J. and Holden, G. (2006) *Teachers Leading Change: Doing research for school improvement.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing

Education Guardian (2009) *Someone to watch over you.* 04.08.09, pp.1-2

Edwards, R.E. (2006) Dancing to an alien beat: Students' experience of a professional doctorate programme. *Education in the North,* No.13, pp.6-13

Edwards, R.E. and Nicoll, K. (2006) Expertise, competence and reflection in the rhetoric of professional development. *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol.32, No.1, pp.115-131

Eisner, E.W. (1996) *Cognition and Curriculum Reconsidered (2nd Edition)*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing

Elliot, J. (1991) *Action Research for Educational Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. London: RoutledgeFalmer

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Forbes, J. (2008) Reflexivity in professional doctoral research. *Reflective Practice,* Vol.9, No.4, pp.449-460

Foucault, M. and Deleuze, G. (1977) Intellectuals and Power. In D.F. Bouchard (Ed) *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Foucault, M (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin Books

Foucault, M (1977a) Preface to Transgression. In D.F.Bouchard (Ed) *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Foucault, M (1978) *The Will to Knowledge. The History of Sexuality: 1*. London: Penguin Books

Foucault, M. (1983) The Subject and Power. In H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (Eds) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics (2nd Edition)* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Foucault, M. (1985) *The Use of Pleasure. The History of Sexuality: 2*. London: Penguin Books

Fox, A. and Reeves, J. (2008) Teacher professionalism in Scotland Post-Devolution. In J. Reeves and A. Fox (Eds) *Practice-focused Learning: Developing excellence in teaching*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Press

Fullan, M.G (1993) The Professional Teacher: Why Teachers Must Become Change Agents. *Educational Leadership*, Vol.50, No.6, pp.1-13 http://www.michaelfullan.ca/Articles_98-99/03_93.pdf Accessed 7th June 2009

Gage, N. (2007) The paradigm wars and their aftermath. In M. Hammersley (Ed) *Educational Research and Evidence-based Practice*. London: Sage Publications

General Teaching Council of Scotland (2002) *The Standard for Chartered Teacher* www.gtcs.org.uk Accessed 1st July 2008

General Teaching Council of Scotland (2002a) *Code of Practice on Teacher Competence* www.gtcs.org.uk Accessed 9th December 2008

General Teaching Council of Scotland (2006) *The Standard for Full Registration* www.gtcs.org.uk Accessed 1st July 2008

Gergen, K.J. (2001) Psychological Science in a Postmodern Context. *American Psychologist,* Vol.56, No.10, pp.803-813

Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin Books

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Publications

Goodson, I. (2003) *Professional Knowledge, Professional Lives: Studies in education and change.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Gorard, S. (2002) Warranting research claims from non-experimental evidence ESRC Teaching and Learning Programme Occasional Paper Series No 48 www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/capacity

Gore, J.M. (1998) Disciplining Bodies: On the Continuity of Power Relations in Pedagogy. In T.S.Popkewitz and M. Brennan (Eds) *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press

Greer, G. (1970) *The Female Eunuch.* London: HarpersCollins Publisher

Gronn, P.(2003) Leadership: who needs it? *School Leadership and Management,* Vol.23, No.3, pp.267-290

Groundwater-Smith, S. and Sachs, J. (2002) The Activist Professional and the Reinstatement of Trust. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol.32, No.3, pp.341-358

Hagger, H. and McIntyre, D. (2006) *Learning Teaching from Teachers: Realizing the potential of school-based teacher education.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Hammersely-Fletcher, L. and Brundrett, M. (2008) Collaboration collegiality and leadership from the head: The complexities of shared leadership in primary school settings. *Management in Education,* Vol.22, No.2, pp.11-16

Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age.* New York: Teachers College Press

Hargreaves, A. (2003) *Teaching in the Knowledge Society: education in the age of insecurity*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Harris and Muijs (2005) *Improving Schools Through Teacher Leadership*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Hatcher, R. (2005) The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* Vol.26, No.2, pp.235-267

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2005) *SS Inspection Report* [Name of this report changed to preserve anonymity]

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2006) *PS Inspection Report* [Name of this report changed to preserve anonymity]

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2007a) How Good is Our School? The Journey to Excellence: Part 3. http://www.hmie.gov.uk Accessed 29th November 2008

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2007b) Leadership for Learning: The challenge of leading in a time of change http://www.hmie.gov.uk Accessed 22nd September 2008

Heshusius, L. (1995) Listening to Children: "What Could We Possibly Have in Common?" From Concerns With Self to Participatory Consciousness. *Theory into Practice,* Vol.34, No.2, pp.117-123

Hodkinson, P., Biesta, G., and James, D. (2008) Understanding Culturally: Overcoming the Dualism Between Social and Individual Views of Learning. *Vocations and Learning,* Vol.1, No.1, pp.27-47

Hoskins, K. (1990) The Crypto-educationalist Unmasked. In S.J.Ball (Ed) *Foucault and Education: Discipline and knowledge.* London: Routledge

Hoy, D.C. (1986) (Ed) *Foucault: A Critical Reader.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd

Humes, W. (2003) Policy Making in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce and W.M. Humes (eds) *Scottish Education: Second Edition Post-Devolution*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Humes, W. (2009) The Social Capital Agenda and Teacher Professionalism. In J.Allan, J. Ozga and G. Smyth (Eds) *Social Capital, Professionalism and Diversity*. Rotterdam: Sense

Humes, W. (2009a). *Keynote address to the Association of Chartered Teachers Scotland* Podcast [online] http://flashmeeting.e2bn.net/fm/fmm.php?pwd=57c923-5380 Accessed 5th July 2009

I'Anson, J., Reeves, J. and Whewell, C. (2008) Developing excellence in teaching: redefining professional enquiry. In J. Reeves and A. Fox (Eds) *Practice-focused Learning: Developing excellence in teaching.* Edinburgh: Dunedin Press

Jackson, D (2006) The Creation of Knowledge Networks. In A. Harris and J.H. Chrispeels (Eds) *Improving Schools and Educational Systems: International perspectives.* Abingdon: Routledge

Jansen, S.C. (1991) *The Knot That Binds Power and Knowledge.* New York: Oxford University Press

Johnston, S. (1994) Is Action Research a 'Natural' Process for Teachers? *Educational Action Research,* Vol.2, No.1, pp.39-48

Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods.* London: Sage Publications

Kirk, G., Beveridge, W. and Smith, I. (2003) *The Chartered Teacher,* Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2000) *5-14 Guidelines. The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum: Guide for Teachers and Managers* http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/Images/guidesaboc_tcm4-122426.pdf Accessed 19th November 2008

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2005) *The Contribution of Chartered Teachers: Advice and Guidance.* http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/cpdscotland/about/background.asp Accessed 1st July 2008

MacDonald, A, (2004) Collegiate or compliant? Primary teachers in post-McCrone Scotland. *British Educational Research Journal* Vol.30, No.3, pp.413-433

MacGilchrist, B., Reed, J. and Myers, K. (2004) *The Intelligent School (2nd Edn)* London: Sage Publications

Menter, I., Holligan, C. and Mthenjwa, V. (2005) Reaching the parts that need to be reached? The impact of the SQH. *School Leadership and Management,* Vol.23, No.1, pp.7-23

Mezirow, J (2000) Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformation Theory. In J.Mezirow and Associates (2000) *Learning as Transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

National Committee for the Inservice Training of Teachers (1979) *The Future of Inservice Training in Scotland*, Edinburgh

O'Neill, O (2002) *A Question of Trust.* The Reith Lectures 2002. www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/reith2002 Accessed 10th April 2009

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2007) *Quality and Equity of Schooling in Scotland.* OECD Publishing www.oecd.org/publishing

Popkewitz, T.S. and Brennan, M. (1998) Restructuring of Social and Political Theory in Education: Foucault and a Social Epistemology of School Practices. In T.S. Popkewitz and M. Brennan (Eds) *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press

Rabinow, P. (1984) (Ed) *The Foucault Reader: An introduction to Foucault's thought*. London: Penguin Books

Reeves, J. and Forde, C. (2004) The Social Dynamics of Changing Practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol.34, No.1, pp.85-102

Reeves, J. Turner, E, Forde, C. and Morris, B. (2005) Changing their minds: The Social Dynamics of School Leaders' Learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education,* Vol.35, No.2, pp.253-273.

Reeves, J. (2007) Inventing the Chartered Teacher. *British Journal of Educational Studies,* Vol.55, No.1, pp.56-76

Reeves, J. and Fox, A (2008) (Eds) *Practice-focused Learning: Developing excellence in teaching.* Edinburgh: Dunedin Press

Reeves, J., Forde, C., McMahon, M., O'Hara, C., Nicolson, A., Meiklejohn, D., Smith, S., Brown, J, Cowie, M. and Stead, J. (2008) *School Governance in Post-Devolution Scotland*. AERS Research Briefing Paper 3 www.aers.gov.uk

Richardson, L (2003) Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. London: Sage Publications

Rogers, C. And Freiberg, H.J. (1994) *Freedom to Learn (3rd Edition).* New Jersey: Simon and Schuster

Sachs, J. (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Scheurich, J.J. and McKenzie, K.B. (2005) Foucault's Methodologies: Archaeology and Genealogy. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd Edition).* London: Sage Publications

Scott, D. (2000) *Reading Educational Research and Policy,* London: RoutledgeFalmer

Scottish Executive Education Department (2000) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century: the McCrone Report*. Edinburgh

Scottish Executive Education Department (2001) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century: Agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone Report.* www.scotland.gov.uk Accessed 1st July 2008

Scottish Executive Education Department (2002) *Professional Review and Development* www.scotland.gov.uk Accessed 9th December 2008

Scottish Executive Education Department (2004) *Ambitious, excellent schools* . www.scotland.gov.uk Accessed 22nd September 2008

Scottish Executive Education Department (2005) *Standard for Headship.* www.scotland.gov.uk Accessed 1st July 2008

Scottish Government (2008) *Report of the Chartered Teacher Review Group: Report of the review group.* http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/06/04102833/0 Accessed 22nd September 2008

Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1998) Consultation paper on *A National Framework for the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers,* Edinburgh

Senge, P. M.(1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.*   New York: Doubleday

Sennett, R. (1998*) The Corrosion of Character: Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc

Sennett, R. (2003) *Respect*. London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press Ltd

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994) *Building Community in Schools*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass

Somekh, B. (2006) *Action Research: a methodology for change and development.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Spillane, J., Halverson, R. and Diamond, J.B. (2004) Towards a Theory of Leadership Practice: a distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* Vol.36, No.1, pp.3-34

Stake, R.E. (2000) The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry, In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster (eds) *Case Study Method.* London: Sage Publications

Stake, R.E. (2005) Qualitative Case Studies. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd Edition).* London: Sage Publications

Stronach, I., Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S. and Warne, T. (2002) Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Educational Policy,* Vol.17, No.1, pp.109-138

Sutherland , S. (1997) Teacher Education and Training: A Study, Report 10 of Higher Education in the Learning Society, Dearing: National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. Norwich: HMSO

Van Maanen, J. (1988) *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography.* London: University of Chicago Press

VITAE project http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/education/centres/crtsd/vitae/ Accessed 21st November 2008

Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society*. London: Harvard University Press

Webb, G. (1996) Becoming Critical of Action Research for Development. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (1996) (Ed) *New Directions in Action Research.* London: Falmer Press

Weick, K.E. (1979) *The Social Psychology of Organizing* 2nd Edition. New York: Random House

Weiskopf, R. and Laske, S. (1996) Emancipatory Action Research: A Critical Alternative to Personnel Development or a New Way of Patronising People? In O. Zuber-Skerritt, (1996) (Ed) *New Directions in Action Research.* London: Falmer Press

Yandell, J. and Turvey, A. (2007) Standards of communities of practice? Competing models of workplace learning and development. *British Educational Research Journal,* Vol.33, No.4, pp.533-550

Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1996) Emancipatory Action Research for Organisational Change and Management Development. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (1996) (Ed) *New Directions in Action Research.* London: Falmer Press