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Abstract.

This thesis examines what influences teachers when they engage with, or disengage from CPD at one U.K. University that is a major provider of teachers’ CPD. The research has been carried out with the aim of informing the management and development of CPD programmes. The views of head teachers, teachers and local authority education specialists were captured during eleven interviews and two focus groups. Participant observation data was collected over a period of four years between 2006 and 2010.

Whilst the initial incentive was to understand the relationship between CPD and professional identity among this group, what came out of my data was that teachers were seeing CPD as an oppressive form of professional discourse. The thesis thus theorises these teachers’ thoughts by drawing on critical counter-hegemonic ideas, such as but not limited to those represented in the work of Michel Foucault.

The inquiry concludes that the ways in which these teachers perceive power has an influence on the ways in which they engage in CPD and that this is closely entwined with how they view their professional identity. The thesis suggests that if universities are to play a significant role in the professional development of teachers, firstly they need to understand these influences and address such feelings. Secondly they need to embrace ways of working with schools and head teachers that acknowledges this understanding.
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1.1 Introduction

This study set out to discover what influences school teachers when they consider whether and how to engage in Continual Professional Development (CPD). It also addresses what influences them when they decide not to engage in CPD or to withdraw from programmes. It has been carried out from the point of view of informing the management, design and delivery of CPD programmes most immediately at the university where I work. It is therefore concerned with accredited post graduate CPD rather than \textit{In Service} (INSET) type development programmes and non-accredited CPD. The empirical research was carried out between 2006 and 2010 and crossed the political milestone of a change in Government in the UK. The Labour administration was replaced by a Conservative coalition Government which had a significant influence on the arena of teachers’ CPD in the sense that funding made available for post graduate CPD during the Labour Government was removed by the Conservative Government.

1.2 Statement of purpose

The focus for this research was prompted both by my own professional experiences from 2005 when I began working as a principal lecturer responsible for teachers post graduate CPD within a faculty of education, and a desire to inform the management and delivery of the CPD programme at the university. It was felt by the university and faculty managers that there was a lack of interest in, and commitment to CPD both from head teachers and
classroom teachers. University managers and senior faculty staff responsible for CPD struggled to understand this lack of commitment and apparent disinterest as there were significant financial and time resources directed to CPD programmes. At the same time, one of the university’s strategic targets was to increase the number of post graduate students. Therefore there was some significant priority and impetus to recruiting teachers to post graduate CPD programmes.

The numbers of teachers engaging with CPD opportunities has varied greatly during the time I have held some responsibility for CPD, partly as a result of the aforementioned change in political priorities, and this has had a significant impact on the way in which the university structured its CPD provision. My sense after working closely with teachers and local authority educational officers and head teachers before 2005 and up to the start of the research in 2006 - was that there seemed to be something deterring teachers from engaging in CPD. It felt like these deterring influences were something to do with the ways in which teachers saw themselves as professionals and the identity and status that this professionalism afforded them, but it was not clear. My research was undertaken to uncover some of these influences and to consider these alongside the political agendas for teachers’ CPD in order to provide some clarity to public CPD discourses today.
1.3 Research Aims

Theoretical notions of professionalism and professional identity as having something to do with the way teachers saw themselves have developed in my mind as this research progressed. These notions emerged from experiences and discussions I have had with teachers and other educational professionals over the years before the start of this research and led me to ponder the apparent sense of powerlessness some teachers seem to feel when taking part in CPD programmes. This lack of power and feeling of oppression is not discussed in the CPD literature but was illuminated in the conversations I had with teachers – both before and during this research, especially situations where they felt their voice was not being heard in relation to their feelings about the CPD they were expecting to do. This, the teachers’ feelings about the business of CPD, and their relationship to it, is the main thing that this thesis aims to investigate and give voice to.

Before the start of my research I was struck by what seemed to be a mismatch between Government rhetoric and policy that teaching would become a Masters level profession (DFES 2001) and what teachers themselves considered to be important when thinking about CPD. Drawing on conversations I had with teachers prior to the onset of my research, I was aware that for many teachers CPD was not something they felt important or held any priority. My second aim is to capture the policy and practice disjunctions with a view of informing both, particularly at my institution, but also to inform a wider audience.
Thirdly my research will also go some way to addressing the claims that the arena of teachers’ CPD has previously had to withstand a lack of theorisation (McCormick et al 2008), and has teacher development as an area of study has gained momentum over the last 20 years attracting the research interests of several academics (Fullan and Hargreaves 1992), postgraduate professional development is particularly worthy of further investigation and research (Arthur et al 2006).

1.4 Definition of CPD

My initial experiences of CPD were whilst working as a senior lecturer in a further education college. From 1998 to 2005 I worked with nurses and care assistants on their CPD programmes and drawing on the positive impact that CPD seemed to have on their professional practice and on their career prospects, I developed the opinion that CPD was a significant benefit for people in that it created be a “win-win” situation. For example, in gaining further and higher qualifications as a result of participating in CPD courses people seemed to benefit from greater rewards both in terms of promotion and progression within the employment area, which resonated with my own experience.

On a personal level I felt that CPD had worked well for me. I left school with four O levels and commenced a nurse training course. During the time I was working as a qualified nurse and then as a nurse in the prison service I engaged in several CPD programmes that led to qualifications that were recognised by the industry. When I then began work as a lecturer at a further education college, I embarked on accredited under-
followed by post-graduate CPD programmes. This enabled me to apply for, and be appointed to, posts that had a good salary which resulted in me having a comfortable standard of living. So I found that I was regularly asking myself the question - why wouldn’t other people want to engage in something that had the potential to create greater financial benefits and opportunities and could offer the option of better career prospects?

My views remained the same, when seven years later I took a position working in a faculty of education at a University in which teachers’ CPD was a significant priority. But I soon had to question my views and regard them as somewhat naïve and arrogant, as I became aware that CPD was not a priority for many people. Both colleagues and trainee teachers with whom I was working argued (at times vociferously) against having to carry out any professional development. As my particular responsibility was to encourage teachers and teaching assistants to engage in, and register for CPD, I realised that I needed to gain a better understanding of the underlying influences and different views and agendas for teachers’ CPD.

One thing that stood out for me was that it felt that some of the strategies used by the university and local authorities to encourage teachers to register for CPD were at times questionable. For example, the local authority and the university seemed to have their own specific agenda for teachers’ CPD. These agendas were ‘sold’ to the teachers by each of the respective organisations as the norm. They didn’t appear to acknowledge the
teachers’ own preferences. The local authorities and university seemed to be setting the agenda for teachers’ CPD in terms of what courses were accessible and funded. I wanted to find out if this influenced the teachers’ level of engagement with CPD.

This ambivalence came out in the teachers’ responses to CPD programme evaluations. From reading evaluations that had been completed by head teachers and teachers on completion of their CPD modules I learnt that the ‘organisation and management of the programmes’ and the ways in which the CPD provision is ‘marketed and promoted’, each feature as significant factors to the way these teachers engage in CPD. The evaluation analysis chimed with an investigation by Arthur et al (2006) into the profiles of teachers engaging with postgraduate study across three universities. They found that, “personal commitment, workplace culture and the HEI organisation all impact on the chances of successful completion of awards by teachers” (Arthur et al 2006: 215). But the notion of personal commitment, workplace culture and the HEI agenda could mean different things to different people. This triggered an interest for me in trying to provide some clarity on these ideas and in identifying if and how these influences impacted on teachers in my study.

I recognised that in working with the notion of identity, in terms of how teachers see themselves within the professional arena and also with the concepts of power, in terms of the strength of influences from local authority and the university, this research would be well supported by drawing on sociological theory. Where my study is not intended to
be a significant contribution to sociological theory, the data analysis is underpinned by appropriate theories. In so doing, this research has been developed to provide some interesting and useful contribution to the area of teachers’ CPD. It is intended that the findings will support the re-development and restructure of the CPD programme area at the University where I work.

CPD conjures different meanings to different audiences and authors. It is also somewhat challenging to define as it is, “highly dependent on the cultural and socio-economic climate prevalent at any one time” (Campbell et al 2004: 16). For example, Evans’ (2002) interest in teachers’ CPD is focused on the cognitive aspects of teachers’ work based learning, she asserted that teachers’ CPD is a cognitive process that is, “guided by and focused upon, practical application of innovations”(Evans 2002:127). It is in respect of this definition she argues researching CPD is, “particularly important because it appears so far to have been considerably neglected, and as an emergent area of study, its knowledge base is still underdeveloped” (Evans 2002: 128).

This concept of CPD is in contrast to that of Cordingley et al (2007) who consider CPD to be a form of pedagogy in that it, “... consists of all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school and which contribute through these, to the quality of education in the classroom. It is the process by which alone, and with others, teachers; review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching, and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills and emotional intelligence essential to good professional thinking, planning and practice with
children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives” (Cordingley et al 2007: 3).

A report for school leaders commissioned by the TDA and carried out by Curee (2012) detailing an evaluation of CPD providers in England found that good quality CPD;

- that is collaborative and sustained is likely to have more significant and lasting impact on practice.
- helps improve outcomes for children and young people.
- is based on effective needs analysis.
- encourages participants to be reflective practitioners and use their learning to inform their professional judgements.

I am concerned with CPD that is a pedagogic process in terms of it providing learning and development opportunities for teachers. These opportunities are realised either within the teachers’ own professional contexts of the classroom or on the university campus. They are accredited, award bearing post graduate programmes that have been validated as a university CPD offer for school teachers.
1.5 Rationale

Both the last Labour Government and the present Conservative coalition Government agreed that there is a correlation between well qualified teachers with access to CPD and good pupil attainment in school (DFE 2001. HMI 2004. DfE 2010). This chimes with the claim by Campbell et al (2004: 13) that teachers’ professional development is a, “high profile, politically hot issue.” But whilst delivering CPD programmes for primary and secondary school teachers on CPD programmes delivered by the two universities in this study, I was struck by the notion that CPD does not seem to be a priority for many teachers. Neither do teachers seem to worry too much with the political agenda for their CPD. My observations are supported by comments in a Select committee report which states, “there is not a strong enough culture of professional development among teachers, and this must change radically if education standards in schools are to improve” (DCSF 2010: 10). The notion that there is a mismatch between the policy and the actions of those to whom the policy is referring is something that this research addresses.

CPD has generally been promoted to teachers in the UK through Government policy as something which is non-threatening and that which is valuable to the teacher (DFE 2001; DfE 2010). But there are some indications that it takes on the role of a controlling mechanism that is tied to rewards and sanctions, for example in situations where the content of the CPD is decided by the head teacher or the local authority and is promoted as something which secures some sort of job security or promotion. This thesis will unpick
these notions of control and shed some light on the way teachers’ perceive the promotion of CPD.

At the onset, and during the early stages of this research, local authorities were responsible for teachers’ CPD. Funding for development programmes and activities was channelled to the local authorities from central Government which enabled many CPD courses to be free to the teachers. The authorities promoted CPD as something which would be both beneficial to teachers and the schools within which they work. But from working with teachers my experiences offer a different view. Some teachers seemed to resent CPD and failed to engage in any development activities, whilst on the other hand, others were eager to embrace development opportunities and take part in CPD activities. I was keen to discover the reasons for this different approach to CPD so that I could develop the curriculum for CPD programmes from an informed perspective.

The rhetoric from the previous Labour and present Conservative coalition Governments that teaching should be a Masters level profession is not reflected in the current national policy (DfE 2010), as the (previously ring fenced) funding for CPD that leads to Masters degrees has been re directed to the whole school budget. Therefore teachers who want to continue their post graduate development and gain masters qualification now have to meet the costs, or negotiate funding with head teachers. The notion that funding may contribute to the teachers’ engagement in CPD is also something that this research addresses.
Whilst delivering CPD study sessions for teachers in schools, I sensed there were some tensions related to teachers’ CPD that were something to do with other professionals within the schools. For example, teaching assistants had their own professional development routes that led to higher level qualifications. In some schools this resulted in the qualified teaching assistant taking responsibility of some classes. The way in which some teachers viewed this developing role of the teaching assistant appeared to have something to do with the way in which these teachers viewed their own status and identity and this seemed in some cases to impact on their engagement with CPD, but the waters were muddy. It wasn’t clear what the link was between the developing role and professional qualification of the teaching assistant, and the way in which teachers viewed their own CPD. I wondered whether this might be more to do with the way in which teachers viewed their own professional identity, as the manner in which teachers acquire their professional identity has implications for the kind of professional development support that they require (Coldron and Smith 1999).

During my time spent with teachers before my research, I was also aware that some teachers seemed to be resentful of the way in which the university and local authority promoted and marketed CPD opportunities. During the early stages of my research in 2006, the University entered into strategic partnerships with several local authorities for the purpose of delivering teachers’ CPD. These strategic partnerships benefited financially from teachers registering for CPD as funding was drawn from the Government for each teacher who registered for an accredited CPD programme. I wondered if the potential to
secure funding for each teacher who registered for CPD had an impact on the motivation of the partnership, for example to recruit as many teachers as possible, and whether this was felt by the teachers themselves.

I developed a sense that teachers seemed to want to be able to select the theme and focus for their CPD rather than accept that which is a ‘standard’ or ‘normal’ local authority programme, or that which is offered as part of a university degree. I wondered whether this was having an impact on the ways in which teachers thought about CPD, in particular as I wanted to be able to consider the role the university played in teachers’ CPD.

From working on leadership and management development programmes with head teachers prior to the start of my research, I realised that head teachers were in a position that allowed them to be able to influence teachers’ own views on CPD, for example in situations where the head teacher had a priority for the development of teachers in terms of a specific subject. I wondered at what point the teachers’ own preferences for CPD were recognised and if these were acknowledged by the head teacher.

Similarly from my own experiences leading up to the start of my research, prospects of promotion seemed to have something to do with teachers’ engagement with CPD. It was claimed that teachers who engage with CPD afford themselves greater promotional prospects than teachers who do not engage (Kington et al 2003). But my own experience
conflicts with this. Whilst working with teachers who have taken part in CPD, I have realised that there is no guarantee that these teachers are more likely to be promoted than teachers who do not have higher qualifications as a result of having taken part in CPD. This offered a further opportunity for my research, to find out if teachers approach CPD with a view to it providing professional progression.

1.6 Research Questions

Subsidiary to my main research question: What factors affect teachers’ engagement with CPD are the following questions;

1) What is the relationship between professionalization, professional identity and teachers’ professional development?

2) What level of priority do teachers place on their professional development and why?

3) How does Government and local authority policy influence teachers’ professional development?

4) What is the role of institutional power in teachers’ CPD and how do teachers engage with this?
5) What other factors influence teachers’ engagement with CPD?

1.7 Thesis outline.

Chapter two looks at the recent and current national policy concerning teachers’ CPD and discusses how the changes to policy have been able to influence the practice of CPD. In contextualising recent and current policy concerning teachers’ CPD, this chapter offers some explanation of how the discourse of CPD is influenced by the national policy agenda.

Chapter three provides the theoretical framework for the thesis. It considers the notion of professionalism within which it illuminates the concept of a ‘new professionalism.’ Professional identity is discussed and the way in which power operates in the construction of professional identity is analysed by drawing on the works of Foucault, Gramsci, Bernstein and Apple.

Chapter four discusses the research approach and how this has been informed by my epistemological position. It introduces the data sources and methods used to gather the data. The methodology was underpinned by a grounded theory approach in the sense
that though I had some tentative notions of what could have been influencing teachers in their approach to CPD, I did not test these as a hypothesis instead I wanted the data to produce the theory (Strauss and Corbin 1998).

Chapter five looks at the data, and organises these into themes. The approach taken to presenting the data attempts to organise the individual voices. This thematic organisation of the data allows me to discuss them in the light of the theoretical issues that I set out to investigate as well as those that emerged as I went along.

Chapter six considers workings of power and how such power is perceived by the teachers. This chapter teases out some of the workings of power and in so doing, discusses the impact on the way in which teachers approach their development.

Chapter seven analyses the relationship between teachers’ CPD and the professional status and identity of teachers. It discusses the ways in which the teachers situated themselves within the school and their perception of how they were seen by the wider society.

Chapter eight - The final chapter offers some suggestions for the development of university-led teachers’ CPD programmes. It draws on the empirical data collection and
on the policy and literature in proposing that teachers’ CPD is influenced by a range of factors that are as significant today as when the data were collected.
Chapter 2:

Policy, professionalism and professional development

2.1 Introduction

This chapter considers the policy agenda for post graduate professional development for teachers in light of the claim that there have been some tensions between the teachers’ personal development needs and the national priority for teachers and schools (Hustler et al 2003). It also examines the ways in which the policy literature portrays the concept of the professional, in acknowledging that, “professionals are not just set in motion between simple polarities” (Stronach et al 2002: 111), they are also identified as such through the different types of knowledge they possess (Eurat 1994), and the stage they are at within their own development (Huberman 1993). Thus it provides a context for considering CPD.

To provide a policy context for the changes to teachers’ CPD, a summary of significant developments is provided in the timeline below;

1998: TDA led the award bearing ‘In Service Education and Training’ (INSET) scheme for the then Department for Education and Skills. This CPD was funded by Central Government via TDA and therefore free to the teacher.

2005: TDA led the development of Post Graduate Professional Development Courses (PPD). Providers for which were partnerships or consortia made up of schools, local authorities and universities. Funding for this CPD was available from central government.
2006: Curee et al was commissioned by the TDA to undertake an evaluation of PPD.


2007: Cordingley et al carried out research into the processes involved in supporting professional learning in contexts. This led to the development and subsequent commencement of the Masters in Teaching and Learning (MTL).

2010: The Donaldson Report argued for teaching to be a Masters level profession.

2010: The MTL commenced in England. The MTL was funded by central Government via the TDA. Universities were able to draw down this funding according to the number of students registered on the MTL programme.

During the period under investigation in this study (2006 – 2010), political shifts in terms of how teachers’ CPD is funded have been felt. For example, at the start of this research in 2006 funding for CPD was allocated from central Government for post graduate programmes that was accessible by local authorities and universities. For example, the Masters degree in Teaching and Learning was fully funded. £8,500 per teacher was allocated to Universities for each teacher taking part in the degree (TDA 2010). But the change of Government in 2010 led to schools receiving core funding which includes funding for CPD, and head teachers had to decide how to allocate funds. No monies are (at the time of writing) ring-fenced; this is in line with the Government’s stated objective of giving, “schools the power to decide how monies are best spent and allocated” (Campbell 2010).
2.2 Context

The post war years were an age of relative optimism that witnessed a demand for teachers which was not satisfied by supply (Mckenzie 2001). The dearth of qualified teachers led to the teaching profession experiencing something of a, “high status in communities that recognised them as autonomous professionals” (McKenzie 2001: 5).

From 1944 to the mid 1970’s, teachers were seen by society as the professionals who knew what was best for children (Le Grand 1996), but the changes to working conditions, training programmes and an increase in the regimes of control led to an argument that teachers came under increasing scrutiny (Ozga 1995) and teaching faced a period of deprofessionalization (Grace 1991). This argument has been supported by the emphasis on the training of teachers in craft skills rather than professional skills (Whitty 1997) and being trained in a particular school which limits the development of wider educational perspectives (Hoyle 1974).

During the last two decades, education policy in England has resulted in schools having to grapple with an increase in audit and accountability which has led to teachers feeling a lack of self-worth (Campbell and McNamara 2009). Teachers’ CPD formed a significant part of this Government policy, being central to the first national strategy: Learning and Teaching: A strategy for Professional Development (DFES 2001) in which it was stated that;
“Performance management systems in schools will only work if teachers’ confidence and competence are nurtured and supported through investment – by Government and the individual – in continuing professional development” (DfES 2001: 1).

Following the launch of the strategy, a report commissioned to identify teachers’ perceptions of CPD found that most teachers perceived the main drivers for CPD activity to be; school improvement and national priority which both took precedence over the needs of the individual teacher (Hustler et al 2003).

Teachers are referred to throughout this and other policy documentation as, “skilled professionals,” (DfEE 2001, DfES 2005, DOE 2011) But skilled in what? Although dated, the claim by Whitty (1997: 304) that, “the government wants to ensure that... trained teachers focus on the development of craft skills rather than on professional understanding” suggests that the agenda for teachers’ CPD was established as having a focus on subject specialisms.

Contrastingly, the Teacher Training Agency review of CPD in 2005, suggested that teachers’ CPD, “must not only meet the immediate need of teachers, but also support them in preparing for longer term change” (TDA 2005: 2). But this was not reflected in reality, as teachers’ CPD was largely developed around national strategy and current political trends (Day et al 2007). Such differing priorities for teachers’ CPD exemplify the claim that it was constantly the subject of political shifts and changes (Campbell 2011).
2.3 Professional Development

Government rhetoric has indicated that schools need to become learning communities that serve both staff and students, and teachers’ professional development should be at the heart of school improvement within these learning communities;

“All head teachers and other members of the leadership teams are to think about how to make their school a real learning community... and how to spread excellent development practice” (DfES 2001: 2).

But there is an apparent lack of understanding both of what is happening in schools with regard to CPD and of the views of school leaders and teachers (McCormick 2010), so it has been difficult up to now to grasp what impact if any the policy agenda has on teachers’ CPD and on the school and to what extent if any, schools have developed communities of learning.

In the 1998 Green Paper: Teachers – meeting the challenge of change, the DfEE announced the Government intention to introduce a performance management model which would provide a framework for the restructure of the teaching profession within schools. Within this green paper it was asserted that, “teachers of the future will need to take personal and collective responsibility for improving their skills and subject knowledge” (DfEE 1998 : 14). This shift in policy to embed teachers’ CPD and professional learning into the school culture was an attempt to enable teachers to develop their skills in the style of “learning on the job,” a model that led to the Post graduate professional development (PPD) model.
Yet several years later at the beginning of my research in 2006, CPD was perceived by teachers in schools that were in partnership with the university as an option and something with which teachers need not engage. Further to which there was, in many cases a weak culture of professional development within schools, exemplified in the research studies carried out between 2003 – 2004 at Cambridge University and the University of Bath. This study uncovered a situation in which CPD played little or no useful role in the lives of teachers beyond delivering Government policy edicts, or the clarification of examination Syllabi” (Gray and Denley 2005).

The Post graduate professional development (PPD) model which was introduced by the Labour Government in 2005 was based on the principle of universities, local authorities and schools working together in partnership (Campbell 2011). This collaboration had a strong focus on workplace learning and in a review conducted by Curee and Seabourne (2010) it was found that the benefits to this model were the development of partnerships and action research opportunities. However, there were also limitations. The review found that there was a lack of support within schools, which when considering the PPD model was to focus teachers’ CPD in schools, creates some challenges to the development of a work-based learning mode. So it was valuable to my research to consider if the teachers felt this lack of support, or if they viewed the work place model as a positive process.
The notion of teachers carrying out their professional development in school was further in evidence by the introduction of the Masters Degree in Teaching and Learning (MTL) which was introduced by the Labour Government as a work-based post graduate CPD opportunity for teachers. Some of the first teachers to take part in the MTL degree registered in 2010 via a Government selected consortia of Universities across the North West of England. The degree put much more emphasis on practice based learning which recognised the barriers to CPD that had been identified by Seaborne (2010) as; access, cost and support in the workplace. The MTL was fully funded by the Government via the Training and Development Agency (TDA) so was free to the teachers taking part. Universities and schools seemed keen to support the development of this new degree (Seabourne 2010). But the MTL was discontinued a few months after its introduction. One of the first policy changes made by the coalition Government was made by Michael Gove, the secretary of state for Education in redirecting the funding for the MTL. The significance for my research is in determining if this shift in policy was felt by the teachers, and if so to what extent? For example, the teachers currently completing the MTL will likely be the only teachers with this particular degree, so one wonders if this will have an impact on how the award is valued by the teachers themselves and also their head teachers and future employers.

The model that focuses on schools being at the centre of CPD emerged as part of the Conservative Government agenda, which decreed that teachers’ professional development, “should be centred on raising standards in the classroom, and therefore take account of objectives to enhance pupil learning as well as supporting broader professional skills such as working with external partners” (DOE 2011: 1). This is a similar
model to that which was introduced in 2005, when the Department for education and skills channelled the core funding for teachers’ CPD directly to the schools budget for school managers to decide how it should be spent. But when this model was introduced previously it led to situations of disparity as some schools spent significant amounts on CPD whilst others spent little or nothing. It also provided the opportunity for funding for research to be lost in the overall spending of the school (Campbell 2011). Given that some teachers have been inhibited from completing CPD due to having to fund the course themselves (Arthur et al 2006), it is useful to seek out the extent to which they are influenced by the issue of financing the CPD programmes.

The impact of moving the responsibility of teachers’ CPD to the schools has been felt by universities and local authorities. The Labour administration in 2005 declared that there would be a changing role for local authorities with less involvement in teacher development (DfES 2005). The same policy document proclaimed that teachers should have a, “clear commitment to professional development” which should focus on enabling the teachers to gain a “good up to date knowledge of their subject specialism” (DfES 2005: 95). This theme was reignited by the conservative government in the 2010 white paper, within which it asserts that it will ensure that, “teachers receive effective professional development throughout their career which will be led by a national network of training schools” (DFE 2010: 9).
Such significant policy changes to the way in which teachers’ CPD is developed and managed, as well as offering new ways of working for universities and local authorities, also creates new and different processes for teachers’ and schools to navigate. In becoming the centre of and for teachers’ CPD, schools are likely to determine the level of involvement with other organisations, out of which could emerge a situation which could lead to some teachers having access to university and local authority resources and others not.

That schools are likely to become the centre for teachers’ CPD provides significant challenge, in terms of having to negotiate teachers, “feelings of anger and resistance and/or hopelessness” and become, “less willing to give their professional attention and loyalty” to professional development (Garman 1995: 33), which is little wonder as “teacher development programmes have been designed consciously or unconsciously in assumptions rooted in bureaucratic control” (Goodman 1995:650). Rather than, “being a process of enlivening teachers and turning schools into critical and inquiring communities, teacher development becomes a process of ensuring cost cutting and of putting in place procedures to ensure compliance, docility and the creation of schools as institutions whose main concern is meeting the requirements of centrally devised diktats” (Smyth 1995:3). If schools are to become the centre for CPD, this offers new ways of working for the universities providing CPD for teachers.
2.4 Universities and teachers’ CPD.

In 2001 the Labour Government declared that universities should work together with Local authorities to provide CPD for teachers, “We want to implement a partnership culture for CPD – with GTC, teacher associations, schools, teachers and local authorities” (DcSF 2001). This declaration prompted some universities to establish collaborative partnerships with local authorities in order to provide accredited CPD for teachers. Where these collaborations had the potential to benefit the teachers in providing access to free and accessible CPD, they were also able to exert some influence on what subjects the CPD would focus. This collaborative partnership model was in existence for a large part of the time my research was being conducted, so it was useful to investigate if this partnership was able to influence teachers’ own perceptions of, and actions towards their CPD.

“Organisations such as ...higher education institutes...have a key contribution to make to focused, practical development, especially where they establish continuing partnerships with schools and their teachers. Schools can identify the detailed teaching and learning issues, while the partner organisation can provide the wider context, new ideas specialist expertise and supportive networks...A number of HEI’s have established strong and effective partnerships with schools and LEAs in delivering award bearing courses” (DfEE 2001: 11).

One of the key benefits of involving the universities in teachers’ CPD is to provide accredited learning programmes. There has been some debate on whether teachers’ CPD should be accredited and this was highlighted in the TDA summary of consultation (2008) which pointed towards universities having a more prominent role in supporting teachers’ CPD, in particular in terms of accrediting training and in supporting development in schools. Teachers who complete CPD that leads to an award feel that they have gained
new and specific skills (Soulsby and Swain 2003), whereas non-accredited programmes are viewed by some teachers as pointless and time wasting (Coldron and Smith 1999).

But I wondered whether the motivation for teachers who do engage in CPD is purely to achieve an award rather than to enhance and improve their knowledge and skills. In the study carried out by Arthur et al (2006: 214) it was found that accreditation seems to provide a quality mark for teachers undertaking those courses. However, the same study found that there is need to research the area of teachers withdrawing from accredited CPD in order that a clearer understanding of the issues can be identified. It is hoped that the findings of my research will go some way to respond to this.

2.5 Local Authorities

The role that local authorities play in teachers` CPD has also been affected by changes to national policy. The white paper *Higher Standards, better schools for all* (DfES 2005: 103) set out new roles for local authorities, and identified that the Government would ensure that, “the local authority becomes a powerful champion of parents and pupils in their area, commissioning rather than providing education” (DfES 2005). But the white paper failed to assert on the role of the responsibilities of the authorities in terms of teachers` CPD. If schools are to become the resource centre for teachers` CPD (TDA 2007) and head teachers given the role of managing this resource. And if teachers are to be accountable for their professional development it becomes difficult to identify any significant role in the future of teachers` CPD for local authorities. So the idea in 2004 – 2005 that local
authorities would facilitate and reward CPD has been turned on its head by successive policy changes.

The 2010 white paper continued the theme of local authorities having less involvement in teacher funding and states that, “Local authorities will be free to define how they will support school improvement but will no longer be required to set local authority targets” (DfE 2010: 77).

That local authorities were no longer constrained to follow a national strategy in terms of school improvement, suggested the possibility of each local authority determining its own set of priorities which may or may not include teachers’ CPD. This liberation provided the foundations for a disparate model of teachers’ CPD when viewed from a national perspective. Local authorities were involved in the funding and development of teachers’ CPD at the beginning of my research, but as the research spanned the change of Government, the authorities’ role changed resulting in a diminished role. One of the things I wanted to find out was what impact teachers felt of the local authority involvement and whether the diminishing role of the local authorities was significant to how they engaged in CPD.

That universities and local authorities are significant stakeholders in teachers’ CPD as it gathers political momentum (Campbell 2011), suggests that changes to each of the organisations roles will have some impact on the teachers themselves, in particular as the involvement of the university and local authority has a positive impact on teachers successfully completing a CPD award (Arthur et al 2006). The model of involvement of
the local authority and the university provided a professional context to teachers’ CPD in
the mutual appreciation of professional standards. However, definitions and comparisons
of what it is to be a professional and what professionalism is attract much discussion and
debate, much of which seeks to link professionalism with development and up-skilling
(Mahony and Hextall 2000).

2.6 The ‘professional’ in professional development.

The white paper: Higher standards better schools for all (DFES 2005: 95) identifies a need
for, “high quality teachers, with access to better professional development.” The paper
argues the need for a “new professionalism” in the school workforce. However, it does
not offer any detail of what better professional development, or a new professionalism
might look like which is unhelpful given that Jackson (2006) found the idea of
professionalism as set out in policy documentation does not easily transfer to the
teacher. This may be due to the notion of a new professionalism being seen as a
smokescreen for challenges to the autonomy of the teacher and a lack of emphasis on
their CPD needs (Hargreaves 2000). So it would be useful to try to tease out if the notion
of being a “professional” comes to mind when teachers themselves consider CPD.

From 1979 to 1997 there were significant changes to the way in which teacher
professionalism was conceptualised (Whitty 2002). During this time, there was
dissatisfaction at Government level with the quality of teaching within schools which led
to changes to initial teacher training and in teacher development. From 1997 the Labour
Government sought to rebrand the teaching profession as it grew concerned at the recruitment and retention of teachers. This rebranding or new professionalism attracted interest from other authors, for example, Mahony and Hextall (2000) argued that teaching needed to undergo a process of modernisation if a new professionalism was to be realised and this modernisation was to be underpinned by a framework for continuing professional development. Similarly Gray and Denley (2005: 10) asserted that a, “renewed professionalism” is reliant on teachers having better access to co-ordinated professional development. But it is not clear what role CPD has in this process not what part the teachers’ play.

The training and development agency reported that one of their overarching principles for developing a “new teacher professionalism” is that all teachers should have a, “contractual entitlement to effective, sustained and relevant professional development” for the entirety of their career (TDA 2006: 16). But it does not give any indication what effective sustained and relevant professional development might be. That this is open to interpretation creates the potential for teachers’ CPD to lack clarity.

2.7 Status

Several Government policy documents refer to the professional status of teachers. (DCSF 2008, DfES 2005, DfE 2010). The Government has pledged to, “raise the status of teachers” (DfE 2010: 10) which would indicate that the status was somehow not high enough. Yet there is no indication if CPD is featured in this development. The Government
goes on to assert that, “we still have some way to go before the status of teaching here matches the status in the highest performing countries: some 43% of teachers here rate the status of teaching as low” (DfE 2010: 19). But there is no qualitative element to this, so we do not know why the teachers rate the status as such and if CPD is implicated from their point of view.

2.8 Summary

This chapter has reviewed policy links between CPD and a new or renewed professionalism and status. It has illuminated the contested notions of professionalism and it has outlined how Government edict is placing head teachers in positions of influence and power over teachers’ CPD. It has also offered some indications of how national policy has the potential to influence teachers’ approach to CPD, which is at the core of what this research aims to seek out.

What is less clear in the policy documents is what teachers themselves feel and if they perceive a link between professional status and CPD or if they interpret a power dynamic. Emerging from this discussion is a sense that there is some inconsistency between the policy makers’ standpoint and that of the teachers. Inequitable provision of teachers’ CPD has been created by changes to training structures which have led to the, “haphazard development of CPD provision” for teachers in the U.K. (Gray and Denley 2005: 2). The
following chapter will discuss the notion of teacher professionalism within a framework of professional knowledge and identity constructed in a context of power-play.
Chapter 3:

Power, identity and professional knowledge

3.1 Introduction

This chapter begins by exploring ways in which teachers are considered to develop their professional knowledge. It leads on to examine what constitutes being a professional and from this looks at what influences professionalism and professional identity. In examining some of the components involved when identity is created, this chapter illuminates how power and power relations create opportunities for dominant practices around the CPD agenda.

3.2 How teachers develop their knowledge.

What we are told about CPD is that it is a benefit to the individual teacher and the school in that it; enhances individual performance, rectifies ineffective practice, establishes the groundwork for the implementation of policy and facilitates change (Blandford 2000: 4). That my research is concerned with CPD as a professional development process and pedagogy, the ways in which teachers actually develop their knowledge is pertinent to the context of this research.
Teachers develop their professional knowledge by reflecting on personal and formal circumstances and events (Widen et al 1996). They learn best when they interact with their professional peers, “in questioning ineffective teaching routines, examining new concepts of teaching and learning, finding generative means to acknowledge and respond to difference and conflict, and engaging actively in supporting professional growth” (Little 2002: 714). This learning is aided and supported by the development within the school of a culture of life-long learning (Day 1999). By way of identifying an appropriate starting point to discuss the concept of reflective, life-long learning in the workplace, the works of Stenhouse, Habermas, and Schön, each of whom considered the notion of experiential learning are considered.

Stenhouse (1975) advocated a model where practitioners investigate their own professional practice in order for this to inform innovation and change that leads to improvement. Teachers do this by means of developing communities of professional learning who’s research site is their own classroom. His view was that the teachers’ own classroom also provides a valuable site for the development of research opportunities (Stenhouse 1981). It is through participating in research and professional enquiry that provides stimulating and engaging improvement opportunities for teachers (Campbell 2011). But caution is needed when considering the implications of and for teachers-as-researchers, as there is the tendency for the practical and personal knowledge to be the focus of teachers’ research and this is at the expense of conceptual and theoretical underpinnings (Goodson 2003).
That teachers’ learning in situ may involve research to some degree normally requires an element of reflection on the situations experienced by the teacher (Grimmett 1995). The debate on experiential and reflective learning has been addressed by Schön (1987: 17) who argued for a reflective essence to learning, as the learner cannot be taught knowledge, but rather has to, “see on their own behalf and in their own way, the relations between means and methods employed and the results that they achieve.” But the caveat for this model to achieve success is that schools in which this learning is situated must put the development of staff as a high priority (Schön 1987: 171).

Of particular significance for my research is the notion exemplified by Habermas, that reflection is a process that can drive empowerment and emancipation (Morrison 1995). For Habermas, a reflective theory is a critical theory that gives those who adapt its use the knowledge to support and drive emancipatory practice (Geuss 1981). “Emancipatory interests rely on the development of knowledge via critical or evaluative modes of thought and enquiry so as to understand the self, the human condition and the self in the human context, the acquisition of such knowledge is aimed at producing a transformation in the self, or in the personal, social or world situation or any combination of these” (Moon 1999: 14). For teachers this provides the opportunity to act as agents for change and improvement, both for themselves and for the school. This model also offers the teachers the potential to use their acquired knowledge to question managerial practices and process. But teachers’ learning in school is challenged when staff development activities are perceived as a process that has to be undertaken rather than an opportunity to develop knowledge and expertise (Campbell 2011). This lack of engagement in the
opportunity to extend and expand on knowledge can be countered when teachers place themselves at the centre of action research and enquiry (Campbell et al 2004).

Considering these different notions of how teachers learn, helps to provide a meaningful lens through which to analyse the discourse of continuing professional development. However CPD is not regarded as a benefit in all cases. It does little more than inform teachers of Government edict and policy (Whitty 1999) and it is only in places where structures to support work place learning are established, and where organisational partnerships (i.e with local authorities and universities) are in place, that CPD attracts some sort of priority (Campbell et al 2004).

3.3 What does being a ‘professional’ mean to teachers today?

Being a ‘professional’ seems to have something to do with practicing within an official frame of standards, vetting and regulation (Mahoney and Hextall 2000), and complying with professional standards, adhering to a professional code of conduct and being a member of a professional body, provide a context within which the teacher is a central figure (Blandford 2000). But, “what it means to be a professional, to show professionalism or to pursue professionalization is not universally agreed or understood” (Hargreaves and Goodson 1996: 4). Despite uncertainty about the concept of professionalism there has been debate around the definition of professionalism and of what it means to be a professional.
The way in which teaching has responded to the changes in organisational structure and to the shifts in political and socio-economic contexts has led to a redefinition and reprofessionalisation of teaching (Mahony and Hextall 2000). A further distinction has been drawn between the “old professionalism” and what it means to be a “new professional in that the “old professional” teacher is traditionally a professional through the experiences of being a teacher, whereas the “new professional” teacher is so through accountability and managerialism (Clarke and Newman 1997). The task of redefining both the activity of teaching and the structural relationships between teachers has been carried out under the auspices of “the discourse of professionalism” (Mahony and Hextall 2000: 82). This reconstruction of teacher professionalism has forced a change to the continuing professional development agenda for teachers (Forde et al 2006), which provides a focus for my research.

However, there is some doubt regarding how the professionalization of teaching is shaping the discourse within which teachers see themselves, “reforms concerning devolution and marketization have given rise to a set of paradoxes about the nature of teaching as a profession...there is evidence that teachers are being deskillled and their work is intensified” (Sachs 2001:150). The discourse is said to, “operate as an occupational strategy, defining entry, and negotiating the power and rewards due to expertise, and as an organisational strategy, shaping the patterns of power, place and relationship around which organisations are co-ordinated” (Clarke and Newman 1997: 7). However, discourse also offers specific types of subject position and identity through which actors come to locate themselves in their relationships. Professional identity thus
is a set of attributes that are imposed upon the teaching profession either by outsiders or by the teaching establishment itself (Sachs 2001).

Teachers’ professional identity as distinct from professionalism has been widely debated. For example, Ball and Goodson (1985) argued that changes and innovations within school can create threats to the identities of teachers within the school. Whilst Coldron and Smith (1999) assert that the teachers’ identity is formed by the way the teacher situates themselves within the school and within society. It has also been argued that, “teachers’ professional identity is negotiated in the course of the individuals’ biography and is influenced by future prospects” (Beijaad et al 2004: 752). But when continuous change, restructuring and uncertainty are experienced, teachers’ professional identities emerge from retrospective and prospective identities (Bernstein 1996). Retrospective identities being formed from past experiences and prospective identities are informed by engagement with social and political activities which promote the development of future and new potential.

The arena of professional identity is also influenced significantly by national policy, for example, Maclure (2001) has asserted that teaching has experienced a series of professional identity crises. She proposes that these crises have been driven by the profession being subject to directives such as the national curriculum, performance management and target setting. But directives such as these are a continual part of the teachers’ professional life, so I wonder if teaching could experience something of an on-
going professional identity crisis. Robinson et al (2005) argued that professional identities are reconstructed when the status of the profession is questioned, so I wonder whether CPD features as means of supporting teachers through any reconstruction of identity, in particular, as Coldron and Smith (1999: 714) assert that, “part of the experience of teaching is continually constructing a sustainable identity as a teacher.”

The self-directed and autonomous days for the teacher are over as the emphasis for teachers now is more to do with compliance with standards and hierarchical agendas (Goodson 2003). The “commercialisation of education and the advent of a new managerialism” has led to teachers’ experiencing a loss of autonomy which has resulted in teachers’ identities being confused (Hargreaves 1994: 24). The loss of autonomy in teaching has also been highlighted by Campbell et al (2004: 29) who argue that the image of the teacher now involves, “a culture of audit and excessive accountability” to the extent that some commentators (Whitty 1999; Power 1997) describe teaching as an audit driven system. So the argument by Gray and Denley (2005) that teachers’ CPD is effective in delivering Government edicts would serve to support this notion of teachers’ identity and image. But it is not clear if the teachers’ themselves recognise any change to their identity, or if they share the view of Forde et al (2006) that engaging in CPD can bring about a change of identity for teachers. The caveat to this view is that this identity could be challenged when teachers choose not to take part in CPD programmes. But there is no sense of the underlying reasons for why some teachers engage in CPD and why other teachers decide not to take part.
3.4 Power relations

Having explained how the discourse of teacher professionalization offers teachers a particular position and identity, that identity is also influenced by how they interact within different power relations (Clarke and Newman 1997). The view that identity is influenced by the, “open ended power-laden enactment” of everyday situations (Kondo 1990: 24), offers some significance for my research, in seeking out the workings of power relations impact on how teachers’ see themselves and how they conjure their identities. There is a view that we should be more questioning about these aspects, as different groups struggle and grapple to ensure that their particular “bias and focus” is that which dominates the reform. Thus the “bias and focus of this discourse are expected to construct teachers’...moral disposition, motivation and aspirations”(Bernstein 2000: 65).

Bernstein refers to struggles in the attempt to dominate the agenda between different groups. In drawing on the policy discussion in the previous chapter there seems to be situations and relationships within the discourse of teachers’ CPD that are reflected in this struggle for the dominant voice to be heard. Wallace and Hall (1997: 94) found that head teachers use their access to power in employing, “overt and covert strategies” in controlling staff in the management of schools. It is not clear if teachers are aware of this controlling mechanism or if they react in response to these strategies. Given that Head teachers are now accountable for teachers’ CPD, I need to tease out if head teachers exert any level of control over teachers in their engagement with CPD, and how the Head teachers’ actions are perceived by the teachers.
Social theory can also offer some explanation to support the understanding of how power and power relations underpin the discourse of teachers’ CPD. In attempting to identify and explore the workings of power on the teachers perceptions of CPD, I am drawing on the works of Foucault to provide a theoretical lens through which teachers’ perceptions of what influences their CPD can be examined. Foucault would argue that discourses themselves are expressions of power relations (Layder 2006: 118) and the employment of a discourse is dependent on the control of knowledge regarding a particular area within the context of the discourse. For Foucault, “the subject is not free but is hedged in on all sides by social determinations” (Scott 2007: 85). But power is not fixed within a particular area. Foucault determined that it is not an exclusive entity but rather that it has a fluidity that enables other actors to embrace its action. According to Foucault, power and knowledge are inextricably linked, those who hold power control knowledge. Power for Foucault was not necessarily a negative process, as it could be the means by which those previously subjected to control could themselves assume power and become liberated in controlling their own destiny. Could embracing a more powerful position therefore support a model of emancipation and empowerment for the teachers in my research? This would also chime with the theory proposed by Habermas in terms of teachers using professional development and learning to increase their opportunities of enlightenment and empowerment.

The ways in which power is created, controlled and distributed is something which Foucault exemplifies in two studies (Madness and Civilisation 1965 and Discipline and Punish 1977). Those who have power in any area of human activity have the capacity to
define and control knowledge in their area of control and so subject others to their rule... there is no power relation without a correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations (Foucault 1972). For Foucault then, power is used to control people by controlling the knowledge they are exposed to through discursive practises.

The notion of whose ideas dominate and how consent is obtained and maintained by those in power is reflected in the process of hegemony, which Antonio Gramsci defined as an ideological rule, a process whereby those in power gained consent from the subaltern in the dominance of ideas (Gramsci cited in Slattery 2003). In determining the national agenda for teachers’ CPD, notions of how teachers learn and develop best have been lauded by successive Governments and local authorities and subsequently written into the political agenda for teachers’ CPD (Campbell 2011). There has been an expectation from these Governments that teachers, head teachers, and universities will consent to engage in this agenda. Similarly, and at a more local level, local authorities, universities and head teachers have been, and are, in positions which offer the opportunity to dominate the agenda and control knowledge within the CPD discourse. This offers an opportunity for my research in finding out if hegemonic practices are displayed by those in power and if so, to identify if counter-hegemonic practice is executed by teachers.

The concept of hegemony is illuminated by the way in which the CPD agenda can be dominated to appear to the teachers that a specific theme of CPD is the ‘norm’ and the only option, and that their consent is expected as result of their position as a teacher.
3.5 Summary:

In drawing on the policy discussion from the previous chapter, this chapter has discussed how the workings of power has the potential to influence the construction of identity and how this is then adopted by teachers, in particular when considering CPD. The works of Bernstein, Foucault and Gramsci have informed the theoretical discussion in which the notions of identity power and hegemony have been debated. From the discussions within this chapter, there is a notion that power, identity and professionalism inter-relate in the creation of some influence on teachers’ CPD. But the degree to which this is felt by the teachers’ themselves is still not clear.
Chapter 4:

Methodology and collecting the data

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines how I went about answering the research questions. It also provides a series of thumbnail sketches of my sources, including the individuals I interviewed, with sufficient demographic detail to be able to identify the different voices that I draw on in subsequent chapters which is a technique commonly used in ethnographic research that draws on a small number of key voices. Sources and the different methods of data collection are discussed and reasons given for focusing on certain methods over others. There is also a discussion of approaches taken to analyse the data.

This research has used a qualitative approach including some ethnographic methods to obtain the empirical data. The rationale for using this approach emanated from the need to capture teachers’ opinions, views and feelings. It was this rationale that steered me away from using a quantitative approach. Also, I wanted to exploit my position in having good access to teachers, head teachers and local authority representatives within their natural work settings. It is seemed appropriate to use this level of access, and the daily contact and interaction I had with teachers to collect data on their opinions and thoughts.
I could also observe how the teachers interacted together and with head teachers and local authority representatives in relation to their CPD.

4.2 Interpretive Research

I applied an interpretive research paradigm, consistent with my focus on issues of significance. The ascription of priority and value, influence, impact and implications for practice and decisions also support the use of this paradigm (Cohen et al 2000). There is a significant distinction between positivistic and interpretive research in that positivism sees research as value free and objective, and aims at manipulation of the external world (Cohen et al 2000), where an, “interpretive paradigm strives to interpret the world in terms of its actors, where meanings and interpretations are paramount” (Cohen et al 2000: 28).

In using an interpretive paradigm, my research acknowledges some elements of a critical research approach in addressing some of the political and ideological contexts of educational research (Cohen et al 2000), and in aiming to illuminate opportunities for emancipation and enlightenment, which if embraced could enable actors to identify hidden coercion and free them from any restrictions that prevent them from determining where their interests lie (Geuss 1981).

The interpretive paradigm is concerned with the behaviour of the individual. This anti-positivist stance aims to understand how people interpret the world around them. Rather
than testing a theory or hypothesis, or having concern for, “discovering universal laws of
society and human conduct with it” (Cohen et al 2000: 9) as positivistic research does, the
interpretive researcher is concerned with the subjective meanings that individuals place
on the actions they take. So this is a useful paradigm for my research as I am interested in
finding out what teachers think about their development and what (and how) other
issues influence them. However, this approach is not without its detractors, in advocating
a critical stance, Habermas (1984: 109) was dismissive of an interpretive stance, he
referred to it as being a “double hermeneutic” where the researcher strives to interpret
an already interpreted phenomena.

One of the main tenets of critical research rests on the assumption that teachers can;

Transform themselves, overcome technical rationality, grow in awareness of both
the overt and the hidden curriculum and encourage reflective practice, self-efficacy
and self confirmation through collective action and social transformation. This
discourse reflects a political vision toward teacher emancipation...common among
this is the belief that teachers must acquire the knowledge, skills and power to
transform the existing social order both individually and collectively (Garman 1995:
31).

So although I am concerned with the subjective interpretations of the teachers in my
research, I also acknowledged the potential that policy and power has on domineering
the teachers’ engagement. Therefore my research used an interpretive paradigm that
was informed by a critical research approach.
4.3 Critical Research

By adopting a critical approach, I explored and challenged the notions of who benefits when teachers engage in CPD. I also sought to identify tensions and challenges (Alvesson and Deetz 2000) and to ascertain if situations regarding CPD are distorted through perceptions of identity and status or power imbalances. In offering an explanation of this approach, Whitley (1999) argued that by taking a critical standpoint, the researcher is critiquing the issue of fairness, whilst Alvesson and Deetz (2000: 8) assert that a critical approach offers the opportunity to explore how certain discourses can, “constrain human autonomy and decision making.”

Using a critical approach allowed me to view the data through a critically reflective eye. So rather than presenting a descriptive story, I took into account other issues central to the lives of teachers. That a critical approach seeks to, “provide an interpretation of social conditions and uncovers ideological distortions” (Moon 1983: 175) offered the opportunity to uncover some of the hidden conditions that influence teachers CPD, that may have gone unrecognised and unreported, and in challenging that which is established traditional or familiar, a critical standpoint can facilitate emancipatory practice (Alvesson and Deetz 2000). If knowledge production is an active process specific to individuals (Cohen et al 2000), then teachers’ own experiences, beliefs and contexts will influence what they determine as knowledge and how they participate in its production and legitimization (Silverman 2000).
These research paradigms discussed above represent different ways of viewing social reality and are concerned with the ways in which this reality is interpreted by researchers. But there are implicit and explicit assumptions that impact on the ways in which researchers interpret social science (Burrell and Morgan 1979).

Epistemology is concerned with how knowledge is acquired and communicated to others (Cohen et al 2000), of whether it is something that is hard that can be engaged with in a tangible manner, or if it is something that is softer that can be acquired through more subjective, spiritual or transcendental means (Burrell and Morgan 1979). Understanding epistemology, helps to answer the question; how do I know what is true? (Cohen et al 2000) as well as helping in the development of an approach to looking at how individuals understand the world around them.

Ontology is concerned with the nature of being and the interaction between social structures and individuals. Bryman (2001) distinguishes between two main ontological positions: objectivism and constructionism thus; Objectivism in general asserts that, “social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social actors” (Bryman, 2001:17) so structures within the social world are objective entities not influenced by humans or other social forces and as such is closely linked to positivism. In contrast, constructionists believe that people have an active role in constructing social reality and social structures, and these social phenomena are in a constant state of flux as people and their society changes (Bryman, 2001: 17-18). This constructionist approach aims to understand the meaning attributed to social entities by people. However, it is
problematic to try to set these two paradigms as polar opposites as a clear dichotomy rarely exists in practice and much research combines elements of both approaches (Silverman 2001).

My research takes some of the attributes from a constructionist approach in believing that human beings are able to, and do influence the social world, and that situations within society can be socially constructed e.g. the notion of emancipation, enlightenment and empowerment is created by society and the people within it. But contrastingly, the discourse of teachers’ CPD is influenced by processes and people, and by changes in the socio-political society. In drawing on a Foucauldian perspective, my research respondents are active participants within the discourse of education, a discourse that is bound by a knowledge and language and driven by the authority of the powerful within this discourse.

The interpretivist and critical research paradigm I have adopted here draws on my belief that the social world, and the study of it, differs from the natural world in that I do not believe there to be one single, objective truth that can be identified and explained. My belief is that opportunities for emancipation and empowerment can be promoted within the social world through considering the social world as consisting of complex human behaviours within changing contexts and situations. My view is that this can be brought about through a variety of methods that aim to understand the structure of the social world and the organisations, institutions and human relationships within it.
The paradigm that is formed from the epistemological, ontological and methodological approach of the researcher will influence both the research questions and the way in which the data are interpreted (Guba 1990). It will also shape the way in which the data are collected.

4.4 Validity and Reliability

If a piece of research is invalid or unreliable, then it is worthless (Cohen et al 2000). For interpretive and critical researchers, validity and reliability are essential to the integrity and value of research.

Triangulation is an effective way of demonstrating validity and reliability in qualitative research (Campbell and Fiske cited in Cohen et al 2000: 113). The assumption is that by looking at phenomena from different aspects, a deeper level of understanding of the phenomena can be gained (Denzin 1978). In using the combined methods of participant observation, interviews and focus groups my research was able to re-examine certain and specific areas, and also to cross reference previous diary entries and field notes. That I adopted a method of triangulation, aided mitigation against any misrepresentation or misinterpretation of meaning through language.

Validity is concerned with honesty, the scope of the data, the sample, the extent of triangulation and the researcher objectivity and should be seen as a matter of degree.
rather than as an absolute (Gronlund 1981). It is also concerned with accuracy and the extent to which the methods of obtaining data can provide a correct answer (Denzin and Lincoln 2008). There are many types of validity but it is necessary to discuss those elements that are located within the paradigm within which the particular research falls (Cohen et al 2000), therefore my research focuses on those aspects of validity that are significant for interpretive and critical approaches.

Qualitative researchers need to guard against following the positivist agenda when considering validity, for example, in not needing to argue the need for their research to demonstrate, “concurrency, predictability, convergence and criterion related internal and external validity” (Maxwell 1992: 107). It has been argued that the intensity of the nature of the relationship between the qualitative researcher and the individuals being studied secures a sufficient level of validity in itself (Agar 1993), but this has been contested as insufficient grounds for validity as researchers cannot be deemed to have a privileged position on interpretation, but instead, “validity in qualitative research is a representation of reality rather than a reproduction of it” (Hammersley 1992: 107).

But Maxwell (1992) offers the notion that validity in qualitative enquiry is achievable by drawing on;

i)  **Descriptive Validity** – which can be explained as the factual accuracy of what the researcher sees and of any notes made. In acknowledging the subjectivities of teachers views, I recorded my observations and conversations in an objective manner, noting exactly what I saw and heard.
ii) **Interpretive Validity** – is the capture of meaning and interpretations that events and situations have for the participants in their own terms. I recorded the teachers’ own interpretations, of how situations and events were translated by them, and the meaning they made of these.

iii) **Theoretical Validity** – the researcher will bring to the research some degree of theoretical construction or explanation. The backdrop to my research is made up of policy, professionalization, identity and power. It is against this that I carried out the empirical data collection.

iv) **Generalizability** – The notion that the theory generated from the research may be useful in helping to understand other situations and phenomena.

v) **Evaluative Validity** – the use of an evaluative model with which to evaluate the research. This resonates with my research in particular as I used a critical lens.

Reliability is concerned with ensuring the research is consistent, precise and accurate and replicable (Cohen et al 2000), it is the, “degree to which the findings are independent of accidental circumstances” (Kirk and Miller 1986: 69). Reliability through replicability can be seen as; stability of observation i.e. if the researcher would have arrived at the same observations had these been conducted at a different place and time, parallel forms i.e whether the researcher would have made the same observations had other phenomena been taken into account when interpreting the observation and inter-rater reliability i.e. if another researcher working within the same theoretical framework and observing the same phenomena would arrive at the same interpretations (Denzin and Lincoln 1994).
However, these articulations are not without contention, Bogden and Biklen (1992: 48) argue that reliability for quantitative methodology is neither appropriate nor relevant for qualitative methodology, they assert that reliability, “can be regarded as a fit between what researchers record as data and what actually occurs in the natural setting that is being researched.” But given that the “objectivity and credibility” (Kirk and Miller 1986:11) of social research is threatened when reliability is neglected, it is necessary to consider how it can be assured in my research.

For qualitative research the reliability of research results is about the researcher coming up with the same findings if they were to carry out similar studies on another occasion (Kirk and Miller 1986). It is also about assuring the quality of field notes (Silverman 2001) and recordings of conversations and observations are the objective record of what has been said rather than an interpretation (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983). For my research, this led to the application of consistency checks by examining and comparing field notes with other observations and previous diary entries. I also used a method of triangulation i.e. using several data collection methods to compare results (Glazier 1992: 211).

4.5 Qualitative approach

A qualitative enquiry typically, and taken in a general sense is a, “situated activity that locates the observer in the world” (Denzin and Lincoln 2008: 4). I was able to observe teachers in their own professional space, my presence was not something unusual to them and I was able to capture numerous conversations, discussions and debates
naturally and without the falseness or artificial nature of setting up interview situations or question and answer scenarios.

Participating in the daily lives of teachers enabled me to watch and observe their reactions to situations and discussions. For example, within a group situation there were only one or two teachers who voiced their opinion, but several others nodded in agreement or express agreement or disagreement by means of facial expressions or other non-verbal expression. Capturing these events was challenging yet informative to the study.

I had very good access to local authority representatives, head teachers and teachers. I worked alongside local authority advisers and curriculum specialists. I also worked in schools with head teachers and groups of teachers and with head teachers, deputy heads and teachers in the university environment. That I had a good level of uninterrupted access to the groups I wanted to investigate over an extended period of time supported the choice of observation as a method. Hammersley (1992: 11) offered a more generic rationale by suggesting that, “to rely on what people say about what they believe and do, without also observing what they do, is to neglect the complex relationship between attitudes and behaviour.”

I wanted to delve deeper and try to ‘get under the skin’ of the teachers and the phenomena that I was studying. I wanted to exploit the privileged position of being able
to work closely with my respondents over a long period of time and I wanted my research to benefit from this position.

In support and justification of the use of a qualitative approach, I would argue that, as quantitative research is dismissive of the rich and detailed descriptions of the social world (Denzin and Lincoln 2008), my research questions are best addressed by an approach that allows for the clarification of the social, cultural and structural contexts associated with organisational dilemmas (Miller et al 1997). The flexible and iterative nature of a qualitative approach also allowed me to consider unexpected and unanticipated situations that arose during the course of the research (Denzin and Lincoln 2008).

This fits with Silverman’s (1997) definition of qualitative research. He describes the core elements of a qualitative approach as being seen through the eyes of the participants in their context and in being flexible. This was achieved in my research by my participation in the teachers’ own professional milieu and in interviewing them both individually and in group scenarios.

Qualitative research is concerned with how events or patterns develop over time which is in contrast to a quantitative approach, and specifically a naturalistic approach which, in general records a situation at one point in time. But this approach is not without challenges. The way in which data was collected and interpreted was subjective and informed by my own epistemology. My subjectivity influenced my interpretation of the
accounts and underpinned the final written work. In drawing on the critical approach and in being reflexive, by demonstrating full and uncompromising self-reference (Davies 2008), I acknowledged the potential of researcher bias and contamination of data. I also recognised that the many actors in my research had different and diverse ontologies and epistemologies of their own. Each of which led to a diversity of responses to my study.

Qualitative enquiry is not without its shortcomings, Giddens (1976) argues that the qualitative researcher can only claim a detailed knowledge of that part of the social world within which they participate. But I would argue that this is could also be seen as a benefit, that the qualitative researcher can therefore focus and specialise in a particular sphere of social research. Bernstein (1974), on the other hand, asserts that there are dangers implicit in the use of language and verbal accounts to claim meaning of events. I am mindful therefore that different meanings could be presented and interpreted in different ways through the ways in which they are explained.

4.6 Data Sources

The principal research aim, of seeking to explore what influenced teachers’ approach to their CPD, led to a choice of specific data sources and tools for collection of these data that would help illuminate the current positions (politically and professionally) of the discourse of teachers’ CPD. In order to choose the most effective data production
methods, a range of potential methods were considered and their appropriateness to this research is discussed below.

The qualitative researcher uses several methods of data collection when gathering empirical data, but often uses participant observation, interviewing and document analysis (Denzin and Lincoln 2008). Other methods were considered for my research, for example I considered using questionnaires to gain some insight into teachers’ level of engagement, as they are widely used and capable of being administered without the need of my presence as the researcher and they are often quite straightforward to analyse (Wilson and McClean 1994 and cited in Cohen et al 2000). But they are constrained by the lack of flexibility of response and therefore limit the scope of data. My research needed to be able to consider new and emergent concepts as they arose, for example in response to policy or school improvement measures, I therefore considered that questionnaires were too limiting. A questionnaire survey carried out by Arthur et al (2006) into teachers’ motivations for CPD received 45% response. I wanted to try to achieve a higher response rate to the issue of teacher CPD, in particular as Evans (2002) argued that the issue of teachers’ CPD needs further investigation. Similarly, I feel that as a survey is likely to generate more context free data (Cohen et al 2000), I am less likely to obtain data that is pertinent to the issue being studied.

Similarly, I decided against using a case study approach as case study research is not easily open to cross checking (Nisbet and Watts 1984) and neither can in take into
account the political fluidity over a period of time, something to which my research was particularly sensitive.

The methods chosen to support the collection of data for my research were; direct and participant observation, semi-structured interviews and focus groups, each of which are discussed in more detail in the following section.

4.7 Participant Observation

Participant observation was the method by which most of my data were collected via field notes which were maintained alongside a research diary. Angrosino (2008) asserted that participation observation relies on significant rapport over an extended period of time between the researcher and the community in which the research is being conducted. Observation can be a powerful tool for the researcher, it is useful in that it can give direct access and insight into complex social interactions and be used to address a variety of types of research questions Moyles (2002). “The hallmark of participant observation is being able to participate in the lives of the research respondents to the extent that the researcher comes to understand the culture as an insider” Davies (2008:81). For critical researchers, using ethnographic methods such as participatory observations can have significant benefit in that the researcher can employ a critical lens through which to view the phenomenon as they collect the data (Thomas 1993).

But caution is necessary as insider research can create a familiarity of events and situations that render new or different incidents difficult to see (Campbell et al 2004).
It is feared by some that the judgement of the observer may be influenced by their close involvement in the sample group and therefore impact on the validity of the research (Cohen et al 2000). To counteract this Denzin and Lincoln (1994) suggest that triangulation of data sources and methodologies is employed. As I discussed earlier, I triangulated observation methods with interviews, focus groups and policy and literature analysis. In further mitigation of this, Gold (1997) argues that it is possible and preferable to use a standardised procedure to maximise observational efficacy whilst at the same time, minimise researcher bias. In acknowledgement of this, I used the research questions to provide a framework for my field notes and research diary notes.

4.8 Research Diary

Research diaries can be an effective procedural tool for educational researchers, the use of a research diary can be used to include some early interpretive accounts alongside thick descriptive data (Morrison 2002). In support of this, Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that research diaries have the potential to contain so much data the researcher should begin to interpret this during the course of the research, rather than allowing data to accumulate without any interpretation. By following these suggestions, I was able to identify quite early on any emerging issues that could benefit the research.

I ensured that my research diary was consulted on a regular basis in order to provide the opportunity for some interpretation of the data that was recorded in the diary. Some of these interpretations were used to provide a framework for future discussions with
respondents in which case they were recorded as such. Alternatively, they were used to influence which meetings or conferences I attended in order to gather more data, in which case diary entries were made to that effect.

A research diary was used throughout my research as it was felt that maintaining such a document would assist in the organisation of data in particular as this research was concerned with gathering data ad hoc from observations of different scenarios and often at short notice. The diary was also used in order to provide a data management resource. For example, to provide dates and times of meetings attended etc. The diary therefore contained dates of meetings, conferences and situations where respondents were likely to be and also school CPD events at which head teachers and teachers were in attendance discussing issues regarding teachers’ CPD. The notes contained within the diary were also used to cross reference data from interviews and other observations, thereby providing a resource for triangulation.

The use of the research diary in this respect differs from how Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) report the use of diaries. They report the use of research diaries to be concerned with the researcher using information from the diaries of participants as data. Furthermore, they advocate that research diaries can be useful in terms of being able to record personal and private information. I would agree with this but would argue that all research data should be treated as personal and private, particularly as on this occasion, I
had tried to establish a trust with participants in collecting data and in guaranteeing anonymity and privacy.

During many of the observations, notes were taken regarding the non-verbal as well as the verbal conversations and interactions that took place. This was most evident during a conference or meeting, where the person speaking demonstrated a particular view, yet many of the other delegates demonstrated their opposition to this view non verbally. This would not have been detected on a voice recorder, yet is pertinent to this study.

4.9 Transcribing observation data

The observation data were transcribed and initially an open coding system used, where categories and sub categories were developed to organise the data. For example, the category of professionalism had as the sub categories, identity, status, generational issues, threat and risk. Strauss and Corbin (1998: 102) assert that, “we must open up the text and expose the thoughts, ideas and meanings contained therein.” They argue that failing to carry out an open coding process would prohibit the necessary analysis and communication.

Transcribing data is a critical step as it is the point at which data can be lost or distorted. It is unrealistic to suppose that transcribed data is anything other than already interpreted data, as much of the transcript is a representation of the translation of the
original data (Cohen et al 2000). In order to limit either damaging or misrepresenting the data, these issues were considered prior to carrying out the empirical collection of my data. All the transcriptions were carried out by myself which, although time consuming, helped to limit the opportunity for misinterpretation and misrepresentation via a third party and also helped to prevent contamination from other influences. A selection of transcripts are included in appendix 1.

Diary data was not copied from the diary in a word for word account as was the case in the transcriptions from the observations and interviews. The way in which the data were recorded in the diary initially contained all the narrative to hand at the time and therefore this would have led to a repetition of tasks. The diary data was used alongside the other transcribed data to support the interpretations and also in providing a means of triangulation.

### 4.10 Ethical considerations of participant observation

Consideration was given to confidentiality and data management throughout this research. Campbell et al (2004: 172) articulate that these areas can be challenging, but they argue that, “the situation is always subject to local individual agreements.” So although I used the BERA guidelines as a framework, I was also mindful that there was the potential to employ more specific agreements as required. When visiting schools and other educational settings, I ensured that the head teachers and /or managers were
aware of the research and offered the opportunity for any organisational requirements to be considered.

Other ethical considerations revolve around informed consent and researcher power and values (Cohen et al 2000). But problems affecting these areas can be mitigated by the researcher forming rapports with the respondents that fosters confidence and trust (Hitchcock and Hughes 1989). I attempted to do this by obtaining informed consent wherever possible. Where this was not possible, for example at conferences and large meetings, I made every attempt to inform the group that I was conducting a research study and gave the opportunity for people to inform me if they wished their views not to be taken as research data. That this research has taken place over several years enabled me to build relationships with head teachers and teachers. In demonstrating transparency and confidentiality, I have endeavoured to enable relationships of trust and confidence to develop.

In order to ensure that all data contained within the diary were maintained in a confidential and secure manner, it was used and stored in acknowledgment of this. At no time was the diary left unattended during operational times. At evenings and weekends, it was stored securely at my home address. In order to provide another layer of security of data, there were no full names of schools or respondents recorded within the diary. During the course of this research, three research diaries have been used consecutively. Once the first diary had been completed, it was securely stored and the second diary
used, the same process was repeated between the second and third. Cross referencing took place between diaries from time to time and each of the diaries were used when transcribing and interpreting the data.

4.11 Semi-structured interviews:

Interviewing is one of the most frequently used research methods (Campbell et al. 2000, Denzin and Lincoln 2008), yet “asking questions and getting answers is a much harder task than it may seem at first” (Fontana and Frey 2008). Interviews are essentially, “special forms of conversation” Silverman (2004; 140), but there are various types of interview scenarios ranging from tightly structured models to informal conversations, the decision of which to utilize depending on the purpose of the research (Campbell et al 2000).

The interviews in my thesis were steered conversations rather than fixed and rigid conversations with set questions and outcomes. This allowed the participants to be able to feel they could express themselves without feeling constrained, and enabled them to be able to identify any issues and situations that I had not considered. The research questions were used as a framework and to offer some steer and organisation to the interview. Davies (2008: 112) asserts that qualitative researchers “need to be open to the possibility that the respondents will not be able to discuss the subject in the terms that is suggested by the interviewer.” so if the interview is to deliver a, “contextually bound and mutually created story” (Fontana and Fray 2008), an appropriate style of interviewing
needs to be developed. In exploiting both the good level of access I had to the respondents and the understanding I had with some of the issues regarding teachers` CPD, I aimed to achieve the balance between allowing the respondents sufficient freedom to discuss the pertinent issues, and to ensure that the areas I wanted to address were given sufficient credence. In addressing this, acknowledgement was given to Fairclough`s (1989) suggestion that interviews must give consideration to the level of discourse produced and the level of interaction between the interviewer and interviewee.

The settings for interviews can be as important as the data from these interviews as teachers can feel uncomfortable in an official, formal setting (Wragg et al 2000). The accommodation within which my interviews took place was carefully considered. To alleviate any potential issues, I conducted my interviews in an area in which the respondents told me they felt able to talk in comfort and with confidence. I was mindful that privacy and confidentiality needed to be maintained at all times.

In order to capture the data from most of the interviews, I used a digital recorder. This was done following discussion and verbal consent of each of the participants in the knowledge that their names and situations remain anonymous and that all digital data was securely stored and removed and disposed of as soon as possible. Davies (2008: 126) provides support for the use of tape recorders in her assertion that the use of recorders in qualitative research is, “universally accepted and unreservedly advocated.” A benefit of
using a recorder is that it is less intrusive and obstructive to the conversation and allows the interviewer to focus on other areas of the interview (Davies 2008).

However, the use of recorders is not without criticism, Cohen et al (2000) suggested that respondents might find the use of a recorder constraining. Whilst Merton et al (1956) sought to consider that the use of any mechanical device in an interview could be perceived and threatening. The participants to my research were offered the opportunity to listen to the recording and to view the notes before the end of the interview. They were also given the opportunity to receive an electronic recording of their interview once it had been downloaded. None requested to do so. However, there were two occasions when teachers requested that the recorder was not used. In both of these instances, I took notes during and immediately following the interview.

4.12 Transcribing interview data

When planning an appropriate method to transcribe the data, the views of Cohen et al (2000:282) were taken into account, they argued that there cannot be a single correct method of transcription, but rather the researcher considers, “whether, to what extent, and how” the transcription is useful to the research. They further asserted that the researcher should not believe that transcripts are able to report everything from the interview. Therefore, in order for the interview transcriptions to enable me to interpret and analyse the data alongside that gathered from observations and focus groups, I used a set of codes by which to label and organise the data.
As with transcripts from the observation data, I began by writing down all verbal communication including episodes of silence. I also made notes regarding the use of jargon and abbreviations. There were no abbreviations used that I did not understand the meaning. The initial process of word processing the interview data did not involve analysing or interpreting any of the data, it was merely the process of writing what had been previously recorded. I cross reference the taped conversations with the notes from the interviews. There were no anomalies or cases where I needed to return to the respondents to check that my transcription was a correct version of what had been discussed.

The purpose and procedure of the interview was revealed to each of the interview participants prior to the commencement of the interview. All respondents were informed that they could terminate their involvement at any time. I considered if there was any way in which the interviewees could be harmed from the interview process or from the information they provided. This was done by discussing this with them prior to the interview.

For each of the interviews, I obtained verbal and recorded consent from each of the participants. They each gave consent on the provision that I maintained their anonymity, privacy and confidentiality. Each were offered the opportunity to amend what they said and to read through the transcription of their interview. I also informed them that the
thesis, once complete will be able to be read by them. The interview respondents were aware that I retained the right to report this project in whichever method is appropriate.

4.13 Focus Groups

Focus groups are a useful research method where the researcher wants to look at the ways in which the respondents interact and position themselves with each other whilst grappling with common issues (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis 2008). A benefit of the focus group or group interview is that the participants’, “agenda can predominate and it is from this interaction that data can emerge” (Cohen et al 2000: 288). That focus groups are particularly helpful for triangulating with interviews and observations (Morgan 1988), offers some support for the use of this method in my research.

By allowing a free debate, the focus group can offer the opportunity for, “hearing the language and the vernacular of the respondents” (Bers 1987: 26). In utilising the “synergistic” potential, the focus group can also produce data that is not available via observations or interviews (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis 2008:397). Of particular interest to my research in seeking to understand the ways in which teachers see themselves as professionals within their peer groups and with specific identities, is the potential that the focus group scenario allowed me to see the, “complex ways in which people position themselves in relation to each other as they processes questions, issues and topics in a focused way” (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis 2008:397).
However, focus groups are not without detractors, Watts and Ebbut (1987) argued that there are disadvantages of using focus groups, none more so than the impersonal nature of group interaction. They question whether group interviews stifle personal matters, but I would argue that the group moderator can steer the discussion, enabling personal matters to be considered in a contextual manner and appropriate manner. Contrastingly, there is some evidence (Frith 2000), that focus groups actually encourage personal accounts. The view that people may be inhibited by the group dynamic and therefore less open in expressing their views is a misconception (Silverman 2004) as the group situation can act as a support for personal disclosure (Farquhar and Das 1999).

4.14 Transcribing focus group data

There is no single type of data analysis specific to focus groups (Wilkinson 1997). To enable the analysis from this method to align with that of the other methods, the proposal by Morgan (1997) that focus group analysis can be successfully achieved by a coding system was utilised in my research. Tape recordings of the group interviews along with notes taken during and immediately following each of the focus groups were used as data gathering instruments, it is from these that the data were transcribed. The transcriptions were word processed documents that were stored electronically alongside data from the other methods. As with interview data, all verbal communication was transcribed, and where there were significant non-verbal communication, this too was
noted. Cohen et al (2000) asserted that non verbal communication is as valuable as verbal communications in research data.

4.15 Ethical considerations of focus groups

The use of digital recording was discussed and agreed with each member of the group prior to the group discussion commencing. The members of the groups in my research were professional colleagues and therefore known to each other, this lessened the potential for unfamiliarity which may have created a barrier to discussion and debate. I did not therefore need to provide any privacy for them other that the room that they would be using for their study sessions. I agreed to maintain total anonymity for the group and also agreed that any names would not be recorded. The group were also keen that I did not identify the schools in which they worked.

4.16 My Sample

The quality of a piece of research is not only determined by the appropriateness of the methodology or of the methods with which to gather the data, but is significantly influenced by the sampling strategy (Cohen at al 2000). It is critical to the outcome of the research that the sample chosen for the study is representative of the particular group (Fink 1995). Other considerations regarding the sample revolve around the size of the sample and the accessibility of the sample. My sample was a non-probability sample, in that it was concerned with a particular group of people, i.e. educational professionals and those involved in the discourse of teachers’ CPD, furthermore and in acknowledging that
there are different types of non-probability sampling, the respondents for my research formed the sample through convenience and purposive sampling (Cohen et al 2000).

Convenience or opportunity sampling utilises the accessibility of the respondents to the researcher;

Captive audiences such as students or student teachers often serve as respondents based on convenience sampling. The researcher simply chooses the sample from those to whom she has easy access. As it does not represent any group apart from itself, it does not seek to generalize about the wider population (Cohen et al 2000: 102).

Accessibility was just part of the rationale for the selection of the sample in my research, the theoretical framework also served to support the choice of sample and to that end responses were used from educational professionals who were less accessible. In purposive sampling the researcher selects the sample based on a specific purpose, so for example, I chose to visit certain and specific conferences and meetings at which CPD or professional identity issues were likely to be discussed. The need to obtain data from teachers who had both engaged in, and disengaged from CPD also led to a purposive approach as I needed to select specific teachers.

The data were generated from within two separate local authority areas in England. Data were obtained from participation in meetings, informal professional discussions, conferences and from CPD events, which took place within the organisational context of the local authority, schools and university.
In order that the sample reflected the wider discourse of teachers’ CPD, respondents to this research were from primary, secondary, sixth form and special education settings. They were at different stages of their teaching careers, from newly qualified to nearing retirement. The sample was made up of both male and female teachers of various ages. Head teachers and deputy head teachers from primary, secondary and special schools were also respondents, along with local authority representatives and university tutors who at the time were responsible for some aspect of teachers’ CPD. It is difficult to place an exact number of participants in this research as there were many conferences and events attended from which data were extracted that were attended by high numbers of education professionals.

4.17 Focus Group sample

Focus groups were set up with groups that had already established a common interest. For example, both of the focus groups were made up of a group of teachers who had registered on a Masters degree as part of their CPD. Data were collected from two focus groups, one from within each of the local authority areas covered by this research.

**Group 1** consisted of 8 teachers all of whom were experienced teachers and had been teaching for some time, they were registered either for a Masters degree in Education, or a Masters degree in Education leadership and Management as part of their CPD. Four of these teachers held leadership positions. The teachers were; Jane, Julie, Paul, Paula, Alan,
Debra, Stuart and Kate. They were from a cross section of school phases, ranging from primary secondary, sixth form to special education settings. The group was made up of male and female teachers of a mixed age range and teaching experience. The focus group took place in the university room in which the group normally had the study sessions for their MA.

**Group two:** Made up of twelve teachers registered on a Masters degree with one university and working in a county in the West Midlands of England. Teachers were from primary, secondary, sixth form, early years and special education settings. The group was made up of both male and female teachers of a mixed age range and teaching experience. The focus group took place in the university room in which the group normally had the study sessions for their MA. The teachers were: Liz,( deputy head) Alan,(head teacher) Karen, Maggie, Gary, Simon, Sue, Carole, Sandra, Carl, Jay and Deirdre. As with the first focus group, they were all registered for a Masters degree with the same university and they were all working at schools within the same local authority. The participants were either doing the first or second module of the Masters degree.

I was mindful that focus groups of this nature are pre-contrived events and that this has both strengths and weaknesses (Cohen et al 2000). The group were aware that I was conducting research into their individual approach to CPD, and they all offer consent to me recording and taking notes throughout the group session. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) advocate that the researcher can gain consent from research participants verbally
if it is not practical to obtain written consent. I therefore noted in my diary the names of the participants alongside the point that they had all given consent.

4.18 Interview Participants

I wanted to interview teachers who were engaged in CPD and also those who were not engaged or who had withdrawn. I selected my sample of interviewees as they each knew I was conducting the research and had expressed an interest in forming my sample. I considered gender and age when selecting the sample, so male and female teachers of different ages were interviewed. I also wanted to interview teachers with different roles within school, I therefore interviewed head teachers, deputy head teachers, heads of department and classroom teachers. That the local authority had a significant stake in teachers’ CPD at the onset of this research, led to representatives from the authority also being interviewed.

Colin

Colin was a maths teacher in a secondary school, he had been teaching for seven years. He was registered on and working towards a Master of Arts degree in education as part of his CPD.

Malcolm

Malcolm was a primary school teacher who had been teaching for thirty years, he had recently retired from teaching and had taken a post with a University as an associate lecturer. He had registered for a CPD programme that led to a Masters degree.
Dave

Dave was a design and technology teacher in a secondary school. He had been teaching for two years prior to which he worked as a sales and marketing manager for a printing company. Whilst Dave was completing his NQT year, he registered for a CPD programme which led to a Masters degree.

Debra

Debra was an English teacher in a Catholic secondary school. Debra had been teaching for three years and had completed the first module of the Masters degree.

Mike (Head Teacher)

Mike was a primary head teacher. He had been a teacher for thirty years, and had been a head for the past eleven years. He was about to retire. He chaired the county head teachers committee and was happy to include information from this role when discussing his views on CPD.

Julie

Julie was a secondary teacher of sixteen years who registered for a CPD programme that led to a Masters degree but withdrew before submitting the first assignment. She was not engaged in any other CPD.
Mike

Mike was a head of department in secondary school. He was currently participating in a Masters programme as part of his CPD. He also performed some seconded duties with the local authority.

Paul

Paul was a science teacher in a secondary school who has been teaching for twelve years. He was engaged on a Masters degree as part of his CPD. He previously worked as a builder.

Lesley

Lesley was a deputy head teacher and CPD co-ordinator at a secondary school. She had been a deputy head for three years and already had a Masters degree. She was not currently taking part in any CPD herself, but does attend in-house CPD events as part of her role as CPD co-ordinator.

Carol

Carol was a primary school teacher who had been teaching for twenty five years. She had not taken part in any accredited CPD nor did she anticipate doing so. She dismissed it as she felt accredited CPD had little or no value to her role as a teacher.
Dianne

Dianne was a local authority adviser who had been a primary teacher for fifteen years prior to working for the local authority. She was currently registered for a Masters degree. However, she was not engaging with this or any other CPD.

Head Teachers:

One head teacher was interviewed formally for this study, but discussions and conversations were held with several other heads; for example, during meetings and following conferences and also at training and study sessions. Observation notes were taken during and immediately following meetings attended by head teachers at which CPD was discussed. When necessary, minutes from these meetings were accessed in order to substantiate the notes made earlier. It was felt that the head teachers’ perspectives could illuminate the research data in terms of providing a management perspective to school based teachers’ CPD. The head teachers’ role featured significantly in the literature and policy documentation, so it was important to me to hear the voices of the head teachers, particularly in terms of having the strategic overview of teachers’ CPD.

One deputy head teacher was formally interviewed for this study, but again, discussions and conversations were held with several other deputy head teachers during meetings and at other events. The role of the deputy head teacher varied depending on the type and size of school. For example, in a small primary school, the deputy head teacher may
have had responsibility for all the CPD that was carried out within the school, in others, the head teacher performs that role. Alternatively, in a large secondary school the deputy head teacher may devolve this responsibility to a teacher who holds the CPD co-ordinators role. That I wanted to capture as many angles as possible led me to hold discussions with, and engage in conversation with, several people fulfilling each of these roles. From a critical standpoint it was important to seek the views of head teachers and others in managerial positions as their actions had the potential to be significantly influential in teachers’ own views.

4.19 Local Authority voices:

The two local authorities studied for this research had both formed a CPD partnership agreement with the university in order that teachers’ CPD could gain post graduate accreditation. Numerous meetings were attended at which local authority personnel were present and express views regarding teachers’ CPD. Similarly, several local authority led conferences were also attended, these too resulted in local authority curriculum advisers and consultants making comments and sharing views on teachers’ CPD. As I mentioned earlier, at the time of conducting this research, local authorities were responsible for providing CPD and also for supporting head teachers in the provision of school based CPD, so I felt that it was necessary to gauge opinion from the people in key influential roles within the authority. One local authority adviser was interviewed for the purpose of this investigation. From a critical perspective, it was valuable to my research to capture the views of local authority personnel as the authority had the potential to be able to significantly dominate the discourse of CPD.
4.20 Conferences

Newly qualified teachers’ (NQT) conference October 2006 in North West. – Held at a Hotel in the North West and hosted and funded by the local authority. In representing the university, I was invited to attend in order to provide information to all NQT’s regarding accredited CPD. All NQT’s within the local authority area who qualified during this year were invited to attend this conference. Teaching unions and educational publishers were also present. I collected data from direct observations of discussions and teachers’ responses to presentations. I recorded all my observations in the research diary.

Newly qualified teachers’ conference October 2006 in West midlands. - Held at a Hotel in the West Midlands and hosted by the local authority, jointly funded by the university. I attended this conference on behalf of the university in order to provide information to all NQT’s regarding accredited CPD. All NQT’s who qualified in 2006 were invited to attend this conference. Teaching unions and educational publishers were also present. I collected data from observing discussions and presentations and recorded these in the research diary.

University CPD partnership conference February 2007 in North West. - A conference to which the University invited all partnership schools. The aim was to identify any CPD issues from the schools’ perspective that could be addressed by the university. This conference was attended by head teachers, deputy head teachers, CPD co-ordinators,
teachers and university CPD tutors and managers. The conference was held at the University’s main campus. I collected data from direct observations and discussions with head teachers and classroom teachers. I also observed head teachers senior university managers and CPD co-ordinators and recorded some pertinent discussions from these observations in my research diary.

**University CPD partnership conference June 2007 in West Midlands.** – This was a conference to which the University invited all partnership schools. The aim was to identify any CPD issues from the schools’ perspective that could be addressed by the university. This conference was attended by head teachers, deputy head teachers, CPD co-ordinators, teachers and university CPD tutors and managers. It was held at the University’s outreach centre within the West Midlands local authority area. I collected data from directly observing conversations and discussions between the conference delegates. All data were recorded within the research diary.

**CPD in schools conference September 2007 in the North West.** – A conference held at a hotel in the North West. The aim of the conference was to share good CPD practice across the county. Head teachers, deputy head teachers, CPD leaders, teachers and local authority advisers were invited along with university CPD and partnership tutors and managers. My role was to discuss CPD accreditation opportunities for teachers.
Various presentations were made at the conference concerning CPD and exemplars of CPD projects were also demonstrated. I observed these and recorded pertinent and appropriate comments in the research diary.

**Special education needs co-ordinators (SENCO) CPD conference October 2007 in the North West.**

A nationally driven policy regarding the training of SENCO specialists provided the platform for this conference. All SENCO’s within the North West were invited, along with Head teachers from Special needs schools and university tutors with an interest in SENCO training and CPD. The conference was hosted by the local authority and took place at a Hotel in the North West. I recorded observations that I made throughout the conference that were pertinent to my research.

**4.21 Meetings and discussions:**

I attended many meetings and held numerous professional discussions regarding CPD, some of which were planned and as a result of my ex officio position on University, local authority and school boards and committees. Others were ad hoc and happened spontaneously, many in informal situations such as during lunch breaks and before and after official meetings. Where possible, I recorded in the research diary the nature of the meeting and the types of teachers participating in order that the interpretations could be placed in context. Where this was not possible, I used the term “general” in my research data notes. This served to identify that I am not aware of the particular orientation of the
teachers or others whose responses I claim as data. I was able to actively participate in some meetings and debates, where this was the case, this is recorded in my diary and inverted commas used to indicate my speech. Where this was not the case and I acted purely as a listener, this too was noted.

4.22 Methodology summary

This chapter has provided the rationale for using a qualitative interpretive approach to the research. It also alludes to the use of a critical standpoint and provides justification for this.

The methods of participant observation, interviewing and focus groups have been analysed and proposed as methods by which the empirical data for this research was gathered. Justification has been offered as to the reason for not using other methods. The use of triangulation as a mechanism for supporting the validity and reliability has also been evaluated.

The sample of participants is introduced and the use of a non-probability sample strategy explained and justified. The venues from which the data was gathered is also explained.
The research questions emanating from the policy examination and the theoretical discussions are expressed within the context of being used as a framework around which the empirical data collection has been conducted.
Chapter 5:
The Teachers’ voices: professional knowledge, power, status and identity.

5.1 Introduction

This chapter captures the findings obtained by the methods I have just outlined. The largely descriptive presentation of the data in this chapter, doing justice to individual voices, is nonetheless organised broadly thematically which lays the ground for a deeper theoretical analysis in the next chapters.

The conceptualisation of how teachers acquire their identities has significant implications for how they engage in their professional development (Coldron and Smith 1999). In applying Bernstein’s theoretical approach, these identities are assumed when considering them against other roles, for example in acknowledging the ‘space’ between the role of teacher to that of other professionals within the schools. This has led me to consider the relationship that identity has to the teachers’ views of their own CPD.

5.2 Professional Identity and CPD

I asked Colin if there was a relationship between CPD and teachers professional identity, he thought for a while before saying that he felt there was a link. He said that the development of the teaching assistant role had resulted in teaching assistants having a higher professional status, which in turn had an impact on the identity of teachers, many
of whom he feels are threatened by the change in status of teaching assistants. He suggests that this has created a lack of motivation to engage in CPD;

“Years ago teachers had a high profile in society and a high status. This is not the case now and I think it is this reason that had led to the decline in teachers’ motivation and commitment. If you think about it years ago, teachers had a really high profile or status and were less qualified in comparison to now – I’m talking about the fact that the Government want all teachers CPD to be accredited at MA level. They might have qualifications at a high level but they have the lowest profile or status that they have ever had”. Asked why he thought that this might be the case, he said, “the status of TA’s [teaching assistants] has increased enormously over the past few years, and by offering them HLTA [higher level teaching assistant status] and other courses, their status will only increase. I think this has a mixed reaction from teachers as some inevitably feel threatened by this and so they’ve turned their backs onto anything that involves them doing anything other than teaching in the classroom.”

In viewing teachers’ status as being somehow lower now than it was in the past has been argued as going from, “the optimism of the 1940’s to the misery of the 1990’s... one of the most notable changes[affecting teachers lowering of status] has been the removal of an autonomous working environment ” McKenzie (2001: 6), which is in contrast to view that teachers have significant individual autonomy that is valued by society (Hargreaves and Goodson (1996).

The force of Malcolm’s responses were based on generational issues. He felt that age related issues are significant to the ways in which teachers engage with CPD. He feels that
older teachers place some value on engaging in professional development as it relates to professional status and he suggests that older teachers consider that teaching still holds a significant status within society. In congruence with Colin, he claimed that these teachers feel threatened by the developing role of the teaching assistant and in a bid to maintain some sort of status as teachers, they feel the necessity to take part in CPD. Contrastingly, he feels that younger teachers do not recognise the profession of teaching as having any particular status and this leads to them not engaging readily in CPD. This is not really surprising as, “aging, occupational development and identity are inextricably linked” (Ball and Goodson 1985: 28). However, when asked Malcolm if teachers’ identity and status were influenced by them participating in CPD, he replied:-

“I think this needs to be looked at in two ways, up to 30/35 years old and above 30/35 years old. “Young teachers do not see the potential and importance of CPD – they are content to teach. I don’t think many young teachers feel it necessary to take part in accredited professional development. I know of several young teachers who see their job as being very short term I think teachers above 35 years – and obviously I’m included here – will view teaching as a profession with quite a high status. I personally feel that I have been part of a high status profession for many years, I agree that as time has gone on, the status may have receded somewhat. However I still feel that to be a teacher is to be a professional with some sort of status. I know that younger teachers are viewing teaching as “just a job” – with no real intention of promotion or gaining head ship. I think young teachers see teaching as something that pays the bills and don’t see why they need to develop or do anything other than teach. If you were to ask a younger teacher what they thought of their professional identity – they are likely to say “what identity” I think
young teachers don’t even consider that teaching has any sort of professional status any more.”

I asked if this had an impact on the way the teachers engaged with CPD;

“Yes, I think it does, I think this might be why some of the older teachers are doing higher level qualifications as part of their CPD – so that they keep one step ahead and maintain some sort of identity themselves.”

I was particularly interested in the point that he raised regarding older teachers trying to keep ‘one step ahead’ and associating this with a separate identity, which is echoing Bernstein’s theory of identities being formed by the spaces that enable some sort of protection for that identity from, in this case, others within the organisation (Bernstein 2000). This notion of ‘space invasion’ in terms of professional identities being at risk of some sort of contamination from other professionals within the school was also evident in the interview with Dave. He told me that he was aware that the whole school workforce were becoming more qualified and he believed that as a teacher he’d “always need to keep one pace ahead.”

I asked what he meant by this, he explained that teaching assistants are becoming more qualified in terms of completing foundation degrees and obtaining higher level status. He felt that teaching assistants could, in the future be taking the place of teachers, he suggested that the teaching assistants would be cheaper to employ.
I asked him if he thought teachers` professional identify and status was influenced by CPD. He said:

“I don’t think that teaching is as high a status profession as it once was. My view is that the media have portrayed teachers in a negative light, and this has had the effect of turning some members of society against them. League tables and OFSTED reports – particularly, the less than outstanding reports, have resulted in the public looking at teachers as failures, how can we have any sort of status”?

Dave argues that the reporting of audit and league tables by the media has some impact on the public status of teaching. This is something that Campbell et al (2011:2) considered when they asserted that, “public accountability is increasingly more visible, in league tables, inspections and media coverage.” Similarly, it is argued that one of the growing trends that are having a significant impact on how teachers are seen and regarded by the wider society is the, “ranking, rating and appraising of teachers via league tables” (Smythe 1995:1) and this is leading to the profession of teaching having a “decreased status” (Harris, 1994 in Forde et al 2006: 143).

I asked Dave if he felt teachers’ identity and status was influenced by CPD. He said that it was. I then asked him to say more about his views regarding this relationship;

“my personal opinion is that teachers CPD and professional identity go hand in hand, but as I’ve said, I am from a business background and CPD was in everyone’s DNA, so not doing any CPD was not an option.”

That Dave offered a comparison to a business model provided a somewhat surprising but nevertheless interesting dichotomy. I was particularly struck to his reference of CPD being in ‘everyone’s DNA’ he indicated that this was not the case amongst his teaching colleagues, which suggests successive attempts to embed CPD into the teachers’
professional lives (Campbell et al 2000, Forde et al 2000) has not been successful in all situations.

I asked Debra if she felt the status and identity of teachers was influenced by CPD. She said;

“In the whole of my school there are only 2 teachers doing any accredited CPD. Teaching is now just another job, it is nothing special, I have several colleagues who just do the minimum, they arrive a minute to nine and leave a minute after three thirty, they don’t take part in any out of school activities and don’t do any CPD.”

She thought before adding;

“teaching is not about status anymore, teachers do not hold any sort of status in society, teaching is just like any other job. Teachers’ identity is determined by the school, if the school has a good OFSTED report, then the teachers within that school are seen as being effective, and teaching well, whereas teachers working in a school that has a bad OFSTED, are seen as not effective teachers.”

The suggestion that OFSTED inspection is implicit in the ways in which teachers’ identities are formed is something which Power (1997) asserted, “governance is an intra-organisational issue of control and motivation... that requires constant vigilance and improvement...and may also relate to the democratisation of organisational life and more radical senses of empowerment” (Power 1997: 41). But according to Debra, the identities of teachers in schools that have had poor audit results seem to suffer as a result, which links to what Dave has also said.
Mike was able to provide a head teacher’s perspective. I asked him if teachers’ professional development had an impact on teachers’ identity and status. He said;

“I think teaching as a profession has more opportunities now than it has experienced in a long time and this has strengthened the identity of teaching. Although we complain often of lack of funds, I think if you were to consider the funding availability of years ago, teaching doesn’t do too badly today. I offer CPD to all the teachers and I pay for them. My belief is that without professional development it is difficult to demonstrate any professional status and identity. I have to say that no teacher has refused to take part in any CPD. I think in some ways the identity of teachers has changed over time, no doubt some would argue that teachers had a higher status in the mid 19’s, and they may well have done, but I’m not sure if they had the responsibility and accountability that they now have, they certainly weren’t as evaluated and assessed as they are today.”

So, Mike’s view of teachers having more opportunities that strengthens their identity echo those of Coldron and Smith (1999) in claiming a significant link between teachers’ identity and how they engage with their professional development, “the conceptualisation of how persons acquire their identities as teachers has implications for the kind of support needed for professional development” (Couldron and Smith 1999: 711).

During the interview with Julie, when I asked her if she felt teachers’ identity and status was influenced by CPD she said, “I think teachers are quite concerned by the lack of status.” Which gives some support to the Government view that, “we still have to go some way to go before the status of teaching here matchers the status in the highest
performing countries” (DfE 2010:10) since teaching has historically been considered as having “only moderate status” (Gitlin and Labaree 1996: 94).

When I asked Mike if he felt that teachers’ identity and status was influenced by CPD he said;

“there is quite a lot of grumbling and concern between teachers that some appear to have a better job than others. Some teachers are worried that they somehow have a worse time of teaching than other colleagues. I think this is due to how some teachers see themselves. I think in the staff room there is competition between some teachers regarding who is more qualified than others. I know of three teachers in my school who have Masters degrees and I think they see themselves as somehow better than the likes of me.”

Mike said that he felt that CPD with a qualification attached, did make a difference to how teachers see each other and that this impacts on the identity of the teachers. He argued that CPD could be creating a division of identity in that some teachers will have Masters degrees and others would not. He added;

“teaching does not have the professional status that it once did. Teachers used to be the pillar of community and were respected within villages and the general public, but not now. If you say you’re a teacher now, people look at you as if to say “so what? So you’re responsible for the state that the education system is in”? I feel that in order for the professional status of teachers to be maintained or even better, to be enhanced, then teachers owe it to themselves to take part in professional development.”

By drawing on images of teaching from the past, Mike is alluding to a ‘retrospective’ identity for teaching which is something Bernstein (1996) proposed. But for Mike, the way in which teaching is seen by the community has changed for the worse. This point is
McKenzie (2001), who argues that, the loss of autonomy, introduction of the national curriculum, auditing, monitoring and league tables have contributed to the loss of status for teachers within the wider community, But critically, for Mike, this deterioration of identity and status can be rectified by teachers taking part in professional development and gaining higher awards. “Accredited CPD programmes seem to provide an important quality mark for teachers” (Arthur et al 2006: 214) and by taking part in CPD and in obtaining higher degrees teachers can, “bring about a change of practice and a change of identity” (Forde et al 2006).

In discussing with Paul how teachers’ identities are formed, he mentioned that he felt that gaining post graduate qualifications had an influence on the identity of teachers, he said;

“I wanted to prove to my head teachers and colleagues that I could do stuff other than just control a class. I think there is a general perception about me – you know with my accent and that, that I am a low achiever. I know that I’m a good teacher, my results are very good and I get on well with pupils and parents, but I also know that many of my colleagues think that I am only able to perform practically, so I wanted to prove to them, and to myself in a way, that I could study and achieve a qualification. I have had no support from my head teacher for this, I have had no support from anyone. No one has ever said “how’s it going”, I have had to be completely self motivated. I have not had any funding for it – I’m paying for it all myself. There’s no carrot at the end of it either, as far as I can see. I’m not assured of promotion or a pay rise, it’s purely for the satisfaction of being able to say that I can do it. So, yes, I suppose it is about changing my identity, I do think that teachers with qualifications are looked at differently to those without any. I think they are taken more seriously and are more likely to get promotion. Most of the CPD put on by the school is a tick box form – which I regard as superficial and meaningless, I wanted to take part in some form of CPD that means something to me as a person and as a teacher. I am aware that many of my colleagues have dismissed CPD as worthless as they see the tick box forms every so often and so give them no priority at all... I also think that many teachers feel that they are
Paul was referring to his accent as he speaks with a broad northern accent. His perception was that his accent led colleagues to consider that he was a low academic achiever. This chimes with Bernstein’s (2000) theory on language and the ways in which an elaborate style of language is seen by some as indicative of belonging to a higher social class than someone who uses a restricted language. Paul was asked if he would expand on the issue raised earlier regarding his colleagues that had dismissed CPD;

“Oh yes, CPD is not linked to anything that you do in school, I know that I’m doing this MA and I’ve linked the assignments to my work practice, but there is a common consensus that CPD is something extra, on top of what they already do. Teachers are feeling “got-at” there is no time or motivation to do CPD. Teachers are dismayed at the Government perception of them, and the public’s perception for that matter. We recently had a session on whole school CPD that was delivered by some outside agency. None of those delivering the session had ever worked in a school. Now, how can that promote CPD to those teachers who are already reluctant? I also know that many of my colleagues are sick to the back teeth of the LA preaching on curriculum and the like, we have an LA person who visits from time to time telling us about CPD opportunities, I don’t think, in the whole of the time I’ve been at this school that anyone has taken part in any of the LA CPD programmes.”

Paul speaks of teachers feeling “got at” and “dismayed” which echoes Campbell and MacNamara’s (2009) argument of teachers having a lack of self-worth. Paul is also critical of LA CPD programmes suggesting that they are not inclusive which has served to discourage teachers from taking part. But this conflicts with the previous Labour Government (DFEE 2001 and DFES 2005). It lauded the CPD model to the extent of providing funding for teachers to gain post graduate qualifications.
I asked Lesley if she felt teachers’ professional identity and status was influenced by CPD, she said; “Yes, accredited CPD is preferable as it leads to a qualification for the teachers and they can cash in any credits against post graduate courses in the future. Teachers who have post graduate credits are able to apply for higher and more senior positions, so this does have an impact on their identity.”

What Lesley is saying here adds depth to the claim that gaining qualification and obtaining more senior positions has a positive impact on the identity of the teacher (Stronach et al 2002 and Eurat 1994), - and it gives credence to the argument that teachers’ status is elevated by obtaining higher degrees (Gitlin and Labaree 1996). Lesley’s view support the findings of Arthur et al (2006), who found that accredited CPD provides something of a ‘quality mark’ for teachers. That accreditation and qualification are seen as significant in these ways by teachers does appear to justify Campbell’s (2011) argument for university involvement in teachers CPD, in that universities are able to offer accreditation and degree level awards.

When I asked Di if the professional status and identity of teachers was influenced by CPD she said;

“Teaching as a body could have a much higher status. Maybe similar to how it was years ago. However, I think that bureaucracy and LA involvement has prevented this. The LA are concerned with interpreting central Government policy, and they will of course interpret this to the best advantage, both for the authority and, as
far as possible, for the schools. But these interpretations might not necessarily suite every individual teacher. There are a lot of people in senior management positions at County level whose infighting has a knock on effect further down the line. People jostle for positions and this does have an impact on the types of CPD that are offered for teachers, I think there are still the opportunities for teachers to raise their professional identity, but to do this they need to be able to embrace CPD and engage with the vision for the development of the education system. Schools are highly political places now and this impacts on the identity of teachers, there is a lot of in-fighting in some schools.”

Di’s reference to competing agendas and the agenda of those in the most powerful positions dominating the landscape, is something that Bernstein considered in asserting that reform emerges out of the struggles between groups to make their “bias and focus” official practice and policy (Bernstein 2000: 65). It is also seen in Foucault’s theory, that those in power are able to control the knowledge and dominate the discourse to their advantage (Foucault 1969). But Di argues that teachers need to be able to form a strong identity to mitigate this domination, and for her this is achievable by engaging in CPD. “Teachers can transform themselves intellectually, overcome technical rationality and grow in awareness of the overt and hidden curriculum” (Smyth 1995:31), and one method of completing this transformation is in the engagement in CPD (Garman 1995).

During the first focus group discussions, one of the participants Jane, felt that her decision to engage in accredited CPD was hers alone and was not influenced by the school. Her view was that teachers need to, “get as highly qualified as possible” if they are to remain in a teaching post. She further commented that as teaching assistants are,
“gaining more and more qualifications, HLTA and the like...if we want to retain any sort of identity as teachers we need to gain qualifications too.” So for Jane, teachers’ identity is tied to their qualification and in order to maintain this there is some sort of comparison to the identity of the teaching assistant’s higher level role. This view is echoed in Ball and Goodson’s (1985) argument that teachers see innovations and reforms within schools as a threat to their identity. This notion of identity being influenced by engaging in CPD and subsequently in obtaining qualifications is something that came out in further discussions.

I asked the group why they had registered to do accredited CPD. They all agreed that they reason they were doing a Masters degree was to maintain what they viewed as some sort of professional identity Paula said;

“well, I’m just about to begin a new role as head of the pupil referral unit and I thought that by getting better qualified and hopefully getting a Masters degree, I am providing some sort of status for myself, you know, being a manager and having more responsibility. When I start my new job, I will have a different identity, I think the problem will be how my colleagues will react to my change of role, but I’m doing this to secure my new role and hopefully boost my chances of keeping it.”

The correlation between obtaining a Masters degree and assuring herself of some kind of professional status and job security is something which could easily be drawn from the previous Labour, and current Government policies (DfEE 2000, DFES 2001, DoE 2010). That some teachers feel the opportunity for progression and promotion is greater if teachers hold Masters degrees (Arthur et al 2006) signifies that there are some notions that obtaining this level of degree is significant to the identity of the teacher.

In relation to this Jane said;

“of course CPD and identity are linked. CPD offers you a chance to improve your knowledge, so you are bound to change, introduce new things to your classroom
practice, and I think this leads to you developing a new identity. Maybe the kids don’t see it, but I reckon the other staff do. Maybe that’s why so many have changed towards me since I’ve been doing this.”

During the discussion with the second focus group, Alan, the head teacher claimed that he was taking part in the Masters degree, as a head teacher he felt he needed to maintain his, “own professional development in order to be a good role model for the other teachers in the school”, he also felt that as a head teacher, he needs to be able to, “offer support to his staff when they embark on Masters degrees”. He felt that he would be unable to do this if he did not have a Masters degree himself.

Maggie claimed that she was doing a Masters degree as she felt that teachers identity was, “becoming a bit diluted and blurred,” when I asked her to expand on this, she felt this was due to the way in which teaching assistants were gaining qualifications and taking classes. Several other members of the group agreed with this. However, Alan interjected with the view that if teaching assistants did not take classes, some schools would be forced to close as there would not be an appropriate level of pupil support, he advocated strongly for the training and development of teaching assistants. This illuminates the discussion of CPD being considered differently by different people. For some classroom teachers, professional development leading to higher qualifications is seen as necessary to maintaining the identity of a role that is becoming threatened by the development of the teaching assistant. But from a managerial perspective CPD, when in
the context of development of the teaching assistant is seen as essential to the function of the school.

This provoked some debate around the training of teaching assistants, and where this seems to have some significance to teachers` own identity, I asked the group if the training of teaching assistants and their qualification had any significance for their own CPD. There was some discussion around this, and three or four of the teachers felt that it could have been part of their decision making process but they felt it was more to do with the identity and status of teaching as a whole.

But this does reignite the discussion regarding the comparison that some teachers draw between their identity and that of the teaching assistant, and in doing so seek ways of maintaining a distinctness of their own role - a distinctness that in many cases is emphasised by engaging in CPD and obtaining qualifications, which could be why teachers strive to reconstruct their identity when they feel, “their status is being threatened or questioned” Robinson et al (2005: 184).

Two of the co-ordinators at the SENCO conference felt that the “up-skilling” of teaching assistants had led to teachers looking at their own development, one of the co-ordinators claimed to know that several teachers engaged in the MA in Education as part of their CPD in order to “keep ahead” of teaching assistants in terms of identity and qualification. The third co-ordinator disagreed with this, she felt that many teachers do not really care what qualifications teaching assistants are doing, many feel that by taking HLTA and
foundation degrees, teaching assistants are helping out the teaching profession in terms of offering a higher standard of teaching support. The three discussed this and agreed that there were conflicting views in this respect.

There was a sense among the teachers in my research that the up-skilling and qualification of teaching assistants carries a risk to their own job security and identity as teachers. This fear is documented by McKenzie (2001) as she argues that teachers have lost much of the job security that the profession of teaching has experienced in the past. Beck (1992 cited in Slattery 2003) develops this point about fear attached to increased risk, by arguing that risk is, “a systematic way of dealing with hazards and insecurities induced and introduced by modernisation” (Beck in Slattery 1992: 255).

5.3 Perceptions of power and the interplay with CPD

The policy documentation also revealed the notion that power and the workings of institutional power relationships may be able to influence teachers` views on CPD and how they engage in CPD. By observing and talking to the teachers themselves, this research sought to unpick how the notion of power was perceived by the teachers.

Colin`s head teacher had a significant influence on his CPD, both with regard to the way in which he encouraged him to register on the programme and also on the type of CPD that he recommended Colin completed. He was permitted by the Head teacher to take part in CPD on the understanding that the work he completed for it could be used by the school.
When I asked Colin the significance of the head teachers influence, he said that the head teacher “bullied” him into doing a CPD course that was not accredited, he added;

“It was just a course about behaviour and assessment, and the interesting thing is, I rather liked it, so I wanted to carry on to get some accredited CPD – after all, it might as well be worth something to you at the end of the day.”

I asked Colin what he meant by being bullied, he defined this as the feelings he experienced as a result of the head teacher repeatedly asking him to take part in the course;

“The Head was very clear in that he didn’t really want me to do the full MA – so we reached a compromise – I could do the MA providing my research and findings would feed back into the school. So I conducted an action research study looking at maths teaching – I wasn’t really interested in this, but by doing it meant I could do the MA. Whilst doing the MA and reflecting on how the Head had treated me, I decided that once I had the MA, I would look for a job in HE [Higher Education] – in fact I have already secured a post at a university – teaching maths to teachers on the Post Grad course.”

Colin referred to the compromise that he and the head teacher reached regarding the CPD programme that he undertook as being beneficial to him as well as the school. But there can be no such compromise when the arrangement is directed by someone in a dominant role, as they will always be able to define what counts as important (Apple 2000). Colin felt that the university used, “strongly persuasive tactics” to enrol teachers onto CPD programmes. His view was that the university was able to use such methods as it was seen by some teachers as being in a position of power. He suggested that the
partnership that had been developed between the university and the local authority, “comes across to teachers as being quite bullish and overpowering” and teachers were made to feel that in order to adhere to the “norm” they should be carrying out a particular CPD programme. The use of the word “norm” is significant in that it conjures the impression of hegemony. By the partnership of the university and local authority allowing their agenda for CPD to appear as the only option is tantamount to the notion of hegemony. Gramsci argued that this is a form of ideological control and control of dominant ideas that is reflected in the consent of the actors (Slattery 2003).

I asked Colin to expand on the way the university is perceived as being bullish;

“Teachers are too disillusioned to bother too much about CPD in general. The University thinks that teachers are desperately waiting to “sign” up to their accredited CPD, that they are there, with a pen just waiting to be given the registration form. Yet the truth is they are not. “I think the University uses its position of power to try to get teachers to sign up for their CPD, but they [the university] have a false view of what is going on – teachers are not generally keen to do accredited CPD – they need to see the practical benefits it will have for them.”

Malcolm also articulated that the role of the head teacher is significant in teachers’ approach to CPD;

“The Head teacher was not supportive as she wanted me to adhere to her agenda for staff CPD and not mine. I knew that I could be a better Head teacher–be more supportive of staff and promote a more collegial environment. I thought that by doing the MA it would put me in a better position for promotion. Now I am
working for the university, they have allowed me to continue with the MA. But I have not lost sight of wanting to be a head teacher.”

I asked him to explain the different agendas, Malcolm said that the Head teacher wanted him to take part in school based CPD that was focused on subject specific themes, or school centred projects such as assessment for learning, or behaviour for learning, but Malcolm wanted to take part in CPD that led to a leadership and management qualification. He felt the head teacher was not supportive of this, he thought that she may feel threatened by his professional development or that she was only interested in what would impact on the school improvement plan. Malcolm added;

“I suppose I was determined that the head teacher was not going to put me off doing the CPD that I wanted to do – she did try to manipulate several staff into doing the CPD that she felt we ought to do.”

So Malcolm challenged the dominance and power over the CPD agenda that was demonstrated by the head teacher. In partaking in CPD that was of value to himself he was adopting a powerful stance. Foucault would not have been surprised by this as he asserted that power is something that is ubiquitous and moveable between different agents (Rabinow 1991). Malcolm felt that this was unfair to the staff as they are now, “taking part in CPD that was not the choice of the teachers themselves, neither did the CPD that these teachers were doing lead to a post graduate qualification. The Head teacher role is really influential in teachers’ CPD. This was very negative in my case,
undermining, and as my CPD plans did not co-inside with hers she was very destructive and objectionable.”

During the interview with Mike, he said that he was;

“aware that the relationships between several head teachers and the local authority are quite strained. I would say they are just power struggles, the heads want to have the final say over the CPD of the staff, but the LA do try to influence what CPD the staff will do. The LA is viewed with scepticism by some teachers, I know of some colleagues who will not take part in any accredited CPD just because the LA are saying they need to, again, I think this is just a power struggle and teachers generally don’t like being told what to do. Some of my colleagues would tell you that teachers are coerced into CPD purely to satisfy the LA targets.”

Mike’s impression of the way that power is demonstrated through the LA and university struggling to domineer the agenda is congruent with Foucault’s theory of knowledge and truth being produced out of power struggles (Rabinow 1991). Furthermore, that power is seen in this situation as being a set of forces which establishes positions and ways of influential behaviour is also something that Foucault asserts (Danaher et al 2000).

Mike continued to talk about the role the head teacher had in his CPD;

“I was lucky as my Head teacher supported my request to do CPD. I spoke to him prior to registering and he was very supportive and appeared to have confidence in my abilities. This then gave me confidence in myself. He also offered time support where possible too. But I know this is not typical for many of the teachers
on the same programme as me. Some of them have had a real struggle to get their head teachers to even acknowledge that they want to do CPD let alone support with funding or time. I just don’t know how they can do any study at all without the support of the Head teacher.”

Asked to explain this last point further, he thought before saying;

“the head teachers role in CPD is really influential, you need them to support you as you need time to reflect on your practice. You need them to allow you to explore the school policies and processes. I just can’t imagine doing this without the full support of my head teacher.”

Mike’s views here illuminate more of Foucault’s ideas about knowledge and power being inextricably linked (Scott 2007). For Foucault, those in powerful positions are able to control the knowledge that is distributed throughout the discourse (Foucault 1969). But the way in which this power and control is demonstrated seems to have an impact on the teachers in my study.

During the interview with Dave, he told me that he knew, “for a fact that many of my colleagues have deliberately not engaged with CPD as they feel coerced into it. In fact the more that CPD is mentioned and promoted, the more they seem to dig their heels in and fight against it.”

I asked Dave to tell me who he felt was responsible for the coercion that he had mentioned;
“the head teachers, the local authorities, and sometimes the university. These powerful organisations make out that they are doing teachers a favour by hard selling the CPD programmes, but all they are really doing is registering as many teachers as possible so that they can get the funding in for them.”

I asked him if he could say more about the term “powerful organisations” he continued;

“I think the LA tries to be very dictatorial over CPD – they like to try to domineer and pressure people, I know of one colleague who feels that he was pressurised into registering for some accredited CPD last year. It doesn’t bother me, as I would take part anyway, but for some teachers who are not that bothered, well, I think the LA will put them off...the Head teachers’ role is important in the CPD of the teachers, as they still have overall say in how the budget is spent and what CPD would be appropriate. They might well delegate this to the deputy, but nevertheless, a senior management perspective normally has a great deal of influence.”

When I asked Debra if anyone else had an influence on her decision to engage in CPD. She replied that;

“the head teacher has been very supportive, right from the beginning, when I first said I would like to do a MA. He has asked me to make my CPD work for the school, and he encouraged me to talk about this at staff meetings.”

Asked to expand she said that the head teacher had requested that the CPD that Debra undertook could feedback into the school action plan. He requested that her assignments were based around the improvement targets for the school. Debra had readily agreed to
this as she felt it necessary to comply with the wishes of the head teacher as he was so supportive of her CPD.

From a head teacher’s perspective, Mike encouraged all his staff to take part in CPD. He felt that the school benefits from teachers who are developing their professional knowledge and understanding. I asked Mike what influenced him in encouraging the staff within his school to take part in post graduate CPD, Mike said that;

“all the staff in this school are participating in some sort of CPD. I feel that by doing so it brings so much back to the school.” He said that he felt that accredited CPD is preferable to non-accredited CPD as it offers an award at the end which will have a positive impact for the teacher as well as the school. The organisation benefits from staff CPD, I think maybe I help in that I encourage staff to use what they are doing on the courses back here in the school, and I also encourage them to discuss it with their colleagues. I think that teachers and TA’s do reflect on what they learn, but they just need prompting from time to time.”

Mike said that he knew of several other head teachers who would disagree with him;

“they are concerned that if they support teachers in doing CPD and in gaining other qualifications, the teachers will just leave and join the school down the road. But I say, so what, whilst they have been working on the CPD, they have been doing so much for the school. “The pupils also benefit, I’m confident that my staff are probably as up to date with current legislation and practice as anybody, and I’m very proud of that. They are also knowledgeable on policy issues and legislation – not just practical resources and new ways of delivery.”
Mike said that as a head teacher he had “significant influence and power over which teachers took part in CPD” and what CPD they completed.

I asked Mike how his role of the head teacher had an impact on teachers` CPD;

“I think that the head teacher role is key, and I know I am one, but it could be very easy for me not to bother too much with the CPD of the staff, I think that would signal a very sad day for the organisation and for the development of the pupils. I can influence the type of CPD that the teachers take part in. I pay for cover for whichever teachers I choose to send on CPD programmes. “Asked if he insisted that the CPD teachers undertook fed back into school, he said, “no not necessarily, I wouldn’t say I insist, but I would strongly encourage it.”

I asked Mike if there were other stakeholders whose actions influenced teachers` CPD. He responded;

“It depends how high you want to go. The Government have the main stake in making funds available for teachers to CPD. The new MTL qualification will put CPD on the map for teachers. Then the local authorities have the Government’s agenda to promote, they can really influence teachers’ CPD. It is the local authority that decides which CPD activities and course take place and attract the funding. The TDA will also be interested in CPD and they are responsible for teachers’ development overall. And then there is you (the university), you have a major stake in supporting the local authority in accrediting their programmes. So yes, I would say there are many other organisations and people with an active and hugely influential stake in teachers’ CPD.”
For Mike the MTL was a significant opportunity for teachers’ CPD in terms of the LA, university and schools working together for the benefit of teachers’ CPD. So, that the MTL funding was re-channelled by the Conservative Government (DFE 2010) suggests a missed opportunity for teachers. It also gives an indication how the discourse of teachers’ CPD, “seems to be like a political football, subject to constant political shifts and changes” (Campbell 2011: 1), with civil servants and politicians being amongst some of the key stakeholders” (Campbell 2011).

I asked Paul if, in his view, there were other stakeholders with an interest in teachers’ CPD, He said;

“The head teachers’ role is hugely significant. The decisions about CPD and who does it is totally with them. They control the funding and who does what. If the head teacher doesn’t want you to do a particular course, then you won’t do it – it doesn’t matter if you think it might be good for you. As I’ve said, I was not allocated any extra time or funding for this MA but I am aware that a couple of colleagues have been given both time and funding for some CPD – because it will benefit the head and the school – they don’t really want to do it, but there you go. There are so many tensions and issues between the county priorities and the head’s priorities and I think it is all to do with targets, they have each got their own and different targets, I know that there have been one or two instances where problems have occurred – I think it’s quite a power fight – it’s funny to watch really, as both sides feel very important and neither thinks they should back down. The sad thing is, we’re caught up in all the bureaucracy that follows.” This impression of the head teachers role is something that is alluded to by Day and Bakioglu (1996:223) in
their argument that “one of the distinctive characteristics of the head teacher was their resistance to external changes.” This may be due to one of the key roles of the head teacher is to “balance the teachers’ individual needs and the school’s requirements of them as members of staff…it is crucial for reasons of morale, that teacher professional development is not lost in the mechanistic institutional programmes of development of a school’s staff” (O’Sullivan et al 1997: 180).

During the interview with Lesley the deputy head, I asked if her role is significant in the way in which teachers approach their CPD she said;

“I chivvy several teachers up and spend time explaining things to them. I’ll go over the CPD process and the accreditation process and what it could mean for them etc. and I like to follow up the staff who have made initial enquiries about CPD programmes. I absolutely believe in CPD and I want the staff to do the same. I must admit though that I do go over the top sometimes, I wonder if I’m a bit too enthusiastic. But I know – through feedback from staff that the fact that I am like I am has led to them taking part in CPD and they themselves have felt that it has impacted positively on their practice and made them better teachers, after all, that’s what it’s all about isn’t it? Does it make a difference to the children? I have to say that I think it does, yes. But going back to what you previously said, I’m convinced that I could really manipulate teachers into taking part in CPD or dropping out of CPD if I wanted to because of the privileged role that I have.”

Lesley went on to say;

“But the Head teacher is also a key player, they hold the funding and purse strings so if they want the teachers to do a certain CPD course, then the chances are that’s the course that the teachers will need to go with. The other thing that is
important of course is the Head teachers’ relationship with the LA. If that’s not good then it doesn’t bode well for the staff in terms of CPD courses or funding. Our Head gets on fairly well with the LA but we’ve had problems in trying to set up a CPD group. The LA want to muster in and we think that it is really not a good idea, you see, the County [local authority] perspective isn’t always a good thing and we feel that we really want to deal with this ourselves as a local group. I know that the LA can be hugely influential in which University it is best for the schools to go with. For example, we’ve decided to go with one university. However, the LA wanted us to use another university because they have some partnership agreement going on with them, but we felt that particular university didn’t have the Kudos that our choice of university had. That’s another thing, I suppose, and now you’ve asked me it has just dawned on me that the choice of university could be an influencing factor, what certificate would look best – the one with “Cambridge” on the bottom or the one with “Bottomridge.” I know that’s hypothetical, but it is a factor, I know several of my colleagues in other schools, deputies who have responsibility for CPD would want to use a reputable university.”

Lesley’s view is from a senior leadership perspective within the school, but she does assert to the notion of power struggles between the head teacher and local authority. She also alludes to the argument of the head teachers being able to control the CPD agenda due to having control of the budget which is something Campbell et al (2000) have argued. This view was echoed in Carol’s response.

During the interview with Carol she said that;

“ The head teachers’ are in a position similar to that of the local authority in that they can dictate and direct what CPD teachers do, and this will be whatever the school needs, the teachers’ own CPD wishes will not be considered.”
She gave thought before saying;

“I think the relationship between the CPD co-ordinator and the head teacher is quite significant. If the CPD representative and the Head teacher have a poor relationship – as I understand many do – then neither are going to care much for the teachers CPD as they are too busy either trying to ignore each other or catch each other out on something. I think the head teacher has a huge influence on teachers’ CPD.”

When asked to expand on this Carol said;

“well the fact that they decide who does what and who gets the money for what. If there can be cover provided and things like that. If the head teacher has taken a dislike to you, you are not going to get very far are you? The head is also watching their back, they won’t want you getting better qualified than them. It’s the same situation as some teachers, probably quite a lot actually thinking about it, who see teaching assistants creeping up on them.”

I asked Di what she felt were significant influences on teachers’ CPD;

“I need to be careful what I say, I can’t say too much, but I am convinced that teachers’ CPD is greatly influenced by the agendas of those in decision making positions at the local authority. Our managers have decided to enter into a partnership with the University and where this has been beneficial to some teachers, in providing Masters accredited CPD, it has put off lots too. Teachers are sceptical and protective of their time, they will not be dictated to by the LA and university.”
I asked her how she thought teachers’ CPD is influenced by those in decision making positions;

“well, my bosses for instance are often arguing and battling over who’s agenda is more important and this rubs off on the teachers, they’re not stupid. I know of several schools where the LA advisers have been in to try to get them to register for CPD, but they (the teachers) have just ignored any attempts to enrol and I think this is due to the way in which the advisers have tried to sell it to them, you know, to try to get their agenda the one that the teachers engage in. The minute teachers suspect any sort of power selling, they’ll back off and you’ll not get them to register for anything.”

Di spoke of “in-fighting” in schools and within the local authority, in terms of which CPD is offered. The local authorities made decisions of which CPD to offer depending on targets and funding and this sometimes conflicted with the type of CPD that was the head teachers’ agenda. She claimed that teachers wanting to engage in CPD need the full support of the head teacher, failure to capture the head teachers’ support meant that for many teachers CPD was, “an uphill battle. I know that sometimes CPD is a low priority, in-fighting and power struggles are common and general bureaucracy is a real barrier.”

Power and power struggles and grappling to give certain agendas dominance over others is raised again here by Di. She attests to knowing that the local authority and schools are often in conflict over CPD, but she also suggests that teachers need the support of the
head teacher in order to ensure access to CPD. Foucault would not be surprised by this, nor by the situations where those in senior and dominant positions can control the agenda for CPD (Danaher et al. 2000).

This theme is continued in the data from the first focus group. One of the participants in the first focus group reported that the head teacher wanted him to take part in a particular course for CPD, that he refused and attended the Masters course, led to him not being funded for his CPD. He claimed that the head teacher would only fund the CPD that the Head wanted the teachers to complete. This generated more discussion around financing CPD. Stuart commented that he was doing this course “under protest” as he felt teachers should not need to do CPD. He felt that the “measure of you as a teacher is more to do with how you work with children and help them to learn, rather than having to learn yourself”, he further suggested that the CPD that was being engaged in here was, “to make sure the local authority and university were hitting their targets” he claims to have been “hard sold” CPD by both the local authority and the university, he felt that this was, “because they are big authorities in themselves, they can monopolise the CPD process.” Some of the others in the group nodded in agreement, and Julie felt that the way in which the CPD was marketed and promoted was very, “aggressive and one dimensional” she felt that the CPD that was being offered and the way in which it is offered does not have the teachers interests at heart, she further suggested that teachers should be able to have “proper study time away from the classroom”, she felt that this has led to, “a lot of my colleagues turning their backs on CPD.”
Paula knew of several teachers who do not intend to engage in any CPD due to the way in which the local authority and University, “work together in collaborating on something that should be focused in school”. She felt that this collaboration is viewed as a “power relation” and teachers “fight against this.” Several other group members agreed with this.

During the second focus group Gary said;

“I don’t think I’d be given the role of mentor if I wasn’t doing a Masters degree. My head teacher more or less told me that I needed to do it, I wasn’t given any choice. And the head has really got you over a barrel as they can so easily make life difficult for you if you don’t agree with what they want.”

One member of the second focus group claimed that when they worked for a school in a neighbouring authority, the head teacher determined the CPD for each of the teachers in the school, rather than the authority. She felt that the authority’s partnership with the university has led to, “a lot of hard feelings and mixed responses to engaging in CPD”. Alan quickly responded that without this partnership the teachers would not have the opportunity to engage with this level of accredited CPD and neither would they benefit from the funding or partial funding that was being experienced.

A discussion at the Cheshire NQT conference focused on the role of the local authority. The participants of the discussion agreed that the local authority was able to influence
the head teachers in some respects with regard to teachers’ CPD, specifically in terms of
the type of CPD that is promoted by the authority. An excerpt from the diary reads;

*The three LA officers were adamant that the LA can influence whether the CPD is focused
on professional skills or on subject specific skills – it seems only when there is a Govt
initiative regarding (i.e. Maths) that subject specific skills are promoted. The advisers felt
that the teachers were being “driven” to registering for something that was being
portrayed as something that they “had to do”, and that they did not have a choice.”*

At the Cheshire SENCO conference the senior SENCO local authority adviser felt that the
university approach in attempting to register teachers for CPD was not appropriate. He
submitted a grievance that the University should not be present at such a conference in
order to register teachers for CPD, despite this being previously agreed between
university faculty managers and Local authority senior advisers. The SENCO adviser felt
that teachers should be given a choice of using the SENCO course as CPD and he felt that
the university and local authority partnership was perceived as domineering and dictating
CPD policy rather that the teachers being able to determine their own CPD. There were
one hundred and twenty teachers present at the conference, twenty six registered for
accredited CPD.

A diary entry from a professional discussion with another head teacher illuminated the
perception of a controlling mechanism. This head teacher asserted that there were other
“more pressing” priorities within the school, that teachers’ CPD was “not an immediate
consideration”. He offered the view that as he was responsible for the, “business of running the school” he would do this in whichever way he felt appropriate. “There is no immediate requirement of me to ensure that my teachers take part in Masters degrees, so they won’t be doing it, simple as that.” And if the teachers themselves wanted to engage he would not support them in terms of time off (cover) or funding.

Contrastingly, a conversation with another head teacher led to them claiming that they would support teachers in taking part in CPD, but only if it involved something that could benefit the school and the school improvement plan. This head teacher said that, “this is where the local authority and university is useful as they can “put CPD courses on that focus on school improvement.” But this poses another argument. In offering CPD courses that benefit the school, the local authority and university may be neglecting the needs and preferences of the individual teachers.

5.4 Professional security, promotion and progression

That gaining qualifications through CPD could support teachers` promotion and progression attempts was a view held by several of my sample. When I asked Debra what influenced her decision to take part in a Masters programme, she said in order to gain progression and/or promotion, she would need to show evidence on her C.V. of professional development and qualifications. Debra felt that by taking part in CPD programmes and obtaining a Masters qualification she was increasing her chances of promotion and gaining managerial positions. She added, “my partners job is not secure,
so I need to do what I can in order to gain maximum opportunities and finance from my
job in case he is made redundant or his hours get cut.”

I then asked if she felt that by taking part in CPD she was helping to secure her position,
she agreed that she was. She said that;

“if I was a head teacher interviewing for a teaching post and two teachers were
going for the same job, let’s say one had a Masters degree and the other teacher
did not, I would give the job to the teacher with the Masters degree as it would
indicate their commitment to the role and if in the future head teachers have to
fund CPD, that teacher would be one less to pay for.”

I asked Mike if there were influences to him engaging in CPD and if so, what these were.
Mike said;

“For career progression. CPD is important if one wants to progress and gain
promotion. It will also hopefully ensure some sort of job security although there is
no guarantee. I would like to be a head teacher one day so I need to be seen to
continue my development. The CPD that is put on through the county is not
accredited and I think if you are doing CPD, you might as well get something for it.
That’s why I’m doing the Post graduate award that leads to the Masters degree. I
think that if you want to get on nowadays, you really need a Masters degree. I’m
not denying that the fact a proportion of CPD is free and then part funded helped
me in deciding to do this programme, although I would probably have taken part
eventually even if had to fund myself. I completed the NPQH, so this meant that I
could APEL the first 60 credits, all I needed to do was complete a reflective essay. I
actually enjoyed doing the NPQH so felt I would like to carry on and make the credits worth something to me.”

The theme of security was continues when I asked Julie what influenced her in registering for the Masters CPD programme. She said;

“I wanted to do something else. There are a lot of NQT’s [newly qualified teachers] about with post graduate qualifications and I wanted to make sure that I was keeping up.”

I asked her to explain this in more detail, Julie told me that she felt she needed to have post graduate qualifications herself. She was concerned that if she did not have at least the same qualifications as the new teachers, her position would be jeopardised. She said that;

“Not many teaching posts come up now – there are very few new opportunities, so I figured that if I wanted to be in with a chance of moving from the school I’m currently in then I need to get something on my C.V.”

Lesley was asked to consider, in her role as CPD Co-ordinator, what she felt to be the main motivators for teachers to engage with CPD She said that, “I think that many teachers see what is happening with school mergers and feel that, in order to give themselves a decent chance at obtaining decent job they need to have something decent on their CV. and I must admit, I think they are absolutely right. There is a lot of competition now for teaching posts, so the better the CV – the more opportunity you
have. That is certainly my own experience, I was given the deputy heads post, I am sure, by the fact that I had done a Masters Degree, there were a lot of good people going for this job, and there could not have been much between us. However, I understand that there were only 2 of us with Masters Degrees and, well, I was offered the post.”

I asked what motivated Lesley to take part in a Masters degree as part of her CPD, she said;

“I did an MSc, but it’s probably more or less the same. Well, I always wanted to be a Head Teacher. From the minute I began my initial teacher training, I wanted to be a Head Teacher, and so, I realised that I would probably need to be continually doing something in order to keep some sustainable development going. My marriage broke down and I realised that I would need to be able to financially support myself, being in teaching earned a reasonable wage, and I could have lived on that. However, I realised that I could kill 2 birds with one stone so to speak, I could give myself a greater potential earning capacity and satisfy my yearning to be a Head teacher. But this would require some serious commitment by myself to study. That was really the driver for me.”

When I asked Di what influenced her decision to engage with CPD, she responded;

“I went to look round a primary school as I had applied for a deputy head’s post and whilst looking round the head teacher started asking me about my CPD, his pro-active approach frightened me off so I realised that if I wanted to progress and go for promotion, I need to do some CPD. The Head said that he insisted all his staff take part in CPD and he would pay for it. I decided that this would be the type of place I would like to work, but not as a deputy head. I have always felt that CPD is a positive thing as it can keep you updated, I was mindful that I could lose
touch with what was going on in the outside world so to speak. I think everybody benefits from CPD – pupils, the teacher, other staff in the school and the organisation, and from a County perspective, the County as a whole. As an adviser, I am asked to advise many schools, mainly on areas of behaviour and low achievement, and I can quite confidently say that the schools where CPD is high on the agenda have far less call for my services or the advice of my colleagues.”

During a discussion with the first focus group, I asked the group how they became engaged in CPD. Maggie said;

“I wanted to do a Masters degree as my role was changing and I needed to be at least as qualified as those who I would be responsible for. My new role will involve me working with teachers who are doing Masters level study, so I thought I`d need to have a Masters degree myself, but if I`m, honest, I don`t know how on earth I`m going to have the time to do it.”

A professional discussion at the Cheshire NQT conference between three teachers and a teachers’ union representative revealed the reason the teachers gave for wanting to participate in accredited CPD was job security, they felt that evidence of participation in CPD would have a positive impact on their CV. “we need to keep on top of the changes in education, if we are going to get promotion either in the school where we work or in another school, we need to show that we have been involved in professional development and training courses.”

That teachers feel compelled to engage in CPD to offer some degree of job security and promotion prospects, suggests that the notion of risk penetrates their thoughts when
deciding whether or not to take part in CPD. The risk of not completing some sort of development programme or gaining a masters degree could have undesirable conclusions. The threat of a loss of identity, i.e. in not, “keeping up with the status of teaching assistants” loss of the chance of promotion and ultimately the loss of occupation seems a very real concern for the teachers in my research. The policy makers (DFEE 2000, DfE 2010) assert that teachers` CPD supports a cohesive development agenda within the school, but the evidence I found of teachers experiencing feelings of loss, danger and risk actually serves to strengthen the “lines of division” (Douglas 1994: 34) within the school.

5.5 Disengaging from CPD

In acknowledging the claim by Arthur et al (2006: 214) that teachers who drop out of, or withdraw from CPD are an, “elusive group to canvas” and in attempting to provide a balanced discussion, I sought the views of a number of teachers in this category as respondents to my research. During observations of a group of teachers during one of the conferences I was able to listen to some of the reasons given by the teachers for them not engaging in any accredited CPD. The following are excerpts taken from my research diary that were recorded immediately following the observation from notes taken during the observation.

“I Can`t afford the time to develop this “portfolio thing”. I need to spend time with my family – my children are more important and need my quality time, they must take my priority.”
“Why should I do any CPD? I don’t need a piece of paper to say that I can do something. You can put whatever spin you like on this at the end of the day – there is no absolute requirement for me to take part in any accredited CPD.”

“Even if we do this accredited CPD and even if we get an MA – it’s all very well, but what will that do for me? Where will I go after that? And what difference will an MA make to me and my teaching? – Nothing.”

“I’m not prepared to pay anything towards my CPD – if the school want me to develop, if the Government want me to do it, then they should pay.”

“If I did any CPD it would only ever be if it was free. But I wouldn’t do it just because it was free.”

“I’m not being pushed into this by the university or the LA. If I do anything it will have to be something based on my subject.”

During the interview with Julie, who had decided to withdraw from the CPD programme, she gave the following explanation;

“I couldn’t get my head around all the terminology, I write how I talk and my assignments were getting returned because I hadn’t written them academically enough.”
When I asked her if she had made use of the university’s student support service, or asked for extra tutorials, she replied;

“I was too busy, what with work and taking on extra duties, when I got home the last thing I wanted to do was extra study.”

I asked her if she felt that she was therefore too busy to take part in CPD. She said;

“I began to wonder why, as a teacher with so much experience, I should have to do more training. If I was that bad, then surely the deputy head or even the head would have pulled me to one side and had a word with me by now. I also wonder if, by us doing CPD we’re not just satisfying the school improvement plan.”

During a professional discussion with several teachers following a partnership meeting, they each felt that their teaching role demanded most of their time. They argued that they did not have sufficient other time to commit to carrying out CPD activities.

Lesley concurred, she felt that many teachers feel that they do not have time for CPD, they feel that they are overworked and that CPD is something that takes up a large proportion of their time. Carol did not engage in any CPD as she felt the workload would be too great;

“Some teachers feel that they are overworked, they feel that they have too much to do and so, as their perception is that CPD takes a lot more time, they do not
buy in to the CPD thing at all. Heavy and increasing workload is the main reason I am given for teachers not doing CPD – on the forms I’ll get something like, “not enough hours in the day” or, “just swamped with the day job”. I always remember an old teacher saying to me “if you want anything doing, ask a busy person” and I think that is absolutely true. It is very easy to claim over work and too busy, but at the end of the day, that is how it is.”

When I asked Carol what influenced her in her decision not to partake in any accredited CPD? She said;

“Why should I do accredited CPD? The credits aren’t really worth anything to me. O.K. you are able to access the MA course with this level of credits, but why would I want a Masters degree anyway? I honestly think that in order to get promotion and secure your job in teaching nowadays, you need to take on as many roles as possible within the school, become the pastoral lead, take responsibility for behaviour for learning and be ready to volunteer for these types of roles, that’s the only thing that gets you noticed, and you can put it on your C.V.”

I asked Carol if she thought that taking on extra roles could be looked at as CPD she responded;

“Yes, but I don’t have to produce anything like I would if I sign up for the accredited programme, I know several of my colleagues are doing some accredited CPD that I think gives them 20 credits, or something towards a Masters degree, but they are just out of their NQT year, young and naive, they do not appreciate the amount of work that they will be needing to do as part of their role anyway, apart from completing the portfolio that they need to do in order to get a Masters Degree. I think the Local authority and University take advantage of the
new, younger teachers who are naive and who are too afraid to say no. They are in a position to be able to convince the NQT’s that CPD is a good thing, that it will matter to them and that they must do it.”

She thought before adding;

“I have heard about the MTL, but how are the Government going to enforce it and police it? They can’t. All the teachers need to do is say “Yeh, O.K. I’m working towards it. I have been to a few training programmes and I’ll write my stuff up when I get time”. It can’t work – it will be another U turn. Why do teachers need a MA anyway? Are they therefore saying that for the past God knows how many years, that the teaching has been substandard because teachers haven’t got a Masters degree? – I doubt it.”

I asked if there was anything specifically that led to her dismissing CPD. She said;

“workload mainly and the principle that teachers should not have to do the accreditation. I don’t want to be coerced into something that is not for my benefit. The local authority is only trying to hit its targets. If we were given dedicated time for study, if the Head would pay for cover for all the staff, say for a day or a couple of days a month, then I think, in fact I’m sure that more teachers would do CPD. I know of several CPD representatives in schools who have tried to arrange certain CPD but, because the Head won’t support it – they have virtually given up. What sort of impression does that give to the teachers who may want to do some CPD?”
A discussion with a deputy head who also held the role of CPD lead in a large secondary school with training school status, revealed that they felt accredited CPD is the only type of CPD that is worth anything to the teachers. She continued to say that most of the teachers within the school “don’t seem to want to engage with CPD”. When asked why she feels this way she thought for a while before saying that she feels their feelings are that they are overworked with their classroom duties and that CPD is perceived as being something extra to what they do during their day-to-day activities.

She also felt that several teachers do not want to do a Masters degree. “They don’t see the point of doing more study – in their minds they are already teachers – they have already qualified as teachers, so why should they do more study?”

But the notions of time constraints were contradicted by Dave, he felt that teachers claim that they are too busy to carry out CPD. “Many teachers perceive that they are too busy, my feeling is that they enjoy “making a point” if they are asked to take on anything extra. I know that they could do CPD if they really wanted to, but they like people to think that they are too busy to do anything other than teach. It seems to be a trait in teaching. I also think that teachers like to talk about how busy they are –between themselves, they are very quick to say that their workload is already full.”

Mike agreed with this, he argued that there are those who are very quick to use the notion that they are too busy to prevent them from having to do any extra study and you
have to say, well at least three managed to do it.” Similarly, Debra said, “I think that teachers give the impression that they are overworked, and this has a knock on affect to how teaching is viewed. Most of my colleagues would say that they have too much to do, that they do not have any time for professional development. I think they would define teachers as being tired and overworked.

Following a professional discussion with two head teachers, I made the following notes in my diary, *Neither head teacher wants to commit to a partnership with the university but instead feels that an “informal” talk in school would be more helpful. They both agreed that they would not be able to release teachers from school and that any CPD that takes place would need to be able to be completed in the school, or in the teachers’ own time. One of the head teachers said that any CPD that teachers did would need to feed back into the school in some way.*

During the first focus group, Stuart said that he thought some of his colleagues didn’t see the point of doing CPD. He said;

“the trouble is, CPD is not something that is important to many teachers. It is easier not to have to do any CPD than it is to have to do it, so teachers will take the easiest option. They will say that they are too busy to do anything other than teach. I personally think this is a very short sighted view, and I think you have to do whatever you need to in order to secure your job and get on.”

Teachers’ non engagement with CPD, either in withdrawing from a CPD programme or from not registering initially seems to be influenced by several factors. Teachers perceive
that it is something extra to their “normal” practice and therefore attached a level of priority and time commitment to CPD that conflicts with their daily practice. Some teachers expressed feelings that CPD was something that was done to the teachers, the concept of autonomous workplace learning or reflecting on their practice was not something that had been communicated to these teachers.

The role of the head teacher and the local authority had some influence on the teachers’ approach to CPD in that, if they felt a decision about their CPD was based on the power role they withdrew or failed to give it any significant priority. That the actions of those in power can act as a disincentive to teachers engaging in post graduate CPD is something that Hustler et al (2003) and Soulsby and Swain (2003) asserted. Furthermore, some head teachers have been a “hindrance” in terms of promising support for CPD then withdrawing the support when other needs of the school are prioritised (Arthur et al 2006).

5. 6 Summary

Teachers’ voices captured in this chapter suggested that these teachers’ professional identity and status was sensitive to changes in the socio-political arena. A chorus emanating from these voices portrayed a sense of teachers’ identity and status being influenced by their continuing professional development and qualification. For some teachers, engaging in CPD seemed to offer some sort of protection and security, for others, it underpinned and strengthened their identity as a teacher.
Similarly, the notion of power and power related interactions seemed to impact on teachers’ decisions of whether or not to engage in CPD. Head teachers, the local authority and university were the perceived source of this power, from which there was some suggestion of hegemony emerging out of the way in which the agenda for CPD was promoted to teachers. These tentative findings are now analysed in theoretical terms in the following chapters.
Chapter six:

Probing CPD through a ‘powerful’ lens

6.1 Introduction:

Though there are many different interpretations offered to the central idea of power, the general view is of a principal having sufficient power to be able to, “make a subaltern do something” (Scott 2006: 127).

In the context that CPD is a pedagogic process that intends to support the development of teachers’ knowledge and practice, this chapter analyses the interface of CPD and Power. In doing so it draws on the work of; Foucault, Gramsci and Apple in illustrating how power is used and in demonstrating counter-hegemonic approaches to the CPD discourse. This chapter also draws on the empirical data presented within the previous chapter in order to discuss in more theoretical depth, the interplay of power on teachers’ thoughts and decisions regarding their CPD.

As I indicated earlier, the current Government is intent on offering head teachers “more control” in deciding how funding for teachers’ CPD is spent (DFE 2010:79). This is seen by the Government as a benefit to schools in that it provides a, “fairer and more transparent” (DFE 2010: 79) model of funding that meets the needs of the pupils. Contrastingly it also provides the opportunity for a disparate model of CPD, in providing
the opportunity for head teachers to be able to prioritise funding according to their individual needs.

My data suggested that the perceptions of power and power relations have something to do with the way in which teachers engage in their CPD. But unpicking these perceptions revealed some nuanced views of power, in so far as the head teachers’ role being seen as a major contributor to the CPD process as a force of encouragement and support for teachers to engage in CPD, but the power wielded by the head teacher was also felt through the way in which the CPD agenda was communicated to teachers and in this way, served as a demotivating factor to some of the teachers.

Tensions arose when the CPD that the head teacher advocated conflicted with that which the individual teachers wanted to participate. In a similar way, the CPD agenda of the local authority and the university also provided a conflict. Further tensions were observed in the way in which CPD was “sold” or promoted to the teacher, and in some cases teachers consent to the CPD that is being offered to them unaware of other alternatives. This chapter considers the way that the workings of power can be seen in terms of how the local authority, university and head teachers can influence the CPD discourse.

In chapter three I alluded to Foucault’s theory of power and how people in positions of power are able to control and define knowledge. Power is used to control people by controlling the knowledge they are exposed to within a particular discourse (Foucault 1969). This can be seen in my study when the local authority, head teachers and
university set the agenda for the type of CPD offered to teachers. The agendas of each of these loci of power seem to have the potential to significantly control and influence the discourse, for example by way of influencing which teachers engage in CPD and what type of CPD is offered, and also by setting conditions and apparent compromises. For instance several of my teachers talk of the head teacher supporting their CPD on the condition that the focus of the CPD is agreed with the head teacher and this was usually focused on a theme relating to school development rather than the teachers’ own preference. In many cases the type of CPD was set by the head teacher and portrayed as the only CPD available to teachers. But Foucault argued that power was able to be adopted by different groups as a means of countering this hegemony, “as far as Foucault is concerned, power functions in terms of the relations between different fields, institutions, bureaucracies, and other groups. What characterises these relations of power is that they are not set in stone. Power can flow very quickly from one point or area or another depending on changing alliances and circumstances” (Danaher et al 2000). Similarly Gramsci declared that hegemony can never be complete as struggles for control will always exist (Slattery 2003).

There were ways in which I saw elements of this kind of counter-hegemony in construction among my teachers. For instance, ... the head teacher attempted to exert some considerable control over Paul’s CPD. Paul alluded to the head teacher having his own agenda for CPD, in requesting that teachers’ CPD feed back into the school improvement plan. So for Paul, the head teacher was displaying power in terms of deciding what type of CPD was accessible. But Paul was determined to take part in CPD
that he felt would benefit himself and so chose to take part in a Masters programme as part of his CPD.

Colin’s head teacher decided which CPD programme would be preferable for Colin to complete. He claimed to have felt “bullied” into carrying out CPD, the nature of which was the head teacher’s choice. He spoke of reaching a compromise with the head teacher. The ‘compromise’ being that the head teacher would support him taking part in CPD that led to a Masters degree providing the work he did fed back into the school. But, viewed from a counter hegemonic perspective there cannot be a compromise in this situation; the head teacher’s role renders the compromise biased towards the head’s position of power (Apple 2000).

The university was also seen as being a source of some significant power, for example, Colin suggested that the University used “strongly persuasive tactics” to enrol teachers onto CPD programmes. He felt that the university was able to control what CPD teachers partook and teachers were made to feel that in order to be adhering to the “norm” they should be taking part in the CPD that was offered by the university.

The university’s agenda was driven by financial reward, in that it could claim funding for each teacher registering for CPD. Promoting the idea of CPD as ‘normal’ practice and obtaining consent from the teachers, is suggestive of the workings of hegemony. “Dominant ideas tend to take on an appearance of naturalness and inevitability that renders them relatively impervious to critique”(Day 2005: 46). According to Gramsci one
of the ways in which such practice can be countered is by demonstrating to people how they are being dominated (Forgacs 1999).

From my sample, the teachers who intentionally chose not to engage in CPD or who withdrew from programmes did so against this powerful agenda that was intended to encourage them to participate. They themselves were exercising a powerful stance in challenging the CPD discourse. Julie said that by doing CPD teachers were just satisfying the school improvement plan. She withdrew from a CPD programme as she felt she should not have to carry out more training. Similarly, a SENCO co-ordinator challenged the local authority and university CPD agenda to the degree of submitting a grievance regarding the type of CPD being promoted and the manner of the promotion, i.e. in presenting CPD as an opportunity at the SENCO conference. The co-ordinator refused to allow the local authority and university representatives to discuss CPD with groups of teachers present at the conference.

6.2 Institutional power

My discussions with Head teachers suggest that they approach the CPD agenda from a managerial perspective. An agenda that is influenced by targets, league tables and audit, as schools are organisations in which the workings of audit and quality assurance and enhancement are displayed more and more (Blandford 2000). Teachers are ‘sold’ the concept of audit as a process that could strengthen job security and assist in the maintenance of teaching posts. However, “audit impinges upon conditions of work and academic career trajectories” (Strathern 2000: 279), which in itself is problematic as the
teachers approach CPD from a personal perspective that is often concerned with career progression and job security.

One strand of the power relations implicit in the use of CPD was to do with different institutional roles and status, to which those of ‘ordinary’ teachers are contrasted with head teachers. My data suggests that the role of the head teacher was significantly influential in terms of teachers’ engagement in CPD as I now discuss.

Dave spoke of the head teachers’ role as being “crucial” in terms of teachers’ CPD. He felt that the head teachers’ priority for CPD would be based on the school improvement plan or OfSTED report. He knew of instances where teachers wanted to take part in accredited CPD to enhance their practice and subject knowledge, but as this did not concur with the improvement plan the head did not support their development.

Similarly Julie referred to her head teacher being able to dictate what activities teachers did in school for their development. In her view the head teacher’s priority for teachers’ CPD was driven by the school improvement plan. She felt that her head teacher enabled the CPD programme to be interpreted by teachers as the only type of CPD available. Paul said his head teacher offered to support him on the condition that his CPD activities and learning were linked to the school improvement plan. Similarly Mike said that his head teacher had an agenda for CPD and this was the agenda for the school, regardless of whether the teachers agreed or wanted to do that type of CPD. In congruence with this,
Di suggested that the “views and perspectives of the head teacher and school management team did influence the teachers’ own views.” She felt that, “encouraging teachers to engage with CPD was a strategy employed by some head teachers in order to adhere to the school improvement plan.” Whilst the audit agenda is demonstrated by the quality assurance processes that include OFSTED inspections and school improvement plans it is also being used as a bargaining tool that benefits the head teacher, it “is a risk reduction practice which benefits the principle because it inhibits the value reducing actions by agents” (Power 1997: 5).

Despite Apple (2000) warning that there cannot be a compromise in such situations where the head teacher will have the power to define the nature of the compromise, my data has revealed that Head teachers do demonstrate a notion of compromise. Dave spoke of himself and his head teacher reaching a “compromise” in terms of support for his CPD, several other teachers were observed discussing the use of compromise in situations where the head teacher had supported their CPD engagement if their development activities were able to feed back into the school in order to provide some progression of the school development plan.

I would argue that by ensuring that their agenda for CPD is seen by teachers as the natural and inevitable CPD activity of the school, head teachers are contributing to what could be seen as a form of hegemony. For Gramsci, people in positions of power do not need to directly impose their values on the less powerful, but rather the less powerful
come to accept the differences in level of power as natural and as a result, consent to the rules directed by those in power. In the same way that Apple (2004: 4) argued that hegemony is used to “saturate” peoples’ conscious thoughts to the extent that the “common sense interpretations” they place on everyday life are driven by the dominant agenda, so my teachers experience similar actions as their managers manipulate their CPD agenda in much the same way.

6. 3 Resisting Hegemony

Such struggles to impose and resist hegemony are specific kinds of power struggle which for Foucault is about the notion of power being elastic and fluid flowing through the ‘river’ of society but being able to be adopted by any actor regardless of position. There are no centres for power that are more important than others. Foucault regarded power as ubiquitous. For Foucault, power operated independently of people. His view was that power is everywhere and that people are the conduits within the discourse through which power flows. Foucault’s power was not something that could be acquired but rather something that is a network that spans everything (Layder 2006).

In keeping with this broad premise, both Paul and Mike spoke of “power fights” and “battles of power relations” between head teachers and the local authorities. Paul said that he knew there had been, “some argument between the head teacher and the local authority advisor to the school, as the head tried to enforce his recipe for CPD and this conflicted with the CPD that the LA wanted us to do.” He added that, “the head teacher
was just flexing his muscles, but at the end of the day, he’s paying my wages, so it is
difficult to argue against what he wants.” Mike said that he knew that relationships
between several head teachers and the local authority were very strained and he felt that
this was due to “power struggles.” In most schools the Head teachers want to have the
final say over the CPD of staff, but the LA do try to influence what CPD the staff will do.
He was aware of many occasions that this has led to arguments and frustrated head
teachers. He thought the head teachers feel that they know what CPD is best for
teachers, and this is affected by the needs of the school.

Mike knew of some county advisers and head teachers who felt that this has led to
teachers being “hard sold” and “pushed into” CPD that they wouldn’t naturally want to
do. Goodson(2003: 31) argued that, “teachers become divorced from what might be
called the vernacular of power, the ways of talking and knowing, which then becomes the
prerogative of managers.” Managers of schools and local authority officials are seen by
some of the teachers as being in possession of some sort of power. This power ‘resource’
is the focus of challenge and tensions as each attempt to exhibit their own agenda for
CPD.

There was also some suggestion that the LA and university create challenges for teachers
in terms of how they collaborate together and with schools on teachers’ CPD. Mike said
that teachers’ CPD, “has got to steer round the power struggles that take place between
the head teacher and the LA and university.” He felt that the, “head teacher needs to be
able to assert his authority over this, or else the teachers could be gaining better
qualifications than him.” He added that, “head teachers like to manoeuvre themselves to
be in the driving seat and they will make sure the LA and University knows this.” Mike was
aware of several head teachers who felt that they knew what type and level of CPD was
preferable for their staff. However this did, in many cases conflict with the type of CPD
being promoted by the local authority and university. He said that there were many
occasions when he was, “doing some teaching for the local authority on INSET courses,
and heard head teachers telling local authority advisers that the teachers would only be
able to take part in a certain type of CPD regardless of whether this was the CPD that the
teachers or the LA wanted to do.” Paul suggested that the local authority feels it needs to
justify itself as an authority and the head teachers feel that they are, “too important to be
dictated to by the local authority.”

In a similar way, Lesley spoke of the local authority perspective for CPD not being shared
by the head teacher of the school, “yet the local authority still feels it needs to muster in
on what the schools are doing.” She felt that this was unhelpful as it disrupted the agenda
for CPD within the school. Paul said that he felt there were “tensions and issues” between
the county priorities for the LA and the priorities of the schools. He felt that this was due
to targets. He is under the impression that the LA had different CPD targets than the
schools, and this results in “quite a power fight,” he told me that he found this, “quite
funny to watch really as neither feels they should back down.” Paul feels that “it is sad
really, because the teachers are caught up in the middle of this, of all this bureaucracy,”
he further added that both the head teacher and senior management teams in schools
feels they are, “too important to be dictated to by the LA, and the LA feel as important in justifying their role as an authority.”

Power struggles between head teachers and local authority advisers can be seen in the vying for position in terms of who can domineer the CPD agenda. Apple (2004:61) maintains that “schools exist through their relations to other more powerful institutions that are combined in such a way as to generate structural inequalities of power.” Some of my teachers used the terms “coercion” and “bullying” when speaking of how they were encouraged to engage in CPD. Rose (1998:113) considers coercion as a “negative practice of control” and is seen it the way in which those in power “seek to control or repress subjectivity,” whilst Wallace and Hall (1997) found that head teachers, in using their access to power, employ “overt and covert strategies” in controlling staff in the management of schools. This access to power has been somewhat fuelled by the change to the way in which teachers CPD is funded.

6.4 Funding for CPD

The issue of finance and funding is significant to the debate on teachers’ CPD as until recently, teachers could complete post graduate CPD at no cost to themselves. Under the previous Labour Government, teachers’ post graduate CPD was funded by the Government via the Higher Education Funding Council and the Training and Development Agency. At the time of gathering the data, teachers could access Masters level CPD at no cost to the teacher. However during the latter stages of the research, the funding for
teachers CPD was redirected to schools and as yet, not ring-fenced exclusively for CPD.
The availability of funding created an opportunity for universities and local authorities to establish an agenda for teachers’ CPD, but these opportunities were seen by some as being driven by maximising finances as the universities were able to claim funding from central Government for each teacher registered on a CPD programme.

This funding situation led to some of my teachers questioning the incentive of these organisations. Julie said that she was aware that the LA was in partnership with the university and this led to the MA being part-funded yet, she had investigated doing another programme with another university and was told that she would have to pay for the course herself. The way in which the funding model worked in the university in this study resulted in every CPD registration attracting £895.00 per student. The university was able to claim this funding whether or not the teachers completed the CPD programme. This funding model was seen by some of my teachers as having the potential to benefit the university (in terms of having collected the funding it need do nothing more) at the expense of the teachers’ development opportunities. So the new funding model introduced by the Conservative Government in 2010 (DfE 2010) of funding being channelled directly into schools would be able to overcome this, or would it?

Reflecting on an interesting discussion that took place at a head teachers regional meeting in October 2010, I was aware that some head teachers are quite adamant that any money coming into school not ring-fenced for a specific action, would just form part
of the schools general budget and will be utilised as per the management priorities, which offers challenges to several aspects of CPD.

That the funding allocation is decided by each individual head teacher, will provide a parity dilemma in that some schools provide funding for teachers’ CPD, whilst others may not. Teachers working within the schools that do not could therefore find it difficult to access CPD.

In having control of finances the head teacher is able to demonstrate control in terms of “maximising an organisations value” (Power 1997: 41). There was some notion that controlling finances provided head teachers with a way of controlling the teachers’ actions. Both Lesley and Paul felt that there was little to be gained in challenging the head teacher as they controlled the budget and made the financial decisions for the school.

6.5 Teachers’ own choice of CPD

Although my research has indicated that the head teacher, local authority and university can influence the type and subject of CPD offered to teachers, there was one example where the head teacher did support teachers to engage in their own choice of CPD activity. Mike encouraged all the staff within his school to engage in accredited and award bearing CPD. He felt that, “whatever CPD teachers were engaged in extended their knowledge and as a result would impact positively in the school.” This model of
management was lauded by the TDA (2004: 6). It recognised the significance of this style of management in revealing that: “the level of support given by head teachers...is a major factor determining the extent to which participants are able to implement initiatives in their schools which arise from the CPD courses (TDA 2004).

Supporting the teachers’ own choice of CPD was something that Debra alluded to, she said that her head teacher fully supported her choice of CPD that would lead to a Masters degree “even though it didn’t feed directly into the school plan, it was what I wanted to do as it would benefit my practice.” She added that as a result of the head teacher supporting her she felt motivated to do well. Similarly, from the head teachers perspective, Alan said that he was, “happy for all the teachers in his school to take part in whatever CPD they would prefer to do” as they “are more likely to be successful if they are motivated by the subject.”

However, I found that there was a significant disparity in the ways in which different schools offer support to teachers when carrying out their own choice of CPD. My findings were corroborated in that some schools encourage classroom based research and “enable teachers to explore and extend their studies through research... whereas other schools show little or no interest in the teachers’ own choices” (Arthur et al 2006: 215).

That my study is conceptualising CPD as an award bearing pedagogic process that teachers engage with in order to develop their knowledge. And that the university CPD modules are concerned with teachers critically reflecting on their own practice offers
some support to the debate regarding the teachers’ own choice of CPD having a significant benefit to the successful completion of an award. However if the CPD process is to be driven by teachers’ own choices of CPD themes and topics, it seems that this will provide a significant implication for the ways in which the local authorities, universities and head teachers either work alone or collaborate on CPD programmes.

6.6 Stake-holding organisations

Both local authorities in this research had formed strategic partnerships with the university in order to provide accredited CPD for teachers. The local authorities’ rhetoric focussed on how the CPD they offered would advantage and benefit the teachers who engaged, and it is evident, from talking to teachers that many agreed with this approach as they took part in the CPD offered by the authority and the partnership.

However, many teachers did not agree. For instance Colin felt that the local authority were, “under the same illusion as the university,” in assuming that teachers want to take part in CPD. He stressed that this “simply is not the case.” He said, “the LA tries to be very dictatorial over CPD” he said that the LA “tries to domineer and pressure people into doing CPD,” he knew of several colleagues who “felt pressurised into registering for accredited professional development last year.” He felt that there could be some financial benefit to the school or the authority themselves, “or perhaps they too had targets to achieve, maybe they needed a certain number of teachers to engage with CPD.”
Similarly, Dave felt that the local authority, “has its own agenda for teachers CPD and doesn’t listen to what the teachers want or need.” He knew of several colleagues and teachers from other schools, who had registered for an accredited local authority CPD course. Following which, they had neither completed anything for the course, nor been followed up by the local authority. He said that this had been an issue for all the teachers who had registered and also for those other teachers who knew about this situation. He spoke of these teachers being “put off doing CPD” due to the way in which the authority had acted.

Some teachers seemed to be put off CPD if they felt pressured into registering for CPD programmes, Dave knew of several colleagues and teachers from other schools who had, “deliberately not engaged in CPD as they felt coerced into it.” He explained that many teachers believe there are coercion and power tactics exercised by the local authority and university which led them to, “dig their heel in... as they do not generally respond well to direction.” Similarly, Mike spoke of an unclear vision for teachers’ CPD as each organisation would have a different incentive and agenda for teachers engaging in CPD. He felt there were conflicts of interests in terms of the different organisations dominating the agenda according to their priorities. He was aware that the local authority had Government targets to meet in terms of teachers CPD, and he was also aware that the university had a financial incentive to teachers engaging in accredited CPD.

There were some conflicts in terms of the CPD agenda from within the local authority, for example, Di said that she was aware that the local authority, “liked to promote a certain
agenda for CPD” and that this agenda was, “put across as being the only programme available.” She said that she knew of “other advisers who strongly disagreed with the way in which the LA dictates what CPD the teachers` can access, and these advisers refused to promote the LA agenda.” Some advisers were aware of this approach and attempted to neutralise the situation by intentionally boycotting any promotion of CPD programmes.

From a school management perspective, Lesley said that the LA`s input could be unhelpful as its agenda for teachers was often in conflict with that of the school. She gave an example of one situation where a senior local authority adviser wanted the school to engage in a leadership and management programme for teachers that was accredited by the university, and therefore offered Masters level credits for all the teachers who participated. She said that the adviser had a “hidden agenda” in that the partnership (the university and the local authority) would benefit financially from the teachers` engagement in the leadership and management course.

A similar conflict between schools and the LA was suggested by Di. She said that she “works with many schools where the head teachers say they want us [LA] to support them with CPD, but when it comes down to it, they don`t want us at all, they have their own ideas and these have no bearing on what the LA can offer.” She said that she felt, “some teachers are disadvantaged because the head teacher won`t share with them the LA programme for CPD.” Di told me of one school where the, “head teacher wanted all the teachers in the school to take part in CPD focussing on assessment for learning” but the LA had been, “working on a CPD package focussing on languages as the school had
been experiencing challenges as a result of an influx of Polish children, and it was felt that the teachers within the school would be best supported by development opportunities around developing their knowledge of languages.” Di gave the example of a senior adviser issuing a directive that the school curriculum advisers should ensure that, “as many teachers as possible register for a languages Post Graduate Diploma”. She felt that this was due to there being some collaboration between the LA and the university regarding the languages course. “But the reality is teachers and head teachers simply might not want it.” She further argued that, “if we (the LA) are seen as being so dictatorial over this, the schools and the teachers within them will just stop listening to us and it could be to their detriment in the long term.”

6.7 The nuances of power

There were some indications that power is also used in the relationship the university has with teachers’ CPD. The university was seen by several teachers responding to my research as being in a position of strong persuasion and coercion, which seemed to be more obvious through the partnership with the local authority and in the way in which teachers were encouraged to register and enrol for CPD programmes. The university agenda for teachers’ CPD was primarily driven by targets and funding as it was able to draw funding for CPD if it achieved a TDA target number of registrations. Whilst the University rhetoric focused on accredited CPD being advantageous for teachers and supporting them in their quest for progression and promotion, some teachers perceived that the university influence was overly powerful.
Some of the interpretations of power seemed to be emphasised in situations where the university was working closely with the local authority. When the two organisations came together and promoted a shared agenda for CPD, this seemed to turn the teachers’ away from engaging in CPD as they were demotivated by their perception of power that this collaborative partnership held. At a newly qualified teachers conference, a representative of a teachers union approached me and told me that the university and LA were, “asking too much of teachers – they already have enough to do in their NQT year without putting the extra pressure of accredited CPD on them,” they then asked me what was the point of accredited CPD and why should teachers need to be Masters. The union representative reiterated this point by saying “I think the LA and University are pushing them too hard.” So what is seen by some as a shared agenda for teachers’ CPD is interpreted by others as a competing agenda.

6.8 The CPD Language

The use of language featured as a contributing factor of several discussions I observed. At a group discussion following the conference, I spoke to Pat – a deputy head teacher of a large secondary school, who offered the following, “the trouble with this, with the LA and university and the TDA, is they talk in a different language to us on the grass roots of teaching. Schools like mine will just get marginalised again- I’ll go back to my staff and tell them that the TDA and university now expect them to be doing research as part of their CPD and they’ll just tell me – when do you expect us to do that? when do we get the
time to do that? - It’s about time you (the university) realised that you are isolating those schools that need the most help." I asked if teachers felt that they were carrying out CPD and/or research as part of their everyday practice. She said; “no, that’s exactly what I am trying to say, you are looking at CPD from an academics point of view, teachers are not academics, that is exactly the problem, teachers do not see themselves as academics or researchers and by talking to them in academic speak we further alienate them.” For Foucault, a key component of a discourse is the language used within the common practices that go to making up that discourse (Rabinow 1984). But Foucault also recognised that where different discourses support and overlap, they also conflict (Danaher et al 2000).

I was struck by Pat’s reference to “academic speak” and the way in which she vociferously drew a distinction between the language used by the university tutors and the teachers. But this has some resonance with what Bernstein (1971) referred to as a linguistic code. Although the perception of a school language might not be restricted in terms of the manner in which Bernstein advocated, it is apparent that the language used by the university or “academic speak” is, as it is not easily understandable by others.

What seemed significant to me when talking to Pat and engaging in discussions within her peer group, was that several head teachers and school managers appeared keen for teachers to be able to develop professionally, but at a pace and within an environment in which they feel teachers can better relate (rather than the university). These head teachers were arguing for the voice of teachers to be heard in terms of what type of CPD was appropriate and for the university to better recognise time constraints.
6.9 Summary

There are some notions that the local authority, university and head teachers, vie for ideological supremacy of CPD in dominating the agenda by employing tactics that hint at hegemony. Some teachers seemed to recognise this and react against it and are therefore perceived by some (particularly those in the more powerful roles) as difficult and dissenting. But the way in which power is both wielded and felt, is something to do with how teachers and head teachers see themselves both within the school and by the wider society. For Foucault, identities are formed by, “discourses or ways of representing knowledge about people and their behaviour” (Scott 2006: 148). The following chapter discusses the notion of identities in more depth.
Chapter seven:

Status and identity as an influence on CPD

7.1 Introduction:

The previous chapter suggested that the powerful actors within the discourse of teachers` CPD; the local authorities, the university and head teachers are able to affect the discourse of CPD in a hegemonic manner. Some of the teachers in my research seem to recognise this but without referring to hegemony as such. They react against it by dismissing CPD. But what seemed clear to me whilst observing teachers was that the way in which they perceived this power and hegemony had something to do with the way they saw themselves as teachers and how they contrasted their identity with the identity of other professionals within the school.

The teachers` voices suggest that the ways in which teachers think about CPD has something to do with the way that they see their professional identity and status as a teacher. The teachers sense that this identity and status is hampered by political innovation and changes to policy. The policy documentation discussed in chapter 2 (DES 1985, DfEE 1997, DfEE 1998, DfEE 2001, DfES 2005, DCSF 2008, DCSF 2009, DCSF 2010, DFE 2010) led me to infer that the issue of identity might have some impact and influence on teachers` CPD. The teachers` views corroborate this, for example some teachers felt
that the identity of teaching would benefit from teachers gaining a Masters level qualification and several respondents felt that by taking part in CPD they were assuring themselves of a particular professional identity.

In drawing on the discussions from the two earlier chapters, this chapter probes in a more theoretical way into the interface of status and identity and teachers’ engagement with, and thoughts about, their professional development. For Foucault, identities are realised by ways of representing knowledge about people and their behaviour (Scott 2006) or within their discourse. In this sense, identity is not constructed, but rather is dependent on some other.

Teachers’ identities are developed partly from the qualifications gained from initial teachers training and partly by the way in which teachers locate themselves within the social space that is the school (Coldron and Smith 1999). This view was echoed in the thoughts of the teachers responding to this study. Several were concerned with how they were ‘seen’ both by colleagues, managers and other educational professionals as well as by the wider society. But this professional identity is hampered through a challenge to the autonomy of teachers (Hargreaves 2000). For the teachers in my research this challenge is emanating from the head teacher, the local authority and the university by the ways I which each sets the agenda for development opportunities. My teachers have indicated that this feeling of loss of autonomy in being able to select their own CPD has led to them reflecting on their own professional identity.
The way in which teachers view themselves and develop and maintain their identity is linked to the level of commitment by teachers to the profession. (Ball and Goodson 1985). This chapter seeks to uncover the ways in which teachers ideas about CPD are informed by their perceptions of their professional identity.

### 7.2 Shifting notions of identity

Several of the teachers spoke of how teaching and teachers were viewed by society in the past. Many expressed the opinion that in the immediate post war years, the teaching profession was well respected by the community and teachers were held in high regard by the public. McEnzie (2001: 5) argued that, “teachers experienced a relatively comfortable educational environment, with high status in communities that respected them as autonomous professionals...although this positive image conceals a mass of educational problems, education was under a warm and pleasant spotlight rather than the heat and glare experienced in more recent years.”

Colin agreed with this, he felt that years ago teachers had a high profile and status within society, he spoke of the village school mistress living in the school house and being well respected in the community. He also spoke of his own teachers being “looked up” to and respected by his own parents. This is supported by Lowe (1993) who argued that from 1944 to the mid 1970’s teaching experienced something of a “golden age,” in which children and parents were expected to trust the professionals and accept that teachers
knew what was best for their children. Colin felt that teachers today do not hold any sort of status within society, he talked of a lack of respect for the teaching profession from society in general and he equated this with a decline in teachers’ motivation and commitment to the profession.

Similarly, Di felt that teachers of the past were less qualified than teachers today yet were apparently held in higher regard by the community. But this is in conflict to the views of Gardner (1995) who found that in the early 20th Century teachers felt that it was essential to obtain certification through development and qualification, failing to achieve certification rendered the teaching profession inferior to other related professions. Di suggested that CPD and teacher qualification could play a part in raising the status of teaching. She felt that there are still opportunities for teachers to raise their own professional identity and added that in order to do this they would need to embrace and engage with accredited CPD.

Malcolm lamented that, while teachers were, “once the pillar of the community,” this is not the case of teachers today. He went on to suggest that there is now “a lack of respect for the teaching profession and professional status of teachers. If you say you are a teacher, people think – so what?” This view is corroborated by McKenzie (2001) who argues that public opinion of teaching has changed considerably over the past fifty years to the point now where teaching has experienced a loss of status and respect within the
community. She further questions whether the term “professional” remains appropriate
when referring to teaching.

Julie echoed this feeling of a shift in status; “the teaching profession holds little status in
society now, if a teacher asked a class to be quiet 10 years ago, the chances are the class
would be quiet, if a teacher asks a class to be quiet now the children want to know why
they should and how the teacher is going to make them.” She attributed this change to
the way in which the teaching profession is viewed by society, “no one respects the
teacher nowadays, nor respects their training and professionalism.” She thought that this
was a contributing factor for a drop in status of teaching and added that CPD does not
necessarily equate to a high level of professionalism, or any sort of status. She has two
colleagues who did not have a first degree, as they did their initial teacher training before
teachers needed a degree, she felt that they were very good teacher.

There is a sense that teachers’ status and identity was different in the past to what it is
today. This seems to be something to do with how teachers were, and are seen by society
and is reflected in the political and managerial changes to the teaching profession.

“Teachers experienced a high status in communities that respected them as autonomous
professionals and had faith in their ability to determine the curriculum” (McKenzie 2001:
4). Some of my teachers talked of status when considering the notion of identity and in
doing so, placed a value on their perception of the status of teaching in the past to what it
is today.
Changes in the social and political climate create a landscape where retrospective and prospective identities merge to form professional identity (Bernstien 2000). Retrospective identities use narratives from the past in order to provide a rationale and exemplar for the present and the future. Whilst prospective identities are concerned with the future and in particular in, “recontextualising selected features from the past to stabilise the future through engaging in contemporary change” (Bernstein 2000: 68).

Changes to educational policy have led to changes within the discourse of education as the full impact of the political changes are realised in schools. My teachers felt that the level and incidence of change has increased significantly and they felt that this has had an influence on how they view their role and identity and also how the role of the teacher is seen by others. McKenzie (2001: 100) argued that, “changes have been so profound that... teachers have lost much of the relative status, affluence and job security that they could take for granted fifty years ago.” These feelings of loss and risk, for example to job security and identity are echoed in the views of many of the teachers in my sample.

7.3 Threat and risk

The processes by which teachers construct their own identities seem to be influenced by situations and agendas that are perceived as risks and threats to this identity, for example the increase in teaching assistant with higher level teaching assistant status. If “each culture is designed to use dangers as a bargaining weapon” (Douglas 1994: 62) then it is little wonder that in today’s society ...the individual has become more reflective,
disciplined and controlled in managing risk (Beck 1992 cited in Slattery 2003: 257). This would seem to be what the teachers are doing in my research when they allude to taking part in CPD programmes for the purpose of obtaining an award that sets them apart from other professionals.

7. 4 Teaching assistants: a threat and risk to the teachers’ own identity?

The developing role of the teaching assistant seems to have an impact on the way in which teachers view their own professional identity. Teaching assistants’ access to structured and accredited professional development and the expectation that local authorities and universities engage in whole-school workforce professional development (Fullan and Hargreaves 1992), has influenced some teachers in the way in which they approach their own CPD. For example, some teachers felt that the professional status of teaching assistants has changed to the point where some teaching assistants are challenging the teachers’ role.

For some teachers this is posing a significant threat to their identity as a teacher. To counter this threat, they have engaged in Masters degree programmes as part of their accredited CPD in order that they afford themselves a form of separate identity. A group of secondary teachers commented during a professional discussion that they felt, “as if teaching assistants were catching them up and snapping at their heels.” The reason many of these teachers gave for taking part in a Masters degree was that they were aware that
teaching assistants were completing foundation degrees, after which they were planning to top up to a Bachelors’ degree.

One particular teacher said “what then? They’ll probably be doing post graduate teaching qualification and before we know where we are, they will be the teachers. Another group of teachers spoke of wanting to maintain a “professional distance” between themselves and teaching assistants. Colin felt that the teaching assistants’ identity had changed significantly over the past few years, he felt that teaching assistants in the past were used mainly to support the children in the classroom with practical tasks, with the teacher always having charge of the class. Teaching assistants’ didn’t have access to the level of training that they now have. He said that, although this had not happened in his school he was aware that in primary schools teaching assistants occasionally take the lesson. He feels that the change in status of teaching assistants’ has had a mixed reaction from teachers. He is aware that some of his colleagues have intimated that they are feeling quite threatened by this. Malcolm felt that the identity of teaching assistants varied from school to school, he spoke of how the teaching assistants viewed their practice, how their role was viewed by other educational professionals and society in general, he felt that teaching assistants’ training and professional development led to the role experiencing an increase in profile compared to what it used to be.

Mike said that he has noticed a, “massive increase in the self esteem and confidence” of most teaching assistants, largely due to the change in their role. He said that he had
noticed a real “upbeat trend” in teaching assistants, a feeling that he compared to that which was experienced by the teaching profession 10-15 years ago. He said that he felt he could also speak for many of his teaching colleagues in saying that the teaching assistant is much more than a teaching assistant.

He viewed the developing role of the teaching assistant as a threat to his own role. He told me that this was evident when teaching assistants were beginning to do foundation degrees. Paul felt that any professional distance between teachers and teaching assistants was being eroded by the way in which teaching assistants were developing. He posed the question; “who is going to do the teaching assistants job when they are all taking classes?” Maclure (1993) asserted that identity is a non-stable entity and rather than something ascribed to a person it is something which is used, for example to, “justify, explain and make sense of themselves in relation to others” (Maclure 1993: 312). Mike and Paul alluded to this position on identity but Mike took the stance that the non-stable view of identity poses a threat rather than offering him the option of making sense and explanation. The tensions between the roles of teachers and teaching assistants seem to have manifested as a result of the change in identity and status of the teaching assistant role. This is running counter to the claim that the “new professionalism” of teaching is underpinned by a shift from the traditional practices of teacher authority and autonomy, towards a culture of working collaboratively with colleagues and negotiation of roles and responsibilities Hargreaves (1994).
In contrast to these views there were several teachers who were happy at the development of teaching assistants. At a group discussion during a teacher training session one teacher said, “let them get on with it if they want to, they’re welcome to it, I’d just like to know where they are getting the time from.” Another teacher felt that she was “only too pleased that teaching assistants are taking more responsibility and having more of a teaching role,” as it “took the pressure off her.” There was some evidence from several schools that I visited throughout this research that there are CPD activities taking place in schools that involve teachers and teaching assistants working and learning together. One teacher involved in such activity told me that she felt that working and learning together strengthened the team ethos and led to a better understanding of each other’s roles. A view that chimes with the Government’s agenda for remodelling the school workforce (Graves 2008) and which draws on the notions of communities of practice. “There is a profound connection between identity and practice. Developing a practice requires the formation of a community whose members can engage one another” Wenger (1998: 149).

But for Foucault identity manifests through the discourse within which the identity is composed. It is done so not independently but in situating the self in respect to others (Edgar and Sedgewick 1999). My teachers are forming their own identity as teachers within the landscape that also features the identity of other professionals and they are placing a value on their own identity as a result. They place themselves in a certain, often subaltern position in relation to the head teachers and other powerful stakeholders and likewise they regard their identity in relation to that of teaching assistants.
7.5 Generational considerations

According to some of the teachers in my research, teachers’ professional identity is influenced by the age of the teacher. Sikes (1985: 27) argued that “schools as social systems are affected and influenced by the processes occurring in them...the aging of members is but one of these processes.” Pat felt that the, “older teachers in her school were very difficult to motivate to engage in any form of CPD... They just want to coast slowly to retirement, why would they want to take part in any extra CPD work?”

This would seem not to be reflected in Malcolm’s view. He suggested that teachers aged thirty to thirty five and above view CPD differently than younger teachers, he further explained that teachers in the older aged group (and he placed himself in this group) were more likely to view teaching as a profession that is well regarded and respected and therefore is perceived by society as having quite a high status. His view is that younger teachers are not impressed by professional bodies and qualifications, they view teaching as, “just a job – something that pays the mortgage and bills,” and he also felt that they are less likely to be interested in promotion, as very few express interest in gaining a headship or even deputy head ships. Many of his younger colleagues didn’t think that they needed to do any CPD, they had completed their initial teacher training and many thought that they shouldn’t need to do anything further, “they feel their job is to teach and that is what they intend to do - just teach.” It is Malcolm’s view that younger teachers do not see the potential or importance of CPD.
In contrast to Malcolm’s view, Lesley commented that there are, “quite a few very keen young teachers – those in their first couple of years of teaching who think they must do as much CPD as they can. They will also ask about CATS points and what the CPD is worth. Younger teachers or those in the early stages of their career are more motivated to do accredited programmes, they want to take part in CPD that has a value. The more senior staff seem less bothered about accredited CPD – to the point that they view it with suspicion.” Her view is that the older staff feel that they have been teaching for years, and therefore feel somehow insulted by being asked to take part in CPD that awards them credits. Age is a determinant of career progression for teachers as many senior teachers are often, “juggling multiple job roles and arguable multiple identities” (Forde et al 2006: 145).

Debra had experienced some negativity from older colleagues to her CPD. She had discussed her CPD with several teacher colleagues at her school and three of the older teachers tried to persuade her not to “waste time” with CPD. Arthur et al (2006) described the teachers responding to their research as either “eager youngsters” or “older reflectors” in view of the fact that the age profile of teachers engaged on the Masters degree in their study were either at the younger or older end of the spectrum. Their study found that 74% of teachers engaging in CPD were in their first 10 years of teaching but the actual age of the teachers was not reported.
Teachers’ age and the length of time they have been teaching seems to have some significance to the ways in which they view their identity as and has some impact on how they view CPD (Coldron and Smith 1999), but there are mixed messages in my research in terms of how the age of the teachers is reflected in the way they perceive CPD. It is not possible to declare a correlation between teachers’ age and the way they engage in CPD activities despite aging, occupational development and identity being inextricably linked (Sikes 1985).

7.6 Audit

One of the ways in which teachers’ identity is affected by a social construct is illuminated in the use of organisational practices (Coldron and Smith 1999), an example of which is inspection and audit. External and internal audit contribute to the ways in which teachers view their identity and also the ways in which they perceive they are seen by society. Paul argued that the lack of status of teaching could be attributed to league tables and published OFSTED reports, many of which served to spotlight some schools as failing or less than adequate. He felt that this, “has a knock on effect to how the public view teachers.” For example, he suggested that teachers working in a school that had a, “less that outstanding” OFSTED inspection grade, were seen by many members of the community as a bad teacher.

Several teachers responding to my research felt overawed by inspection targets and audits. One teacher spoke of teachers’ roles changing in particular with respect to having
much more responsibility and accountability, in particular in terms of “being driven by league tables,” and although he related this to adding to the professional status of teachers, felt that not all teachers were ready to accept this change to their role.

Addressing performance indicators, standards and audit is to do with being an effective bureaucrat and being able to manage targets and it is generally demoralising to teachers Mahony and Hextall (2000). This view would concur with many of the views of teachers observed and interviewed for this study, in that performance and league tables have served to establish a competitive marketplace in which head teachers strive to compete with others in order to attract pupils and students Mahony and Hextall (2000).

But as an instrument of accountability, it is difficult to argue against the principle of audit as it, “advances values that academics generally hold dear such as responsibility, openness about outcomes and widening of access”( Strathern 2000:3), which would support the notion of emancipation and empowerment. However, my teachers did not interpret the practice of audit as something which enhanced their identity or that served to create a positive view of teaching to society in general.

7. 7 Qualifications and promotion

Being able to claim an award on completion of a CPD programme seems to be a contributing factor for many teachers engaging in that particular programme of CPD.
Some of my teachers felt that by achieving a post graduate qualification they were able to maintain an identity that offered some distinction from teaching assistants. Others agreed that in obtaining a Masters degree they were somehow affording themselves some professional security.

OfSTED report that accredited CPD increases the teachers’ confidence. This is supported by several teachers from my study. One of whom said that she had not appreciated the extent to which her confidence would increase. She engaged in school based CPD and carried this on to progress to the Masters degree. It was the increase in confidence that led to her applying for, and being successful in obtaining a deputy head position.

Similarly, a teacher speaking at a conference felt that engaging in post graduate CPD to Masters degree helped improve her confidence when in staff and management meetings, she felt that she interacted much more assertively as a result of growing her knowledge.

Di was engaged on a Masters degree programme, she felt that there are still opportunities for teachers to raise their own professional status and identity, and added that in order to do this they would need to embrace and engage with accredited CPD. The study carried out by Arthur et al (2006: 206) found that the majority of teachers investigated for their research said that it was either “important” or “very important” that the CPD in which they were involved, led to an award.” This is in congruence with the agenda from the previous Labour Government, it identified that the introduction of the Masters in teaching and learning will, ” boost the status of the teaching profession still
further and bring us into line with the highest performing education systems in the world” (DCSF 2008). The introduction of the MTL qualification for, (in the first instance) NQT’s, offered an indication of where accredited CPD sat within policy. The previous Labour Government claimed;

The best teachers, school leaders and support staff constantly seek to improve and develop their skills and subject knowledge. Ongoing engagement in effective CPD is at the heart of our plans for unlocking the talent of the school workforce...a key part of this is our ambition that teaching should become a Masters level profession (DCSF 2008).

Several other respondents felt that introducing a Masters degree for teachers was a positive move, that teachers see the Masters degree as a qualification that can “increase the status of teaching.” Dave said that although it is no guarantee that doing the MA will provide job security and promotion, he felt that by doing a Masters degree it would give him a “better chance over other teachers who are not doing any CPD.” Colin’s experience was quite different, he felt that his head teacher did not want him to do a Masters degree but instead focus on non- accredited CPD that was being carried out in the school. Malcolm on the other hand was completing a Masters degree at the time he gave a response to this research. His reason for taking part in Masters level CPD was, he felt that not having a Masters degree had led to him being unsuccessful at three deputy head interviews.
Lesley felt that teachers have a better chance for promotion if they have carried out CPD and obtained higher qualifications. She felt that if she had not obtained a Masters degree she would not have been successful in obtaining the deputy heads post. She went on to say that the reason for her engaging with CPD and obtaining an MSc, was that she was keen to get promotion and develop professionally. She felt that promotion depended on her obtaining higher qualifications.

Debra offered the following view to engaging with CPD; “I decided to take part in a Masters Degree as part of my CPD as I feel that it will increase my chances for progression and promotion. I realise that as the childhood population decreases the school roles are falling, we are already seeing this in the co-location of some schools and the closing of others. I want to try to do everything I can to get promotion and to progress, and hopefully provide some sort of security for myself.” So it seems that teachers who complete CPD and gain some kind of award attribute this to providing a sense of job security or promotion which resonates with the argument that teachers who complete an award feel they have, “gained new and specific skills, knowledge and understanding” (Soulsby and Swain 2003 :7).

From a head teacher’s perspective, Mike reported that many of his teachers were taking part in CPD programmes that were accredited and would therefore upon successful completion, obtain a Masters degree. He went on to say that he felt teachers need to be involved in this type of CPD in order to maintain a professional identity that is “held in
some sort of regard by the public.” A significant argument given that, “public accountability is increasingly more visible in league tables and inspections and media coverage” (Campbell et al 2000: 17).

However, there are contradictions to this as many teachers and head teachers fail to give credence to the necessity for an award. These teachers feel that the identity of teachers is not affected by post graduate qualification. A secondary school teacher who had withdrawn from an accredited CPD programme felt that she did not need to carry out any accredited CPD as she had been successfully teaching for twenty years and on no occasion has she had a bad appraisal or report. She felt that her professional status as a teacher is not influenced by the qualification she has, nor the development with which she participates.

A teacher who was a head of department in a large secondary school informed a group of colleagues that “teachers are not looked at any differently because they have a Masters degree,” he gave his own case as an example, and said that he was not treated or looked at any differently because he was doing an MA. He added that: “it doesn’t matter what CPD I or anyone else does, it will not affect the way in which we are viewed professionally.” He didn’t think teachers need to get degrees to maintain any sort of professional status or identity; he suggested that if he wrote down on an application form that he had an MA it would not make any difference to how senior school managers saw him. His view was that if teachers wanted to get on and get promotion, they needed to be aware of Government initiatives and know how to get through loops, how to write
reports and convince the likes of heads and OFSTED that things are O.K. – even though they might not be. He called this, “being generous with the truth.”

My research has found that many teachers do not constantly seek to improve and develop their skills. Julie for example, withdrew from Masters level accredited CPD. She spoke of the Masters Degree not equating to a level of professionalism. She identified that two colleagues had trained as teachers prior to teacher training being a first degree level programme. She felt that these teachers were very skilled, successful and capable professionals. Similarly Carol disagreed with the need for teaching to become a Masters level profession. She felt that teachers did not need to gain a Masters degree to “prove how good they are at teaching.” She continued, “Are they (the Government) saying that, in the past goodness knows how many years, that teaching has been substandard because teachers do not have a Masters degree?

During a discussion that took place following a CPD partnership conference. It was revealed that none of the teachers in the discussion group felt the Masters degree was necessary or that by having a Masters degree, “proved that you were a better teacher than before you completed the degree.” A head teacher offered the view that by promoting the Masters degree and “pushing post graduate CPD”. The university was “putting teachers off CPD altogether.”

Paul said that he knew of several teachers who had been successful in getting promotion to deputy head, and none had Masters degrees but all “knew how to talk about what the
latest Government policy is, knew the words to say, like ‘focus’, ‘strategic’, ‘collaborative’ and so on.” He went on to say that he felt teachers were perceived by the community as “just someone that looks after kids in the classroom” he felt that teachers were not viewed for their qualification, skills or experience. This is in contrast to another teacher who said that although it is no guarantee that doing the MA will provide job security and promotion, he felt that by doing the MA it would give him a “better chance over other teachers who are not doing any CPD.

There is something of a debate within teaching as to whether teachers need to obtain a Masters degree in order to practice effectively in the classroom. This seems to have some influence on how teachers view their identity and on their engagement with CPD. The study by Arthur et al (2006) found that 52% of teachers said it was important that CPD leads to an award and 28% felt that it was very important. Their research went on to conclude that any quality mark provided by accredited CPD was realised on a personal level by the individual teachers rather than by the head teachers and the schools. But any award bearing benefits were not evident in the research carried out by Coldron and Smith (1999), instead they argued that teachers` development is best focused on the acquisition of; an array of educational traditions, a critical approach to practice, classroom management skills and research development.

7.8 Summary

There are some indications that teachers` decisions of whether or not to engage in continuing professional development activity is influenced by their perception of identity,
and of how teachers are seen by society and others within the organisations within which they work. For some teachers, taking part in professional development activities seems to offer an element of job security, in particular if the activity carries an award. Similarly, successful completion of award bearing CPD is seen as a benefit in terms of progression and promotion. But this is often determined by how the teachers see themselves and how they perceive they are seen by others. There is evidence that award bearing courses do not impact on the teachers’ own learning but rather offer an acknowledgement that some development has taken place.

The identity of teaching has changed somewhat over the years and there are some suggestions that this has an impact on how teachers’ identities are formed. For example, the developing role of the teaching assistant has influenced the ways in which teachers see themselves and for some this has added a burden of insecurity of their own identity, which is not surprising when teachers face the burden of being substituted and replaced by less qualified staff (Whitty 1997).

The identity of teachers is being hampered by the de-professionalisation of teaching (Hargreaves 2000). Teachers engagement with CPD therefore seems to be able to be influenced by the shifting sands of their own identities, but without a properly funded and co-ordinated approach to CPD, teachers are likely to “continue to sink into the quagmire” (Gray and Denley 2005: 10).
Chapter 8:

Summary and implications for practice.

8.1 Introduction

The four year period during which the data collection for this thesis took place continued the theme of political changes that have influenced the discourse of teachers CPD. Between 2006 and 2010 there was a period of considerable political change that has had a significant impact on the education and schools agenda. At the onset of the study the Labour Government was in power and financed, promoted and supported Masters level post graduate CPD for teachers. The MTL was introduced as an opportunity for teachers in their early years of teaching to embark on post graduate CPD that led to the new Masters degree. The change in Government led swiftly to a change to the ways in which teachers are trained and developed. The funding for the MTL was withdrawn as the conservative Government made significant changes to the way in which teachers’ development is funded and delivered.

That there have been many changes in policy that have led to several reconstructions of teachers’ CPD provision, offers some explanation to there being something of a mismatch in the Government priorities for CPD and that of the teachers’ themselves. My research has to capture the feelings of the teachers during these changes and through the time when the discourse was undergoing such significant developments.
Political rhetoric places good quality training and development for teachers (DfE 2010:3) on a par with good pupil attainment in schools (DfE 2010). In capturing some significant components to the discourse of teachers’ CPD, this thesis has illuminated what influences teachers’ when they make their decisions to engage in CPD. Where this thesis was not directly concerned with interface between pupil attainment and teachers’ development, it acknowledges that the overall intention of developing teachers is to enhance pupil experience and achievement. That the locus of teacher development is now focused in schools, my research has uncovered some significant implications for the provision of teachers’ CPD today.

This chapter pulls together the key findings from the data analysis and contextualises these in the light of changes to the policy. By unwrapping some of the components inherent in the discourse of teachers’ CPD, it outlines and proposes recommendations for the organisation of teachers CPD in a university context.

8.2 Professional identity and status

This study has illustrated of how policy change and associated discourses and reward structures intersect with changing notions of ‘professional’ with associated re-positioning of prestige and status. For some teachers such as Julie and Pat, their identity as a teacher is not affected by their qualification or by any higher level qualifications they may achieve through CPD. Contrastingly there are a significant number of teachers who believe CPD is a key feature of how they are viewed professionally, Mike, Malcolm, Di and Colin each
agreed that by taking part in professional development their identities as teachers were
benefiting. For these teachers, CPD that leads to a qualification offers some form of
security to their identity as a teacher that sets them apart from other professionals within
the school context.

For Malcolm, Dave and Maggie we see that the teaching assistant role has developed to
the extent that there is now a blurring of boundaries between the role of the teaching
assistant and their own role which has led to them taking part in CPD in order to achieve
an award that in some way protects their identity as a teacher. For others, such as Mike
the developing role of the teaching assistant bore little significance to the role of a
teacher.

The political agenda is fundamental to teachers` identity, both in terms of how teachers
see themselves and how they perceive that they are seen by the wider society. My
research suggests that teachers were aware of the political influence particularly when
local authorities were responsible for CPD, for example as a result of the availability of
funding. Mike, Lesley and Di each referred to the Governments agenda for CPD in terms
of how central policies influence the type of CPD that is accessible to teachers. There is
some debate on the issue of whether subject and craft skills are seen on a par with
professional skills, such as leadership and behaviour management. For example at the
SENCO conference, a head teacher explained that they would only support CPD if it had a
school improvement focus. Similarly, Lesley said that the local authority agenda for CPD
was based on leadership and management, but her school focus was for something different. Di referred to the local authority having a specific focus on a CPD offer that focused on languages, but she knew several schools that wanted to focus on assessment for learning.

Claims that teaching discourses are experiencing an on-going professional identity crisis (Campbell 2004, Campbell et al 2000 and Mahony and Hextall 2000), are borne out by the accounts of the teachers who responded in this research, and demonstrated in how they give accounts of their approach to CPD. For instance teachers in my research sought to distinguish their role from the role of the teaching assistant by engaged in CDP. Malcolm and Colin both alluded to the view that their identities as teachers were challenged by organisational structures and they were taking part in a Masters degree CPD programme in order to mitigate these challenges. Similarly, Di cautioned that teachers’ identities were susceptible to influence by external organisations and in order for teachers to be able to sustain some sort of identity they needed to engage in CPD.

8.3 The power dynamic

This thesis has illustrated some of the workings of discursive constructs within a public policy context. The way that those is powerful positions can control knowledge is seen in the situations where the local authority, university and head teachers are able to determine which teachers can access CPD and with what type of CPD they engage. The power within this discursive formation reveals an ideology that is linked to hegemony. Colin said that he had consented to taking part in CPD that was beneficial to the school.
Dave articulated that head teachers, local authority representatives and university tutors portray their CPD agendas as the norm without offering alternatives.

Teachers were dissuaded from engaging in CPD by what can be called hegemonic processes on the part of the local authorities and the university. Although the local authorities now have less of a role in teacher development and as a consequence, there are fewer collaborative partnerships with universities, head teachers are in a position from which they can affect a similar process of hegemony. As CPD funding becomes part of the schools overall funding allocation, the opportunity for head teachers to be able to influence the CPD agenda in their favour seems entirely possible.

There is an inevitability of strategic resistance to policies whose benefit is not clear to those in subservient positions. Many of the teachers in my study resisted the directives and changes to policy. But this is nothing new or exclusive, as Gramsci argued, true hegemony can never be absolutely complete as struggles for ideological controls will always exist (Joll 1977, Day 2000). Therefore, the teachers who made the decision not to engage in CPD or who decided to withdraw from CPD programmes were resisting this process of hegemony. It remains to be seen if this resistance will still exist if the power and control of CPD rests with the head teacher, in particular as they will also be employing teachers and as such able to determine employment conditions. But my research suggests that head teachers also have a significant impact on CPD, by being able to determine the type of CPD with which teachers engage, and in deciding which teachers take part in CPD.
Head teachers are bound by the governance agenda and as such approach CPD from a managerial perspective, which is seen by some teachers as being at odds with the way the teachers themselves approach their development. A significant consideration of the management agenda is to do with the financial implications for CPD. The cessation of central funding for post graduate accredited CPD for teachers together with an absence of determining any exclusivity for CPD funds, serves to create the potential for disparity and difference between schools.

That universities are no longer able to access funding for teachers CPD provides a challenge in that they will need to change the way in which they work with schools if they are to retain a stake in developing teachers. This seems to offer the chance to form collaborative partnerships with schools in order to offer accreditation for CPD programmes that are being carried out by the teachers in school. But my research suggests that the both the university and head teacher are seen as being in positions of power that significantly impact the way in which teachers approach their CPD. So any new collaborative partnerships have the potential to be influential to teachers’ decision making processes. However, they are also in a position to demotivate teachers from CPD if they act in such a way as to incorporate a system of hegemony.
8.4 Final thoughts and implications for professional practice

That this research is framed within a critical lens has uncovered some hidden workings of power within the discourse of teachers’ CPD. Drawing on Habermas and Foucault, I am inclined to argue that in order for teachers to be able to challenge practices that are felt by them to be coercive and destructive to their identity as teachers, the teachers themselves need to be seen as qualified professionals who are actively engaged in professional development.

But what are the implications for university faculties? Universities’ still hold the unique selling point, that they are able to offer accreditation for academic programmes. But there is a challenge to university education faculties; in order to retain a role in teachers’ CPD, they will need to adapt. This will involve challenging traditional methods of delivering CPD, for example in considering the type of CPD available to teachers and in establishing partnerships with schools in working towards a shared agenda for CPD. If university departments are to provide award-bearing development opportunities for teachers, it seems that they will need to form stronger links with schools and develop flexible delivery opportunities for CPD.

There is some sense of history repeating itself, by view of the funding now being channelled to head teachers, as when this model was experienced in the past, it led to an unacceptable and haphazard providing of CPD. Universities could position themselves to
be able to provide some stability and quality assurance of CPD programmes if schools engage them in collaborative partnerships. But there is an element of caution, At the TEAN conference held on 18th May 2012, the keynote speaker – Dr. Carolyn Daly spoke of a “Profound period of change in policy for teachers’ professional learning”. She argued that there is no longer a ‘golden age’ of university engagement with professional learning post-qualification which has had significant impact on the “marketisation of teacher education in England.”

There remains a significant question: Will head teachers enable the funding to be used exclusively for the purpose of teacher development? And if so, will the CPD with which the teachers participate, be according to their own wishes or will it conform to the agenda of the head teacher? This could be influenced by the way in which head teachers view teachers’ CPD and if they consider that developing teachers can add value to the school plan. It could also be influenced by head teachers perceiving benefit to the school of collaborative partnerships with universities.

The empirical data collection for this research ended in 2010 and where three years have been spent in the analysis and the writing of the final report, I would argue that the findings and suggestions remain valid today. In particular, as the discourse of education continues to experience changes and innovations that have the potential to impact on teachers’ CPD, this is seen in the recent School Direct initial teacher training programme.
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Example of Transcript:

Example 1.

Interview.

MK

Teacher in secondary school for 13 years – deputy head at same secondary school for 2 years.

Current engagement with CPD: Currently participating on MA – Leadership and Management pathway

I asked Mike what were the factors that influenced his decision to participate with CPD:

“For career progression. CPD is important if one wants to progress and gain promotion. It will also hopefully ensure some sort of job security although there is no guarantee. I would like to be a head teacher one day so I need to be seen to continue my development. The CPD that is put on through the county is not accredited and I think if you are doing CPD, you might as well get something for it. That`s why I`m doing the Post graduate award that leads to the Masters degree. I think that if you want to get on nowadays, you really need a Masters degree. I`m not denying that the fact a proportion of CPD is free and then part funded helped me in deciding to do this programme, although I would probably have taken part eventually even if had to fund myself. I completed the NPQH, so this meant that I could APEL the first 60 credits, all I needed to do was complete a reflective essay. I actually enjoyed doing the NPQH so felt I would like to carry on and make the credits worth something to me. The way that the course is delivered also had an impact, the fact that I can do much of the study in my own classroom makes a difference, I haven`t got to go to university once a week, because I don`t think i`d have time to do it if that were the case.”
“I was lucky as my Head teacher supported my request to do CPD. I spoke to him prior to registering and he was very supportive and appeared to have confidence in my abilities. This then gave me confidence in myself. He also offered time support where possible too. But I know this is not typical for many of the teachers on the same programme as me. Some of them have had a real struggle to get their head teachers to even acknowledge that they want to do CPD let alone support with funding or time. I just don’t know how they can do any study at all without the support of the Head teacher.”

Asked to explain this last point further, he thought before saying:-

“the head teachers role in CPD is really influential, you need them to support you as you need time to reflect on your practice. You need them to allow you to explore the school policies and processes. I just can’t imagine doing this without the full support of my head teacher.”

Mike thought again before saying:-

“When I was doing some work in an advisory capacity for the LA they too were supportive and gave me what I would call a subtle push for me to get onto this particular course. I felt trusted to have a degree of self motivation. My family were pleased and supportive, my partner very pleased and encouraging. She enjoyed my success when completing the NPQH so anticipating the same sort of thing when I complete this. I am the first graduate in the family, so parents and other siblings very pleased for me and also enjoy my success.
I asked Mike if CPD influenced teachers’ identity.

“there is quite a lot of grumbling and concern between teachers that some appear to have a better job than others. Some teachers are worried that they somehow have a worse time of teaching than other colleagues. I think this is due to how some teachers see themselves. I think in the staff room there is competition between some teachers regarding who is more qualified than others. I know of three teachers in my school who have Masters degrees and I think they see themselves as somehow better than the likes of me. But, on the other hand, there are those who are very quick to use the notion that they are too busy to prevent them from having to do any extra study and you have to say, well at least three managed to do it.”

Mike said that he felt that CPD with a qualification attached, did make a difference to how teachers see each other and that this impacts on the identity of the teachers. He argued that CPD could be creating a division of identity in that some teachers will have Masters degrees and others would not.

I asked Mike if he felt the status of teaching was influenced by CPD. Mike said,

“teaching does not have the professional status that it once did. Teachers used to be the pillar of community and were respected within villages and the general public, but not now. If you say you’re a teacher now, people look at you as if to say “so what”? so you’re responsible for the state that the education system is in. I feel that in order for the professional status of teachers to be maintained or even better, to be enhanced, then teachers owe it to themselves to take part in professional development.”
I asked him if, in his view there were other stakeholders whose actions influenced teachers’ CPD he said,

“I am aware that the relationships between several head teachers and the local authority are quite strained. I would say they are just power struggles, the heads want to have the final say over the CPD of the staff, but the LA do try to influence what CPD the staff will do. The LA is viewed with scepticism by some teachers, I know of some colleagues who will not take part in any accredited CPD just because the LA are saying they need to, again, I think this is just a power struggle and teachers generally don’t like being told what to do. Some of my colleagues would tell you that teachers are coerced into CPD purely to satisfy the LA targets. Teachers have a large degree of independence in the classroom, but less so when it comes to decisions that affect the whole school, these are still made by senior management. I feel that in order for the professional status of teachers to be maintained or even better, to be enhanced then teachers owe it to themselves to take part in professional development.

“The LA are viewed with scepticism in some areas, I know of some teachers who will not take part in any accredited CPD just because the LA are saying they need to – again – I think this is just a power struggle. Some of my colleagues would tell you that teachers are coerced into CPD purely to satisfy the LA targets.”

“I’m not sure of the Governors’ take on CPD, I know they are kept informed of staff who are taking part in some sort of CPD. As far as the Uni is concerned – I don’t have any
problems or complaints – they are able to deliver the courses flexibly and locally, so I’m
fine with that.”

I asked Mike of his views on the professional identity of teaching assistants

“I’ve noticed a massive increase in the self esteem and confidence of most TA’s – largely
due to the change in their role. Some still give the impression that the teachers are a “cut
above” them, but mainly I’ve witnessed a real upbeat trend in the TA’s. Most teachers I
know would also support this – I think I can speak for all of my current colleagues when I
say that TA’s are much more than TA’s if that makes sense. But there are a few
colleagues who seem to be feeling a bit threatened by this, and this was evident last term
when several TA’s registered for a Foundation Degree. I have got a lot of time for TA’s
let’s face it – we’d be in a right mess if it wasn’t for them.”
Interview with LG

Deputy Head and CPD co-ordinator

April 2008

In your role as CPD Co-ordinator, what do you feel are the main motivators for teachers to engage with CPD?

“Several teachers see it as the potential to increase their status. We have several teachers who have expressed quite a lot of interest in a leadership and management course, in fact the course was full only 2 days after being advertised. But this could be due to several things, firstly, there is cover available, so by signing up to the programme, which incidentally is accredited, they know they will get 2 days away from the classroom. I would like to think that this isn’t the only reason they have decided to show interest in this course, but you never really know. The most militant of teachers can appear very interested in something if they think it will get them out of the classroom for a decent spell. So to answer your initial question, one motivator could be time away from the students. Secondly, I think that there are quite a few very keen young teachers, who maybe in their NQT year, feel that they need to take all the training that they can get. They will ask me about CPD, and what they can do to obtain CATS points. The younger staff are normally less sceptical about accredited programmes, the older staff seem somehow to view accreditation and something quite daunting – despite my advice to the contrary. I also think that many teachers see what is happening with school mergers and
feel that, in order to give themselves a decent chance at obtaining decent job they need to have something decent on their CV. and I must admit, I think they are absolutely right. There is a lot of competition now for teaching posts, so the better the CV – the more opportunity you have. That is certainly my own experience, I was given the deputy heads post, I am sure, by the fact that I had done a Masters Degree, there were a lot of good people going for this job, and there could not have been much between us. However, I understand that there were only 2 of us with Masters Degrees and, well, I was offered the post.”

What initially motivated you to complete the MA?

“I did an MSc, but it’s probably more or less the same. Well, I always wanted to be a Head Teacher. From the minute I began my initial teacher training, I wanted to be a Head Teacher, and so, I realised that I would probably need to be continually doing something in order to keep some sustainable development going. My marriage broke down and I realised that I would need to be able to financially support myself, being in teaching earned a reasonable wage, and I could have lived on that. However, I realised that I could kill 2 birds with one stone so to speak, I could give myself a greater potential earning capacity and satisfy my yearning to be a Head teacher. But this would require some serious commitment by myself to study. That was really the driver for me.”
Do you think that your role is significant in influencing teachers?

“I chivvy several teachers up and spend time explaining things to them. I’ll go over the CPD process and the accreditation process and what it could mean for them etc. and I like to follow up the staff who have made initial enquiries about CPD programmes. I absolutely believe in CPD and I want the staff to do the same. I must admit though that I do go over the top sometimes, I wonder if I’m a bit too enthusiastic. But I know – through feedback from staff that the fact that I am like I am has led to them taking part in CPD and they themselves have felt that it has impacted positively on their practice and made them better teachers, after all, that’s what it’s all about isn’t it? Does it make a difference to the children? I have to say that I think it does, yes. But going back to what you previously said, Yes, I’m convinced that I could really manipulate teachers into taking part in CPD or dropping out of CPD if I wanted to because of the privileged role that I have.”

“The Head teacher is also a key player, they hold the funding and purse strings so if they want the teachers to do a certain CPD course, then the chances are that’s the course that the teachers will need to go with. The other thing that is important of course is the Head teachers´ relationship with the LA. If that’s not good then it doesn’t bode well for the staff in terms of CPD courses or funding. Our Head gets on fairly well with the LA but we’ve had problems in trying to set up a CPD group. The LA want to muster in and we think that it is really not a good idea, you see, the County [local authority] perspective isn’t always a good thing and we feel that we really want to deal with this ourselves as a local group. I know that the LA can be hugely influential in which University it is best for the schools to go with. For example, we’ve decided to go with one university. However, the LA wanted us to use another university because they have some partnership agreement going on with them, but we felt that particular university didn’t have the Kudos that our choice of
university had. That’s another thing, I suppose, and now you’ve asked me it has just
dawned on me that the choice of university could be an influencing factor, what
certificate would look best – the one with “Cambridge” on the bottom or the one with
“Bottomridge”. I know that’s hypothetical, but it is a factor, I know several of my
colleagues in other schools, deputies who have responsibility for CPD would want to use a
reputable university.”

“Actually thinking about it a bit more, I think the status thing is quite important to
teachers and how they see themselves”

I asked her if she was referring to inside or outside of the school

“Both, I suppose, but I was really referring to inside, how they think other teachers and
managers see them. I can think of several teachers who are doing the Masters degree
because they think it will offer some sort of higher status, you know, put them on the
track to promotion, that sort of thing. These teachers ignore the barriers.”

What might these perceived barriers be?

“Some teachers feel that they are overworked, they feel that they have too much to do
and so, as their perception is that CPD takes a lot more time, they do not buy in to the
CPD thing at all. Heavy and Increasing workload is the main reason I am given for teachers
not doing CPD – on the forms I’ll get something like, “not enough hours in the day” or, “just swamped with this to that”. I always remember an old teacher saying to me “if you want anything doing, ask a busy person” and I think that is absolutely true. It is very easy to claim over work and too busy, but at the end of the day, that is how it is.”

Are there any other barriers or perceived barriers?

Erm….I’m not sure all teachers are fully aware of the accreditation process, I think they see the word and think, gosh, that sounds like it might be difficult or labour intense, I don’t think they are aware that it is merely a process that affords them credits for the work that they do. And of course, being teachers, they won’t admit to not knowing, they would not want anyone to think that they don’t know something.

I asked Lesley if she felt teachers’ professional identity and status was influenced by CPD, she said

“Yes, accredited CPD is preferable as it leads to a qualification for the teachers and they can cash in any credits against post graduate courses in the future. Teachers who have post graduate credits are able to apply for higher and more senior positions, so this does have an impact on their identity and I think they think so to.”

The interview ended as Lesley had an incident to attend to.
Example 3
Interview.

JP

Teacher in secondary school for 16 years.

Current engagement with CPD: Started on a Post Grad Certificate course leading to an MA. She withdrew from the course.

I asked Julie what influenced her in registering for the Masters CPD programme. She said:

“I wanted to do something else. There are a lot of NQT’s [newly qualified teachers] about with post graduate qualifications and I wanted to make sure that I was keeping up.”

I asked her to explain this in more detail, Julie told me that she felt she needed to have post graduate qualifications herself. She was concerned that if she did not have at least the same qualifications as the new teachers, her position would be jeopardised. She said that,

“Not many teaching posts come up now – there are very few new opportunities, so I figured that if I wanted to be in with a chance of moving from the school I’m currently in then I need to get something on my C.V. I thought if I did a higher degree then the management might listen to me.”
Julie had decided to withdraw from the CPD programme, she gave the following explanation.

“I couldn’t get my head around all the terminology, I write how I talk and my assignments were getting returned because I hadn’t written them academically enough.”

When I asked her if she had made use of the university’s student support service, or asked for extra tutorials, she replied,

“I was too busy, what with work and taking on extra duties, when I got home the last thing I wanted to do was extra study.”

“I began to wonder why, as a teacher with so much experience, I should have to do more training. If I was that bad, then surely the deputy head or even the head would have pulled me to one side and had a word with me by now. I also wonder if, by us doing CPD we’re not just satisfying the school improvement plan.”

Julie felt that she was not able to make use of the CPD within her practice,

“I got disheartened as every time I went back to school with new ideas from the course I got knocked back. I don’t feel that I’m able to suggest changes. I also wonder if, by us doing CPD we’re not just satisfying the school improvement plan.”
I asked Julie what her view is of the identity of teachers.

“I think teachers are quite concerned by the lack of status. If my teacher said “be quiet” to the class, then the class was quiet, now, if I said that – the pupils would want to know why and would probably create more noise, yes, I think that teaching or the role of the teacher has changed quite a lot, I know of a couple of teachers who work at my school who haven’t even got a first degree, because they did their initial teacher training before you needed a degree, and I would say they are amongst the best teachers in the school. I think teachers are more that just teachers though now. We have to be nurse maids, counsellors, administrators, mediators and such like. I wouldn’t want to go back to having to wear caps and gowns to teach, but I do think we need to revisit some of the old ways, particularly where discipline in the classroom is concerned. If we were allowed to discipline pupils now then our professional status would rise, pupils just don’t respect the profession any more.”

I then asked if she felt CPD plays a role

“I think teachers professional identity is linked to their training and development – I went to a few INSET days, but to be honest, I didn’t really learn much – just got some ideas for new resources to use in the classroom – but then – there’s no money for new resources. If you look at Doctors and Barristers, they belong to a professional body that is quite high
I don’t think the GTC is as high profile. Even nurses – their professional body is very strict with who practices and what they do, they also insist on them carrying out so many hours of CPD per year or risk losing their registration.”
Example 4

Interview.

MW

Head Teacher in primary school for 22 years

Participates on County Heads CPD programmes.

I asked Mike what his views were on CPD;

“all the staff in this school are participating in some sort of CPD. I feel that by doing so brings so much back to the school. I think accredited CPD is better than other programmes as it gives the staff an award at the end, and in my experience that matters. The organisation benefits from staff CPD, I think maybe I help in that I encourage staff to use what they are doing on the courses back here in the school, and I also encourage them to discuss it with their colleagues. I think that teachers and TA’s do reflect on what they learn, but they just need prompting from time to time.”

“The pupils benefit as well, I’m confident that my staff are probably as up to date with current legislation and practice as anybody, and I’m very proud of that. They are also
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knowledgeable on policy issues and legislation – not just practical resources and new ways of delivery.”

I asked him what his views are of the professional identity of teachers in the current climate.

“I think teaching as a profession has more opportunities now than it has experienced in a long time and this has strengthened the identity of teaching. Although we complain often of lack of funds, I think if you were to consider the funding availability of years ago, teaching doesn’t do too badly today, I offer CPD to all the teachers and I pay for them. My belief is that without professional development it is difficult to demonstrate any professional status and identity. I have to say that no teacher has refused to take part in any CPD. I think in some ways the identity of teachers has changed over time, no doubt some would argue that teachers had a higher status in the mid 19’s, and they may well have done, but I’m not sure if they had the responsibility and accountability that they now have, they certainly weren’t as evaluated and assessed as they are today.”

Can I now ask you of you views of the professional identity of teaching assistants?

“Well again, all the TA’s here are doing some sort of CPD, many are already HLTA’s and several are doing the foundation degree. Without doubt this has had a significant impact on the way they see themselves. They have become more confident and comfortable with their role. I think the teachers also see that the TA’s role has changed - they are now much more than just teaching support.”
In terms of teachers CPD how would you view the relationships between other relevant actors?

“I think that the head teacher role is key, and I know I am one, but it could be very easy for me not to bother too much with the CPD of the staff, I think that would signal a very sad day for the organisation and for the development of the pupils. I have the power over which teachers do CPD and which teachers don’t do it, and I also control what sort of CPD that they do. I have people, mainly other head teachers, saying to me – you support teachers through CPD and then all they do is leave you for a better job elsewhere, then you’ve lost money and a member of staff – well, I say, what I always have believed, “ so what” all the time they have been taking part in the CPD they have been bringing so much back into the school, that outweighs the issues of them leaving. I’ll employ another teacher and give them the opportunity for CPD so the cycle starts again. But I don’t have a high staff turnover at all.

Mike said that he knew of several other head teachers who would disagree with him